OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

FOURTH SESSION—THIRTEENTH PARLIAMENT

10-11 GEORGE V, 1920

IN FIVE VOLUMES

Volume I: Pages 1-1034 Volume II: Pages 1035-2002
Volume III: Pages 2003-3078 Volume IV: Pages 3079-4017
Volume V: Pages 4019-4591

VOLUME CXLI

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE TWENTY-SIXTH DAY OF FEBRUARY TO THE SEVENTH DAY OF APRIL, 1920, INCLUSIVE.



OTTAWA
THOMAS MULVEY
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1920

PROPERTY OF
SUN LIFE OF CANADA
NOV 28 1939
LIBRARY

MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

OF THE

RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR ROBERT LAIRD BORDEN

P.C., G.C.M.G., K.C., LL.D.

AT THE OPENING OF THE

FOURTH SESSION OF THE THIRTEENTH PARLIAMENT

1920

THE MINISTRY

First Minister, Secretary of State for External Affairs	Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Laird Borden, P.C. G.C.M.G., K.C., LL.D.
Minister of Trade and Commerce	Rt. Hon. Sir George Eulas Foster, P.C. G.C.MG., B.A., D.C.L., LL.D.
Minister of Justice and Attorney General	Rt. Hon. Charles Joseph Doherty, K.C., D.C.L. LL.D.
Minister of Railways and Canals	Hon. John Dowsley Reid, M.D.
Minister of the Interior and Superintendent General of Indian Affairs	Hon. Arthur Meighen, K.C., B.A.
Minister of Customs and Inland Revenue	Hon. Martin Burrell.
Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment	Hon. Sir James Alexander Lougheed, K.C.M.G., K.C.
Postmaster General	Hon. Pierre Edouard Blondin.
Minister of Marine and Fisheries and Minister of the Naval Service	Hon. Charles Colquhoun Ballantyne.
Secretary of State and Minister of Mines	Rt. Hon. Arthur Lewis Sifton.
Minister of Immigration and Colonization	Hon. James Alexander Calder.
President of the Privy Council and Minister of Public Health	Hon. Newton Wesley Rowell, K.C.
Minister of Labour	Hon. Gideon Decker Robertson.
Minister of Finance	Hon. Sir Henry Lumley Drayton, K.C.
Minister of Agriculture	Hon. Simon Fraser Tolmie.
Minister of Militia and Defence	Hon. Hugh Guthrie, K.C.
Minister of Public Works	Vacant.
Solicitor General	Vacant.
Parliamentary Secretary for External Affairs	F. H. Keefer, K.C.
Parliamentary Secretary for the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment	Lieut.-Col. Hugh Clark.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Speaker.....Hon. EDGAR N. RHODES, K.C., B.A., LL.B.

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees..GEORGE H. BOIVIN, K.C., B.A.

Clerk of the House.....W. B. NORTHRUP, K.C., M.A.

Serjeant-at-Arms.....Lieutenant-Colonel H. W. BOWIE.

Editor of Debates.....THOMAS P. OWENS.

Associate Editor of Debates.....A. C. CAMPBELL.

Official Reporters of Debates :—

English : George Simpson, Robert C. Dunbar, F. W. S. Galbraith, Earl C. Young, H. E. Oliver, W. H. Dickson, Frederick Berryman, T. S. Hubbard.

French : J. O. Marceau, Marcel Gabard.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES :

Messieurs : Ballantyne, Burnham, Chabot, Devlin, Elkin, Foster (Sir George), Hocken, Kay, Lemieux, McKenzie, McLeod, Marcil (Bonaventure), Munson and Richardson.

Chairman : R. L. Richardson.

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Fourth Session—Thirteenth Parliament.

1920

ALLAN, GEORGE WILLIAM—Winnipeg, S. Riding.
AMES, SIR HERBERT BROWN, Kt.—St. Antoine.
ANDERSON, ROBERT KING—Halton.
ANDREWS, GEORGE WILLIAM—Winnipeg Centre.
ARCHAMBAULT, JOSEPH—Chambly and Vercheres.
ARGUE, IRA EUGENE—Swift Current.
ARMSTRONG, JOHN A. MACDONALD—York, N. Riding.
ARMSTRONG, JOSEPH EMMANUEL—Lambton, E. Riding.
ARTHURS, JAMES—Parry Sound.

BALDWIN, WILLIS KEITH—Stanstead.
BALLANTYNE, Hon. CHARLES COLQUHOUN—St. Lawrence-St. George.
BALL, ROBERT JAMES—Grey, Southeast Riding.
BÉLAND, Hon. HENRI SÉVÉRIN—Beauce.
BEST, JOHN—Dufferin.
BLAIR, WILLIAM JOHN—Battle River.
BLAKE, MATTHEW ROBERT—Winnipeg, N. Riding.
BOIVIN, GEORGE HENRY—Shefford.
BOLTON, FERRIS—Lisgar.
BONNELL, SAUL—Kootenay, E. Riding.
BORDEN, Rt. Hon. SIR ROBERT LAIRD, G.C.M.G.—Kings (N.S.).
BOURASSA, JOSEPH BOUTIN—Lévis.
BOWMAN, JAMES—Huron, N. Riding.
BOYCE, GEORGE—Carleton.
BOYER, GUSTAVE—Vaudreuil-Soulanges.
BOYS, WILLIAM ALVES—Simcoe, S. Riding.
BRIEN, JOHN WESLEY—Essex, S. Riding.
BRISTOL, EDMUND—Toronto Centre.
BROUILLARD, JOSEPH OVIDE—Drummond and Arthabaska.
BUCHANAN, WILLIAM ASBURY—Lethbridge.
BUREAU, JACQUES—Three Rivers and St. Maurice.
BURNHAM, JOHN HAMPDEN—Peterborough, W. Riding.
BURRELL, Hon. MARTIN—Yale.
BUTTS, ROBERT H.—Cape Breton South and Richmond.

CAHILL, FRANK S.—Pontiac.
CALDER, Hon. JAMES ALEXANDER—Moosejaw.
CALDWELL, THOMAS WAKEM—Victoria and Carleton (N.B.).
CAMPBELL, J. A.—Nelson.
CANNON, LUCIEN—Dorchester.
CARDIN, PIERRE JOSEPH ARTHUR—Richelieu.
CASGRAIN, PIERRE FRANCOIS—Charlevoix-Montmorency.
CASSELMAN, ORREN D.—Dundas.
CHABOT, JOHN LEO—Ottawa.
CHAPLIN, JAMES DEW—Lincoln.
CHARLTON, WILLIAM ANDREW—Norfolk.
CHARTERS, SAMUEL—Peel.
CHISHOLM, ALEXANDER W.—Inverness.
CLARK, HUGH—Bruce, N. Riding.
CLARK, MICHAEL—Red Deer.
CLARKE, WILLIAM A.—Wellington, N. Riding.
CLEMENTS, HERBERT SYLVESTER—Comox-Alberni.
COCKSHUTT, WILLIAM FOSTER—Brantford.
COOPER, RICHARD CLIVE—Vancouver, S. Riding.
COPP, ARTHUR BLISS—Westmorland.
COWAN, WALTER DAVY—Regina.
CRERAR, Hon. THOMAS ALEXANDER—Marquette.
CRONYN, HUME—London.
CROTHERS, Hon. THOMAS WILSON—Elgin, W. Riding.
CROWE, SANFORD JOHNSTON—Burrard.
CRUISE, ROBERT—Dauphin.
CURRIE, JOHN ALLISTER—Simcoe, N. Riding.

d'ANJOU, JOSEPH EMILE STANISLAS EMMANUEL—Rimouski.
DAVIDSON, AVARD LONGLEY—Digby and Annapolis.
DAVIS, FRED LANGDON—Neepawa.
DÉCHÊNE, AIMÉ MIVILLE—Montmagny.
DELISLE, MICHEL SIMÉON—Portneuf.
DEMERS, MARIE JOSEPH—St. Johns and Iberville.
DENIS, JEAN J.—Joliette.
DESAULNIERS, ARTHUR L.—Champlain.
DESLAURIERS, HERMAS—St. Mary.
DEVLIN, EMMANUEL B.—Wright.
DOHERTY, Rt. Hon. CHARLES JOSEPH—St. Ann.
DOUGLAS, JAMES McCRIE—Strathcona.
DOUGLAS, JOHN C.—Cape Breton South and Richmond.
DRAYTON, Hon. SIR HENRY, K.C.M.G.—Kingston.
DUFF, WILLIAM—Lunenburg.
DUTREMBLAY, PAMPHILE RÉAL—Laurier-Outremont.

EDWARDS, JOHN WESLEY—Frontenac.
ELKIN, STANLEY EDWARD—St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert.
ETHIER, JOSEPH ARTHUR CALIXTE—Laval-Two Mountains.
EULER, WILLIAM D.—Waterloo, N. Riding.

FAFARD, J. FERNAND—L'Islet.
FIELDING, Hon. WILLIAM STEVENS—Shelburne and Queens.
FINLEY, ALBERT ERNEST—Souris.
FONTAINE, JOSEPH ELOI—Hull.
FORTIER, HYACINTHE ADELARD—Labelle.
FOSTER, Rt. Hon. SIR GEORGE EULAS, G.C.M.G.—Toronto, N. Riding.
FOSTER, THOMAS—York, E. Riding.
FOURNIER, C. A.—Bellechasse.
FRASER, EVAN E.—Welland.
FRIPP, ALFRED ERNEST—Ottawa.
FULTON, FREDERICK JOHN—Cariboo.

GAUTHIER, LOUIS JOSEPH—St. Hyacinthe-Rouville
GAUVREAU, CHARLES ARTHUR—Témiscouata.
GERVAIS, THEODORE—Berthier.
GLADU, JOSEPH ERNEST OSCAR—Yamaska.
GLASS, SAMUEL FRANCIS—Middlesex, E. Riding.
GOULD, OLIVER ROBERT—Assiniboia.
GREEN, ROBERT FRANCIS—Kootenay, W. Riding.
GRIESBACH, WILLIAM ANTROBUS—Edmonton, W. Riding.
GUTHRIE, HON. HUGH—Wellington, S. Riding.

HALBERT, ROBERT H.—Ontario, N. Riding.
HALLADAY, HOWARD H.—Bow River.
HAROLD, JOHN—Brant.
HARRISON, CHARLES ROBERT—Nipissing.
HARTT, THOMAS A.—Charlotte.
HAY, THOMAS—Selkirk.
HENDERS, RICHARD COE—Macdonald.
HEPBURN, WILLIAM BERNARD RICKART—Prince Edward.
HOCKEN, HORATIO CLARENCE—Toronto, W. Riding.
HUGHES, Hon. SIR SAM, K.C.B.—Victoria.
HUNT, AYLMER BYRON—Compton.

JACOBS, SAMUEL WILLIAM—George Etienne Cartier.
JOHNSTON, J. FRED—Last Mountain.

KAY, WILLIAM FREDERIC—Missisquoi.
KEEFER, FRANCIS HENRY—Port Arthur and Kenora.
KEMP, Hon. SIR EDWARD, K.C.M.G.—Toronto East.
KENNEDY, JOHN WILFRED—Glengarry and Stormont.
KENNEDY, WILLIAM COSTELLO—Essex, N. Riding.
KING, HON. W. L. MACKENZIE—Prince (P.E.I.)
KNOX, ANDREW—Prince Albert.

LAFORTUNE, DAVID ARTHUR—Jacques Cartier.
LALOR, FRANCIS RAMSEY—Haldimand.
LANCTÔT, ROCH—Laprairie and Napierville.
LANG, NORMAN—Humboldt.
LAPOINTE, ERNEST—Quebec East.
LAVIGUEUR, HENRI E.—Quebec County.
LEDUC, J. ALFRED—Westmount-St. Henry
LEGER, AUGUSTE THÉOPHILE—Kent (N.B.)
LEMIEUX, Hon. RODOLPHE—Maisonneuve-Gaspé.
LESAGE, JOSEPH EDMOND—Hochelaga.
LOGGIE, WILLIAM STEWART—Northumberland (N.B.)
LONG, CHARLES EDWIN—North Battleford.

MACKIE, HENRY ARTHUR—Edmonton, E. Riding.
MACKIE, HERBERT J.—Renfrew, N. Riding.
MACLEAN, Hon. A. K.—Halifax.
MACLEAN, WILLIAM FINDLAY—York, S. Riding.
MACNUTT, THOMAS—Saltcoats.
MCCOIG, ARCHIBALD BLAKE—Kent (Ont.)
MCCREA, FRANCIS N.—Sherbrooke.
MCCURDY, FLEMING BLANCHARD—Colchester.
* MCDONALD, AUGUS—Timiskaming.
MCGIBBON, PETER—Muskoka.
MCGIBBON, PETER ROBT.—Argenteuil.
MCGREGOR, ALEXANDER—Pictou.
MCINTOSH, JOHN CHARLES—Nanaimo.
MCISAAC, JAMES—Kings (P.E.I.)
MCKENZIE, DANIEL D.—Cape Breton North and Victoria.
MCLEAN, HUGH HAVELOCK—Royal.
MCLEOD, HARRY FULTON—York-Sunbury.
MCMASTER, ANDREW ROSS—Brome.
MCQUARRIE, WILLIAM GARLAND—New Westminster.
MAHARG, JOHN A.—Maple Creek.
MANION, ROBERT JAMES—Ft. William and Rainy River.
MARCIL, Hon. CHARLES—Bonaventure.
MARCILE, JOSEPH EDMOND—Bagot.
MARTIN, PETER FRANCIS—Halifax.
MAYRAND, HORMISDAS—Maskinongé.
MEIGHEN, Hon. ARTHUR—Portage la Prairie.
MERNER, JONATHAN JOSEPH—Huron, S. Riding.
MEWBURN, Hon. SYDNEY CHILTON—Hamilton, E. Riding.
MICHAUD, PIUS—Restigouche and Madawaska.
MIDDLEBRO, WILLIAM SORA—Grey, N. Riding.
MOLLOY, JOHN PATRICK—Provencher.
MORPHY, H. B.—Perth, N. Riding.
MOWAT, HERBERT MACDONALD—Parkdale.
MUNSON, CHARLES ARTHUR—Northumberland. (Ont.)
MURPHY, Hon. CHARLES—Russell.
MYERS, EDWARD THOMAS WORDON—Kindersley.

NESBITT, EDWARD WALTER—Oxford, N. Riding.
NICHOLSON, DONALD—Queens (P.E.I.)
NICHOLSON, GEORGE BRECKEN—Algoma, E. Riding.

PACAUD, LUCIEN TURCOTTE—Megantic.
PAPINEAU, LOUIS JOSEPH—Beauharnois.
PARDEE, FREDERICK FORSYTH—Lambton, W. Riding.
PARENT, GEORGE—Quebec, W. Riding.
PAUL, WILLIAM JAMES—Lennox and Addington.
PECK, CYRUS WESLEY—Skeena.
PEDLOW, ISAAC ELLIS—Renfrew, S. Riding.
PELLETIER, FRANCOIS JEAN—Matane.
PORTER, EDWARD GUSS—Hastings, W. Riding.
POWER, CHARLES GAVAN—Quebec, S. Riding.

* From April 29 (p. 1787).

PREVOST, JULES EDOUARD—Terrebonne.
PROULX, EDMOND—Prescott.

REDMAN, DANIEL LEE—Calgary, E. Riding.
REID, Hon. JOHN DOWSLEY—Grenville.
REID, JOHN FLAWS—Mackenzie.
RHODES, Hon. EDGAR N.—Cumberland.
RICHARDSON, ROBERT LORNE—Springfield.
* RINFRET, FERNAND—St. James.
ROBB, JAMES ALEXANDER—Chateauguay-Huntingdon.
ROSS, DUNCAN CAMPBELL—Middlesex, W. Riding.
ROWELL, Hon. NEWTON WESLEY—Durham.

SAVARD, EDMOND—Chicoutimi-Saguenay.
SCOTT, FRANK STEWART—Waterloo, S. Riding.
SÉGUIN, PAUL ARTHUR—L'Assomption-Montcalm.
SEXSMITH, JOHN ALBERT—Peterborough, E. Riding.
SHAW, HUGH MURRAY—Macleod.
SHEARD, CHARLES—Toronto, S. Riding.
SIFTON, Rt. Hon. ARTHUR LEWIS—Medicine Hat.
SIMPSON, THOMAS EDWARD—Algoma, W. Riding.
SINCLAIR, JOHN EWEN—Queens, P.E.I.
SINCLAIR, JOHN H.—Antigonish and Guysborough.
SMITH, WILLIAM—Ontario, S. Riding.
SPINNEY, EDGAR KEITH—Yarmouth and Clare.
STACEY, FRANK BAINARD—Fraser Valley.
STEELE, MICHAEL—Perth, S. Riding.
† STEIN, ADOLPH, Kamouraska.
STEVENS, HENRY HERBERT—Vancouver, Centre.
STEWART, JOHN A.—Lanark.
STEWART, THOMAS JOSEPH—Hamilton, W. Riding.
SUTHERLAND, DONALD—Oxford, S. Riding.

THOMPSON, ALFRED—Yukon.
THOMPSON, RICHARD FREDERICK—Weyburn.
THOMPSON, THOMAS HENRY—Hastings, E. Riding.
THOMSON, LEVI—Qu'Appelle.
TOBIN, EDMUND WILLIAM—Richmond and Wolfe.
TOLMIE, Hon. SIMON FRASER—Victoria City. (B.C.).
TRAHAN, ARTHUR—Nicolet.
TREMAIN, HADLEY BROWN—Hants.
TRUAX, REUBEN E.—Bruce, S. Riding.
TUDHOPE, JAMES BROCKETT—Simcoe, E. Riding.
TURGEON, ONESIPHORE—Gloucester.
TWEEDIE, THOMAS MITCHELL MARCH—Calgary, W Riding.

VERVILLE, ALPHONSE—St. Denis.
VIEN, THOMAS—Lotbinière.

WALLACE, THOMAS GEORGE—York, W. Riding.
WHIDDEN, HOWARD PRIMROSE—Brandon.
WHITE, WILLIAM HENRY—Victoria, Alta.
WHITE, Rt. Hon. SIR THOMAS, K.C.M.G.—Leeds.
WIGMORE, RUPERT WILSON—St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert.
WILSON, GORDON CROOKS—Wentworth.
WILSON, JAMES ROBERT—Saskatoon.
WRIGHT, H. O.—Battleford.

* From April 19 (p. 1357).
† From April 6 (p. 949).

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

Constituencies of the House of Commons

Fourth Session—Thirteenth Parliament.

1920

ALGOMA, EAST—George Brecken Nicholson.
ALGOMA, WEST—Thomas Edward Simpson.
ANTIGONISH AND GUYSBOROUGH—John H. Sinclair.
ARGENTEUIL—P. Robert McGibbon.
ASSINIBOIA—Oliver Robert Gould.

BAGOT—Joseph Edmond Marcile.
BATTLEFORD—Henry Oswald Wright.
BATTLE RIVER—William John Blair.
BEAUCE—Hon. Henri Sévérin Béland,
BEAUHARNOIS—Louis Joseph Papineau.
BELLECHASSE—C. A. Fournier.
BERTHIER—Theodore Gervais.
BONAVENTURE—Hon. Charles Marcil.
BOW RIVER—Howard Haden Halladay.
BRANDON—Howard Primrose Whidden.
BRANT—John Harold.
BRANTFORD—William Foster Cockshutt.
BROME—Andrew Ross McMaster.
BRUCE, NORTH—Hugh Clark.
BRUCE, SOUTH—Reuben E. Truax.
BURRARD—Sanford Johnston Crowe.

CALGARY, EAST—Daniel Lee Redman.
CALGARY, WEST—Thomas Mitchell March Tweedie
CAPE BRETON NORTH AND VICTORIA—Daniel D. McKenzie.
CAPE BRETON SOUTH AND RICHMOND—John C. Douglas, Robert H. Butts.
CARIBOO—Frederick John Fulton.
CARLETON—George Boyce.
CHAMBLY AND VERCHERES—Joseph Archambault.
CHAMPLAIN—Arthur L. Desaulniers.
CHARLEVOIX-MONTMORENCY—Pierre François Casgrain.
CHARLOTTE—Thomas A. Hartt.
CHATEAUGUAY-HUNTINGDON—James Alexander Robb.
CHICOUTIMI-SAGUENAY—Edmond Savard.
COLCHESTER—Fleming Blanchard McCurdy.
COMOX-ALBERNI—Herbert Sylvester Clements.
COMPTON—Aylmer Byron Hunt.
CUMBERLAND—Hon. Edgar N. Rhodes

DAUPHIN—Robert Cruise.
DIGBY AND ANNAPOLIS—Avard Longley Davidson.
DORCHESTER—Lucien Cannon.
DRUMMOND AND ARTHABASKA—Joseph Ovide Brouillard.
DUFFERIN—John Best.
DUNDAS—Orren D. Casselman.
DURHAM—Hon. Newton Wesley Rowell.

EDMONTON, EAST—Henry Arthur Mackie.
EDMONTON, WEST—William Antrobus Griesbach.
ELGIN, E. RIDING—Vacant.
ELGIN, W. RIDING—Hon. Thomas Wilson Crothers.
ESSEX, N. RIDING—William Costello Kennedy.
ESSEX, S. RIDING—John Wesley Brien.

FORT WILLIAM AND RAINY RIVER—Robert James Manion.
FRASER VALLEY—Frank Bainard Stacey.
FRONTENAC—John Wesley Edwards.

GASPÉ—Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux.
GEORGE ETIENNE CARTIER—Samuel William Jacobs.
GLENGARRY AND STORMONT—John Wilfred Kennedy.
GLOUCESTER—Onésiphore Turgeon.
GRENVILLE—Hon. John Dowsley Reid.
GREY, N. RIDING—William Sora Middlebro.
GREY, SOUTHEAST RIDING—Robert James Ball.
HALDIMAND—Francis Ramsey Lalor.
HALIFAX—Hon. A. K. Maclean, Peter Francis Martin.

HALTON—Robert King Anderson.
HAMILTON, E. RIDING—Hon. Sydney Chilton Mewburn.
HAMILTON, W. RIDING—Thomas Joseph Stewart.
HANTS—Hadley Brown Tremain.
HASTINGS, E. RIDING—Thomas Henry Thompson.
HASTINGS, W. RIDING—Edward Guss Porter.
HOCHELAGA—Joseph Edmond Lesage.
HULL—Joseph Eloi Fontaine.
HUMBOLDT—Norman Lang.
HURON, N. RIDING—James Bowman.
HURON, S. RIDING—Jonathan Joseph Merner.

INVERNESS—Alexander W. Chisholm.

JACQUES CARTIER—David Arthur Lafortune.
JOLIETTE—Jean J. Denis.

* KAMOURASKA—Adolph Stein,.
KENT, N.B.—Auguste T. Leger.
KENT, ONT.—Archibald Blake McCoig.
KINDERSLEY—Edward Thomas Wordon Myers.
KING'S, N.S.—Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Laird Borden, G.C.M.G.
KINGS, P.E.I.—James McIsaac.
KINGSTON—Hon. Sir Henry Drayton.
KOOTENAY, E. RIDING—Saul Bonnell.
KOOTENAY, W. RIDING—Robert Francis Green.

LABELLE—Hyacinthe Adelard Fortier.
LAMBTON, E. RIDING—Joseph Emmanuel Armstrong.
LAMBTON, W. RIDING—Frederick Forsyth Pardee.
LANARK—John A. Stewart.
LAPRAIRIE AND NAPIERVILLE—Roch Lanctôt.
L'ASSOMPTION-MONTCALM.—Paul Arthur Séguin.
LAST MOUNTAIN—John Frederick Johnston.
LAURIER-OUTREMONT—Pamphile Réal DuTremblay.
LAVAL-TWO MOUNTAINS—Joseph Arthur Calixte Ethier.
LEEDS—Rt. Hon. Sir Thomas White, K.C.M.G.
LENNOX AND ADDINGTON—William James Paul.
LETHBRIDGE—William Asbury Buchanan.
LEVIS—Joseph Boutin Bourassa.
LINCOLN—James Dew Chaplin.
LISGAR—Ferris Bolton.
L'ISLET—J. Fernand Fafard.
LONDON—Hume Cronyn.
LOTBINIÈRE—Thomas Vien.
LUNENBURG—William Duff.

MACDONALD—Richard Coe Henders.
MACKENZIE—John Flaws Reid.
MACLEOD—Hugh Murray Shaw.
MAISONNEUVE—Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux.
MAPLE CREEK—John Archibald Maharg.
MARQUETTE—Hon. Thomas Alexander Crerar.
MASKINONGÉ—Hormisdas Mayrand.
MATANE—François Jean Pelletier.
MEDICINE HAT—Rt. Hon. Arthur Lewis Sifton.
MEGANTIC—Lucien Turcotte Pacaud.
MIDDLESEX, E. RIDING—Samuel Francis Glass.
MIDDLESEX, W. RIDING—Duncan Campbell Ross.
MISSISQUOI—William Frederic Kay.
MONTMAGNY—Aimé Miville Déchène.
MOOSEJAW—Hon. James Alexander Calder.
MUSKOKA—Peter McGibbon.

NANAIMO—John Charles McIntosh.
NEEPAWA—Fred Langdon Davis.
NELSON—J. A. Campbell.
NEW WESTMINSTER—William Garland McQuarrie.
NICOLET—Arthur Trahan.
NIPISSING—Charles Robert Harrison.
NORFOLK—William Andrew Charlton.
NORTH BATTLEFORD—Charles Edwin Long.
NORTHUMBERLAND, N.B.—William S. Loggie.
NORTHUMBERLAND, ONT.—Charles Arthur Munson.

ONTARIO, N. RIDING—Robert A. Halbert.
ONTARIO, S. RIDING—William Smith.
OTTAWA—Alfred Ernest Fripp, John Leo Chabot.
OXFORD, N. RIDING—Edward Walter Nesbitt.
OXFORD, S. RIDING—Donald Sutherland.

PARKDALE—Herbert Macdonald Mowat.
PARRY SOUND—James Arthurs.
PEEL—Samuel Charters.
PERTH, N. RIDING—Hugh Boulton Morphy.
PERTH, S. RIDING—Michael Steele.
PETERBOROUGH, E. RIDING—John Albert Sexsmith.
PETERBOROUGH, W. RIDING—John Hampden Burnham.
PICTOU—Alexander McGregor.
PONTIAC—Frank S. Cahill.
PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE—Hon. Arthur Meighen.
PORT ARTHUR AND KENORA—Francis Henry Keefer.
PORTNEUF—Michel Siméon Delisle.
PRESCOTT—Edmond Proulx.
PRINCE ALBERT—Andrew Knox.
PRINCE EDWARD—William Bernard Rickart Hepburn.
PRINCE, P.E.I.—Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King.
PROVENCHER—John Patrick Molloy.

QU'APPELLE—Levi Thomson.
QUEBEC COUNTY—Henri E. Lavigueur.
QUEBEC, EAST—Ernest Lapointe.
QUEBEC, SOUTH—Charles Gavan Power.
QUEBEC, WEST—George Parent.
QUEENS, P.E.I.—Donald Nicholson, John Ewen Sinclair.

RED DEER—Michael Clark.
REGINA—Walter Davy Cowan.
RENFREW, N. RIDING—Herbert John Mackie.
RENFREW, S. RIDING—Isaac Ellis Pedlow.
RESTIGOUCHE AND MADAWASKA—Pius Michaud.
RICHELIEU—Pierre Joseph Arthur Cardin.
RICHMOND AND WOLFE—Edmund William Tobin.
RIMOUSKI—Joseph Emile Stanislas Emmanuel d'Anjou.
ROYAL—Hugh Havelock McLean.
RUSSELL—Hon. Charles Murphy.

ST. ANN—Rt. Hon. Charles Joseph Doherty.
ST. ANTOINE—Sir Herbert Brown Ames, Kt.
ST. DENIS—Alphonse Verville.
ST. HYACINTHE-ROUVILLE—Louis Joseph Gauthier.
† ST. JAMES—Fernand Rinfret.
ST. JOHN CITY AND COUNTIES OF ST. JOHN AND ALBERT—Stanley Edward Elkin, Rupert Wilson Wigmore.
ST. JOHNS AND IBERVILLE—Marie Joseph Demers.
ST. LAWRENCE-ST. GEORGE—Hon. Charles Colquhoun Ballantyne.
ST. MARY—Hermas Deslauriers.
SALTCOATS—Thomas MacNutt.
SASKATOON—James Robert Wilson.
SELKIRK—Thomas Hay.
SHEFFORD—George Henry Boivin.

* From April 6 (p. 949).
† From April 19 (p. 1357).

SHELBURNE AND QUEENS—Hon. William Stevens Fielding.
SHERBROOKE—Francis N. McCrea.
SIMCOE, E. RIDING—James Brockett Tudhope.
SIMCOE, N. RIDING—John Allister Currie.
SIMCOE, S. RIDING—William Alves Boys.
SKEENA—Cyrus Wesley Peck.
SOURIS—Albert Ernest Finley.
SPRINGFIELD—Robert Lorne Richardson.
STANSTEAD—Willis Keith Baldwin.
STRATHCONA—James McCrie Douglas.
SWIFT CURRENT—Ira Eugene Argue.

TÉMISCOUATA—Charles Arthur Gauvreau.
TERREBONNE—Jules Edouard Prevost.
THREE RIVERS AND ST. MAURICE—Jacques Bureau.
* TIMISKAMING—Augus McDonald,
TORONTO, CENTRE—Edmund Bristol.
TORONTO, EAST—Hon. Sir Edward Kemp, K.C.M.G.
TORONTO, NORTH—Rt. Hon. Sir George Eulas Foster, G.C.M.G.
TORONTO, SOUTH—Charles Sheard.
TORONTO, WEST—Horatio Clarence Hocken.

VANCOUVER, CENTRE—Henry Herbert Stevens.
VANCOUVER, SOUTH—Richard Clive Cooper.
VAUDREUIL-SOULANGES—Gustave Boyer.
VICTORIA, ALTA.—William Henry White.
VICTORIA, ONT.—Hon. Sir Sam Hughes, K.C.B.
VICTORIA AND CARLETON, N.B.—Thomas Wakem Caldwell.
VICTORIA CITY, B.C.—Hon. Simon Fraser Tolmie.

WATERLOO, N. RIDING—William D. Euler.
WATERLOO, S. RIDING—Frank Stewart Scott.
WELLAND—Evan E. Fraser.
WELLINGTON, N. RIDING—William Aurelius Clarke.
WELLINGTON, S. RIDING—Hon. Hugh Guthrie.
WENTWORTH—Gordon Crooks Wilson.
WESTMORLAND—Arthur Bliss Copp.
WESTMOUNT-ST. HENRY—Joseph Alfred Leduc.
WEYBURN—Richard Frederick Thompson.
WINNIPEG, CENTRE—George William Andrews.
WINNIPEG, NORTH—Matthew Robert Blake.
WINNIPEG, SOUTH—George William Allan.
WRIGHT—Emmanuel B. Devlin.

YALE—Hon. Martin Burrell.
YAMASKA—Joseph Ernest Oscar Gladu.
YARMOUTH AND CLARE—Edgar Keith Spinney.
YORK, E. RIDING—Thomas Foster.
YORK, N. RIDING—John Alexander Macdonald Armstrong.
YORK, S. RIDING—William Findlay Maclean.
YORK, W. RIDING—Thomas George Wallace.
YORK-SUNBURY—Harry Fulton McLeod.
YUKON—Alfred Thompson.

* From April 29 (p. 1787).

CANADA

House of Commons Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT

Thursday, February 26, 1920.

FOURTH SESSION, THIRTEENTH PARLIAMENT—OPENING.

The Parliament which had been prorogued from time to time to the 26th day of February, 1920, met this day at Ottawa for the despatch of business.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

Mr. Speaker read a communication from Lieut.-Colonel H. C. Henderson, Governor General's Secretary, announcing that His Excellency the Governor General would proceed to the Chamber, temporarily occupied by the Senate, at three p.m. on this day, for the purpose of formally opening the session of the Dominion Parliament.

A message was delivered by Colonel Ernest J. Chambers, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, His Excellency the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this honourable House in the Chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly the House went up to the Senate Chamber.

And the House being returned to the Commons Chamber:

VACANCIES.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that during the recess I received communications from several members, notifying me that the following vacancies had occurred in the representation, viz.:

Of David Marshall, Esq., member for the Electoral District of Elgin, East Riding, by decease.

Of Ernest Lapointe, Esq., member for the Electoral District of Kamouraska, by resignation.

Of Louis Audet Lapointe, Esq., member for the Electoral District of St. James, by decease.

I accordingly issued my several warrants to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out new writs of election for the said electoral districts respectively.

NEW MEMBERS.

I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery certificates of the election and return of the following members, viz.:

Of Simon Fraser Tolmie, Esq., for the Electoral District of Victoria City.

Of Oliver Robert Gould, Esq., for the Electoral District of Assiniboia;

Of Robert H. Halbert, Esq., for the Electoral District of Ontario, North Riding.

NEW MEMBERS INTRODUCED.

Oliver Robert Gould, Esq., member for the electoral division of Assiniboia, introduced by Mr. Thomas MacNutt and Mr. Andrew Knox.

Robert Henry Halbert, Esq., member for the electoral district of North Ontario, introduced by Mr. Michael Clark (Red Deer) and Mr. John W. Kennedy.

OATHS OF OFFICE.

Bill No. 1, respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—Sir George Foster.

MESSAGE FROM HIS MAJESTY THE KING.

CABLEGRAM FROM THE KING ON THE OCCASION OF PARLIAMENT'S FIRST MEETING IN THE NEW BUILDINGS.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to communicate to the House the following cablegram:

London, Feb. 23, 1920.

I desire that you will convey to my faithful Senate and House of Commons of Canada my warmest greetings on this the first occasion of their assembly in the new buildings, with the erection of which my son is proud to have been associated. It is my firm assurance that the deliberations of the Parliament of Canada will as in the past redound to the happiness and prosperity of the great Dominion whose well-being is so vital to the whole Empire.

George Rex.

Rt. Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, moved, seconded by Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King (leader of the Opposition):

That Mr. Speaker do make grateful acknowledgement of the gracious message of His Majesty the King on behalf of the House of Commons.

He said, Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that I should say a few words on this occasion in reference to the message of His Majesty the King and the subject matter thereof.

We have been favoured at various times by having associated with the home of the Parliament of Canada different members of the Royal Family. This site of our Parliament buildings was chosen by our late beloved Queen Victoria. The corner stone of the old building was laid by her son, then the Prince of Wales, afterwards King Edward VII of England. The corner stone of this present building was laid by His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught, and that of the memorial tower by His Royal Highness, Edward, Prince of Wales. So that from the first days of Confederation down to the present time, the foundation and construction of our Parliament buildings have been connected with the Royal Family. Their interest in Canada has been exemplified by their active association with the home of the Canadian Parliament.

This occasion invites us to review some of the events of our history connected with our past Parliamentary homes and to indulge in some reminiscences. I may be pardoned, therefore, for saying a few words as to the past, as well as with regard to the present and to the future.

Our Parliamentary homes have been somewhat nomadic; and in that respect they have partaken of the character of our earlier period of exploration and development. To the British colonies in North America Parliamentary institutions came in due time. The old Parliaments of the Maritime Provinces early found their homes in the cities of Halifax, Charlottetown and Fredericton; and these homes have been maintained to the present time. The Parliaments of Upper and Lower Canada, when united, found their homes in various cities. The first meeting of the Parliament of United Canada was held at Kingston in the year 1841. Thence it was moved to Montreal in 1844. Fire drove the representatives of the people from their legislative home at Montreal and they betook themselves to Toronto. After Toronto had sheltered the members of the Parliament of United Canada for about ten years, they found a home in the city of Quebec. After Queen Victoria's choice of Ottawa as the seat of the Federal Government and the building of the old edifice which was destroyed by fire in 1916, the Parliament of the United Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada met in Ottawa in 1867, and on November 6 of that year the first meeting of the Parliament of Canada was held in Ottawa. This brief sketch gives us an idea of the wanderings from place to place of our representatives, until at last they settled down in the Parliament Buildings at Ottawa in 1867. With the exception of a short interregnum after the fire of 1916, during which we found shelter in the Victoria Museum Building, we have since made our home here. And now, a few years after the fire of 1916, we occupy this noble and splendid edifice, which we hope will long continue to be the home of the Parliament of Canada.

May the record of Canada's legislators in their new home be as worthy of being embalmed in the history of our country as has been the record of those who have been connected with the Parliaments of the past.

We cannot help looking back to that day, the 6th of November, 1867, when the members and senators of the first Parliament of Canada crossed the threshold of their new home in Ottawa. I have often tried to sympathize with their state of mind, their hopes, their fears; none of us lived the lives that they lived; passed through the struggles which they passed through; earned the experience that they earned. It is impossible, therefore, for us fully to appreciate their feelings. At that time 181 members of Parliament and 72 members of the Senate crossed the threshold of their first national Parliamentary home. With what hopes; with what fears; with what pride in the record already made; with what uncertainty of feeling, yet with what strong hope in the future did these men—young, middle-aged, and old—commence their deliberations. Behind them were the struggles of long years of development, of organization, of the formation of municipal institutions, of bringing the country out of the rough and into a condition under which it could make greater and fuller progress, with all the struggle and contest and difficulty incidental thereto. In their hearts there was a new fire; on their faces a new light. They looked to a future vague and uncertain, yet full of strange and hidden potencies, flooded

with the rising sun of possible great and glorious days.

These men had courage; they needed to have courage. As they looked upon the past and tried to look into the days to come, they needed the full consciousness of their high emprise, all the courage of their resolution, all their optimism and hope, to face the dim and uncertain future and go on to the work left for them to do. We who stand here after a lapse of more than fifty years can plainly read the record. We find it in the harvest which has been gathered from the seed they scattered on uncertain grounds; in the advance which has been made in territory; in the increase of internal strength. It is a record which ministers to our pride, though it is no occasion for boasting. It tells of a past which is a source of gratification to people who have carved out a road for themselves from the rough and the wild—people who belong to a country whose proportions are noble; whose foundations are securely laid, whose superstructure remains for the generations of the future to complete in manner worthy of its firm foundation.

Mr. Speaker, as we cross the threshold of this the noble home of Canada's Parliament of to-day, it behooves us to contrast ourselves with the men of the past. We must look to the proud record which has been made and which has been handed down in trust to us. We must question ourselves as to what manner of workmen we shall prove ourselves to be as we bring forth the tools of our art and apply them to the work that yet remains to be done. Are we fitted to carry on the work so well begun? When fifty years have passed and others stand where we stand to-day, will our work bear the scrutiny of those who succeed us? Will it stand contrast with the work of the Fathers of Confederation?

Looking back over the years which have passed since Confederation, and observing where we stand now as compared with where we stood fifty years ago—not only as regards our own internal affairs, but as regards also our status as a country among the nations of the world—we cannot help realizing that in all respects Canada's position is immeasurably greater now than it was then.

But every advance that we make in knowledge of the world outside of Canada, every advance that we make in world life and world struggle, put upon us the added responsibility of higher conceptions, of stronger principles, of a finer finish of culture and of superstructure to the great national edifice, now being raised, and in the completion and finishing of which it is our duty and privilege as well to take some part.

(Continuing in French). (Translation): Mr. Speaker, before resuming my seat, I wish to say a few words to my colleagues—my friends, as well, I trust,—who, within these precincts, speak French as their mother-tongue. It goes without saying that in undertaking such a task, I shall make many mistakes. I am yet a pupil, a very young pupil in the colloquial knowledge of French, but it is with the greatest confidence that I appeal to the indulgence, goodwill and proverbial courtesy of my colleagues.

Let me first congratulate you on the inauguration of these Halls of Parliament and on our crossing the threshold of this national edifice, built upon its old foundations, and designed according to the old style of architecture, and surrounded as it is with the memory, traditions and the very presence of those noble men, who, half a century ago, framed our constitution, the Fathers of Confederation. We have in Canada the descendants of two great historic nations, of two virile and powerful races which, in past centuries, have strongly determined the destinies and inspired the ideals of a large portion of the territories and peoples of Europe. Our ancestors, throughout the world, on land and on sea, have struggled against each other on many a battlefield; but our ancestors, more particularly within the later years, have fought, on various battlefields, side by side against a common foe, for the same cause, prompted by the same ideas of justice, liberty and for the rights of humanity. The feuds, misunderstandings, ill-feeling and prejudices of the days of yore are almost a memory of the past, and what remains now enshrined in our hearts is the memory of a noble courage, of a perfect camaraderie, of an entente cordiale as permanent, I hope, as it is deep-seated.

In North America, our two races have played a glorious part and on this continent unexplored, uninhabited, and almost a virgin wilderness, they have developed a civilization, the richest and the most powerful in the world, over this vast expanse of territory which is now known as Canada. Our two races, for over two centuries, have battled and contended with each other for mastery, and afterwards they have remained together in this territory as good friends, as fellow-citizens of a common and well-beloved country.

There are differences between the two ethnical groups; differences of genius, of origin, of character, of language. Those differences have existed from the very outset and will perpetuate themselves in the future; but the causes of those divergences should not be lost sight of and now, after the stress and storm of the awful and tragical war that we had just brought to a triumphant conclusion, if we wish to grapple with the problems of the future, we must set to the task of welding all the elements of our population into a united nation, as fellow-citizens and inhabitants of a country which needs all our efforts towards its upbuilding and its fashioning into a noble and great commonwealth. On this historic occasion, when we cross the threshold of our new home of the Parliament of Canada, let us make it our duty to dedicate ourselves anew to the service and welfare of our country; let us pledge ourselves ever to keep burning, on the altars of this national temple, the sacred fires, lit over half a century ago by those noble and distinguished men, who even in death are never silent and still speak to us and whose example of service and sacrifice are still our inspiration.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I have the privilege, on behalf of His Majesty's loyal Opposition, of seconding the motion which has just been moved by the right hon. the Acting Prime Minister (Sir George Foster).

The cable of greeting which has been read by you, Mr. Speaker, from His Majesty reminds us not only of the sovereignty which we share in common with all parts of the British Empire, but of the constant concern of members of the Royal Family for the well-being and prosperity of this Dominion, and of the many intimate associations of its Royal members with these halls of Parliament.

My Rt. hon. friend has spoken so feelingly and effectively of the attachment between His Majesty the King and the people of this Dominion that I shall refrain from attempting to add to what he has so eloquently said in this connection, beyond mentioning that hon. members on this side of the House share in equal measure the sentiments of loyalty and devotion to the person and office of His Majesty.

If more were needed to reveal the heart of the Canadian people, and, for that matter, the heart of the Royal Family, it would be found in the expressions of mutual affection everywhere evoked during the recent visit of His Royal Highness, the Prince of Wales, and the memory of that visit at this time.

May I join my right hon. friend in giving expression to other sentiments which we experience in common on this historic occasion?

It is not more a source of regret to supporters of the Government than it is to hon. members of the Opposition that the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) is prevented, because of the impaired condition of his health, from being present at and participating in these opening ceremonies, certain as they are to live in the memories of all who are privileged to witness them. It is gratifying to us, as it will be to the people of Canada, to know that the change of scene and thought, and most of all, the freedom for a time from vast responsibilities, which the Prime Minister is at present enjoying, have not been without their beneficent effects; and that restoration of health, which we all hope may be speedy and complete, appears now to await him. Still, we regret his absence, and we miss his presence.

There is another presence which will also be missed by this House and by the country on this memorable occasion. I am sure every hon. member will deeply regret that the Right Honourable Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who for fifteen years preceded the Prime Minister in that high and important office, and who for forty-four years was an honoured and greatly beloved member of this House, was not spared to witness the restoration of these Halls of Parliament in which his long life was given with such fidelity to his country's service. Especially on occasions of ceremony, such as this, do we miss his distinguished appearance, his chivalrous and courteous manner, and, most of all, his charm of utterance and ability to portray the significance of transpiring events toward which many of us stand as mute spectators.

But, Sir, whilst we miss these leaders of our political parties through the recent past—the one taken from us and the other spared to us—we are all glad, I am sure that, circumstances being what they are, the honour of being the first to welcome the Commons to their new home, and to speak the word which gives its appropriate setting to this occasion, should have fallen to one who is not only so eminently gifted in the art of expression, but who is also the oldest member of the King's Privy Council for Canada. May I extend to my

right hon. friend the congratulations of hon. members of this side of the House, in which I know hon. members on his own side will very cordially join, that, despite the many vicissitudes of a long and strenuous public career, he has been spared to attain this distinction, and to enjoy it in the capacity in which he meets Parliament to-day.

With all that my right hon. friend has so eloquently and appropriately said, we of His Majesty's loyal opposition are in full accord. Did time permit, and were it fitting so to do, one might dwell at great length upon the thoughts which this occasion inspires, and which the dignified and noble proportions of this imposing edifice cause to be uppermost in one's mind. Great as the temptation is to speak of much that is suggested here, with the permission of the House I shall content myself with but an added reflection or two upon the notes that are sounded as one contemplates the impressive loveliness and vast architectural beauty of these Halls of Parliament in their finished state.

It is not always easy to interpret the mind of genius; but genius lies in the ability to interpret to others the mystery of the greatness that lies everywhere about them. This, in a word, through the medium of these buildings, is what the chief architect, Mr. John Pearson, and Mr. J. O. Marchand, his associate, and others with them have succeeded in doing, with such admirable skill and such perfect taste, as respects our vast Dominion. The committee of both Houses in charge of the work of reconstruction, the departmental officers and officials of Parliament, and all who have assisted in thought or execution of design, are to be congratulated upon what we behold to-day. They are not less to be commended for permitting the architects great freedom in the working out of their ideas. If it is appropriate, as I believe it is, to single out the chief architect for special mention on this occasion, I would remind the House of the tablet which appears in St. Paul's in honour of Sir Christopher Wren, the architect of that great cathedral: "Lector, si monumentum requiris, circumspice"—"Reader, if it is a monument you seek, look around." If it be praise of Mr. Pearson and his associate that is demanded, let it be uttered by the visible embodiment of their conceptions.

The first note sounded through a contemplation of these buildings, even in their unfinished state is that or our Canadian nationality. First and foremost, comes the thought that this is a national edifice, that it symbolizes Canada. More and more, as the years go by, we shall come to feel towards these buildings as the Englishman feels towards the Houses of Parliament at Westminster. How strange that they too should have been destroyed by fire some eighty years ago! These Halls of Parliament, like those yonder, represent our nation's story; they are the centre of our nation's story; they are the centre of our national life. With consummate skill, exception.

The stone of which the walls of the interior are constructed bears upon its surface the marks of the sea, though it comes all the way from the Middle West. It is Canadian stone. Like the Laurentians which we see as we look towards the setting sun, it reminds us that, recent as our country's written history may be, its material foundations belong to the oldest known geological formations to be found anywhere on the surface of the globe.

Francis Parkman has told, in one of his great works descriptive of Canada's past, of how, while New England was still a wilderness, and the settlers of Virginia scarcely dared venture inland beyond the sound of a cannon shot, Champlain, in the near vicinity of the Rideau and the Chaudiere, where these very buildings stand, was planting on shores and islands the emblems of his faith. The daring exploits of those early intrepid explorers and Christian missionaries, that form the romantic and heroic background of our early history, are depicted here and there in sculpture and painting throughout these halls, reminding us of the great race that first brought the arts of civilization to this part of the North American continent.

In the main entrance, the central column, commemorative of Confederation, washed at its base by a mythical sea, stands symbolical of the British Isles, whence sprang our political institutions. It serves to remind us, as well, of what a noted historian has referred to as "the expansion of England," and the other races that have combined to make our Canadian nationality what it is. When completed, the fan-shaped projections of this central column will unite with like expansions from the columns that take their rise from the outer edges of this central court, thereby forming a series of arches symbolical of the several provinces of the Dominion. In this splendid way will be commemorated our Confederation, the unity of the British peoples, and what the Parliament of Canada and the Legislatures of the

several provinces owe to the mother of Parliaments in the old land.

The tower which is to be the crowning feature of this structure will be a national memorial to Canada's sons who gave their lives for the world's freedom in the recent war. All Canada will rejoice at this recognition of our heroic dead, the chivalry of our young land. Beneath the stone at its base, laid by His Royal Highness, the Prince of Wales, in September last, will be found the names of the workmen who have carved the stone, and wrought the iron finishings which are a part of this structure. In the tower itself, I believe it is contemplated to record the name of every man and woman who served with the military and naval forces of Canada during the war. What finer symbolism could there be of the forces that combined to win the War—the armies in the field, the navy and the merchant marine upon the sea, and the workmen in essential industry wherever found?

In this Chamber and in the Senate, as also in the reading room and the Railway Committee Room, the design and artistic detail will be such that, not only will great dignity and impressiveness be lent to the surroundings, but each room will speak its own purpose.

The Hall of Fame which connects the central court with the Library will be our Canadian pantheon, the prophecy of a Canadian Westminster or St. Paul's of the Canada that is yet to be.

In this unique and inspiring manner, those of us who are privileged to assemble here, will be reminded daily of our country's vastness in extent and resources, its variety and picturesqueness in natural scenery, and ever-changing customs, its strength and virility in all that relates to the development of its industries, its progress in art and letters, as well as in material wealth, and of the true greatness of the Canadian people in character and heroic achievement.

A second note sounded in this wonderful environment is that of harmony—harmony of colour and design, harmony of aim and purpose, harmony of the several parts that unite to comprise the whole. Here surely is something that will not be without its influence upon the amenities of our parliamentary life, and its bearing upon the great problems that confront our nation. We have too often mistaken the significance of our differences of origin, of temperament, of interest, forgetting that variety may lend a richness to life which uniformity tends wholly to destroy. What is needed in the upbuilding of our nation is not the obliterating of differences, but the reconciling of them. We should seek to make this noble structure a temple of reconciliation in all that pertains to our national life. To what loftier purpose could we dedicate the new privilege that is ours to-day?

There is another note that is sounded, and which at the moment seems to ring out beyond all the rest. It is the spirit of our people. To some it has seemed a misfortune that we should have entered these buildings before they had reached completion. They, surely, have never heard of "the glory of the imperfect." What we witnessed in the destruction of these buildings was a symbol of the desecration and the desolation of recent years. What we are witnessing to-day is the spirit of the people rising out of the ashes and ruins of the world, and building anew a civilization of a higher and saner order than any the world has hitherto known. Who would separate himself from this work of reconstruction, standing aside lest his garments may be stained? Why, Sir, we have here a foretaste of the industrial commonwealth that is to be, where, in the affairs of State, the workers in industry are the builders in common with the framers of a nation's laws.

And this note brings out another; it is the greatness that is yet to be. It was on the 56th anniversary of the laying of the corner-stone of the old Parliament Buildings by King Edward VII, at that time the young Prince of Wales, that his brother, His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught, officiated at the relaying of the same stone as the new foundation of these buildings as restored. Speaking of that earlier occasion, His Royal Highness remarked that, looking at that stone, and all that it represented of the changes that had taken place when it was first laid, we recognized how little those who had assisted at the ceremony of those days could foresee the great progress and advancement that has been made by this Dominion. If that remark was true when we were still in the midst of war, how much more true it is to-day when Victory has been won and Peace restored. When Edward VII, as Prince of Wales, visited the capital of Canada that was to be, he and his party made their journey from Montreal to Ottawa in canoes, they were escorted by Indians and couriers des bois, they landed at a wharf on the banks of the Ottawa, and climbed its slopes. To-day, our transportation terminals rival our legislative halls. What will Canada be in another fifty-six years? What in another five hundred and sixty? Who will dare to say?

Great as was the faith of the Fathers of Confederation in the future they foresaw their anticipations have been eclipsed even within the lives of some who were spared until our day.

Sir, this nation's greatness can be limited only by its aspirations. We have been given by Providence a firm and enduring foundation. All that we wish for in material environment is symbolized in what we see to-day. The form, the semblance of loveliness, the outer strength and beauty, are all here. It remains only to cherish and ennoble the nation's ideals and to seek their realization in the justice of our laws.

Words of my own fail to express what I wish for my country in this connection. But the words of another come to me as I speak, and I apply them to the soul of our nation in the spirit of the resurrected form and beauty we behold to-day. It is a note clearer, purer, more ethereal, than all the rest.

Through the deep caves of thought I hear the voice that sings:
"Build thee more stately mansions, O my soul,
As the swift seasons roll!
Leave thy low-vaulted past!
Let each new temple, nobler than the last,
Shut thee from heaven with a dome more vast,
Till thou at length art free,
Leaving thine outgrown shell by life's unresting sea!"

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Beauce) (Translation): Mr Speaker, you will realize that it was not my intention to address the House this afternoon. However, I feel it to be my duty—an agreable duty indeed—to notice in the presence of my colleagues, the remarkable effort just made, in the French language, by the right honourable minister of Commerce (Sir George Foster), who is now filling the important functions of leader of the Government.

He has set an example to his English-speaking colleagues, and we, whose maternal tongue is that of Racine and Corneille, hope that this example may be often followed.

In a language as distinguished in substance as it is in form, the honourable minister displayed before our eyes the panorama of the history of Canada. It was truly interesting. He made us live over again the hours of anguish which preceded the cession of Canada to England and the trying period which followed it.

We remember indeed reading in our history that the beginnings of the English regime in Canada were not always what they should have been.

There lacked lubricant between the administrative machinery of the time and the French Canadian people—then, supplying with the native races, the only population of the country. But in 1775, there took place in America an historical event which was a source of inspiration for Great Britain.

Two years ago, Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be present, in Westminster, upon an occasion the remembrance of which will ever live in my memory. It was the celebration in London, in the heart of the British Empire, of the anniversary of American Independence. It was on the 4th of July, 1918, and upon that memorable day Mr. Churchill, in his speech, uttered the following words:

"When England lost the empire which was called the United States of America, England thereby won an empire."

How, Mr. Speaker, did England win an empire by losing the United States? Because this event determined with so clear-sighted political men as the English are, a new course in the management of their dependencies. It was a lesson by which it profited. And it profited by it to such an extent that to-day is seen around it this empire an integral part of which we are proud to be.

We are to-day meeting for the first time in this legislative temple. The speakers who preceded me have praised in inimitable language its artistic and harmonious proportions. I have but to join my voice to theirs, and to add that we of the French tongue are ready as we always have been to unite our efforts to those of our English-speaking friends and colleagues who share with us the soil of Canada on a footing of absolute equality.

We are here the descendants of two ancient and chivalrous races who have just demonstrated — if ever proof were needed —that they had not degenerated, when for five years on the battlefields they covered themselves with an immortal glory.

Yes, we desire to take our share, not only of the benefits which naturally accrue to a Canadian citizen, but also our share of responsibility and duty.

We were bidden to do so by the honourable minister; we shall willingly do it.

Mr. Speaker, I have but one word to add: let all devotion join together, let all energy in the country unite. The work to be done is immense and for the carrying out of the task before us, it is not too much of all the experience of men older than myself, and of all the ardour and spirit of

those who are younger. Let all old and young join hands in what is truly a sacred union.

Then it comes to my mind at this moment that the Greek history tells us that in the great celebrations, in Athens, was to be seen a procession of a truly imposing nature. It was the filing past of the old men ahead of those of the younger generation, the old men, bending towards the grave, chanting words like these: "We are the fathers of the nation, the hour of our departure is near, we disappear and you will follow us." And after the old men had marched past the forum, the younger one appeared and these were singing: "We come after you and our supreme duty shall be to march in your footsteps."

A moment ago, the honourable minister was recalling to us the immense task accomplished by the Fathers of the Confederation, at a time when the future was not very bright before them. Well, we can repeat after him as after the Fathers of the Confederation: "We are your descendants and we will follow in your footsteps, in order that Canada towards which are turned the eyes of the world, be a happy country, united in harmony and prosperity."

Motion (Sir George Foster) agreed to.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that when the House did attend His Excellency the Governor General this day in the Senate Chamber, His Excellency was pleased to make a speech to both Houses of Parliament. To prevent mistakes, I have obtained a copy, which is as follows:

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I congratulate you that after an enforced absence of four years, it is possible for you to assemble in your new legislative home, resting in trustful security upon the old foundations and surrounded by the picturesque and historic setting of Parliament Hill. Though not entirely completed, its noble proportions, its wide and convenient spaces, its beauty of design and chasteness of finish and its unique local situation mark it as a most striking and dignified structure, worthy of the people whose national life it will henceforth serve.

Since the last Session of Parliament events of importance have taken place which have brought appreciably nearer the much desired settlements of peace. Following the exchange of the final ratifications, the Treaty of Peace between the Allied Powers and Germany has been brought into full force and effect and has rendered possible the constitution of the League of Nations and the establishment by it of the various Commissions and mandatories authorized by the Treaty to be carried out under its direction. It is satisfactory to note that the status of Canada as a member of the League has thus been definitely fixed.

The Treaty of Peace with Bulgaria has been concluded and will be submitted for your approval. Negotiations for the conclusion of Treaties of Peace with Hungary and Turkey are now well advanced and, if concluded in time, will be laid before you during the present Session of Parliament.

The first meeting of the International Labour Conference, in accordance with the provisions of the Treaty of Peace, was held in Washington in October and November of last year and was attended by representatives of my Government and of the Canadian employers' and employees' organizations. It will be gratifying to learn that Canada was selected as one of the twelve Governments whose countries are entitled to representation on the governing body of the International Labour Office.

When the remaining Treaties shall have been concluded and the functions of the League of Nations and the various tribunals authorized thereby become fully operative, it is confidently hoped that the end will have been reached of the confusion and uncertainty consequent upon the long and regrettable delay in bringing into operation the provisions of the Treaty and an effective beginning made in the improvement of national conditions and the adjustment of international relations which will ensure the continued blessings of peace.

The forces which Canada contributed to the war have now nearly all been returned and mostly demobilized and the great majority have resumed their avocations and again become active and important factors in civil life.

The Department of Soldiers' Civil Reestablishment and the Soldiers' Land Settlement Board continue to provide vocational training and opportunities for permanent occupation which greatly aid in the solution of the problem of readjustment, whilst the work of the Labour Employment Bureaus and the helpful service of the Canadian Patriotic Association in administering the emergency fund provided by Parliament, have materially assisted in solving the problem of temporary non-employment.

In the European economic field clear vision is still impossible and the unsettled state of Exchange, the lack of International Credits, and the inflation of paper currency, combined with the scarcity of raw materials and the demoralization of labour and transport conditions, combine to retard production and to restrict the exchange of products necessary for the proper sustenance of life and the rebuilding of the waste and destruction caused by the great war. From every quarter of the world is being impressed, often by severe privation and suffering, the one great lesson that increased production through increased work, combined with thrift and economy in individual and state, is the only sure hope of business improvement and future prosperity.

After four years of war and a year and three months of confusion and dislocation which has succeeded thereto, it is satisfactory to know that business in Canada has been well maintained, that production has been large and that general conditions are on the whole satisfactory. It is cause for thankfulness that of all countries affected by the war, Canada has maintained a record of social

order and industrial and commercial prosperity second to none.

The ratification of The International Opium Convention renders it necessary to obtain legislation to carry into effect its provisions relating to the sale of opium, cocaine and other deleterious drugs. A Bill will be laid before you for that purpose.

A Bill to provide for a Dominion Franchise will be introduced, dealing with the qualifications of voters and the procedure necessary to enable all persons legally qualified to register their votes.

Other Bills will be presented for your consideration including a Bill respecting Copyrights and Bills providing for the amendment of the Patent Act, of the Loan and Trust Companies Acts, the Indian Act, and the Exchequer Courts Act.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

The accounts for the last fiscal year will be laid before you. Estimates for the next fiscal year will be submitted at an early date, making provisions for the various services of the Government of Canada. These have been formed with a view to strict economy, having due regard to the requirements of the public service and the obligations of the Country.

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:
Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

In inviting your careful attention to the important subjects which will engage your attention I pray that the blessings of Divine Providence may attend your deliberations.

On the motion of Sir George Foster it was ordered that the speech of His Excellency the Governor General to both Houses of Parliament be taken into consideration on Monday next and that this order have precedence over all other business, except the introduction of Bills, until disposed of.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER moved:

That a special committee be appointed to prepare and report with all convenient speed lists of members to compose the select standing committees of this House under Rule 10; said committee to be composed of Messrs. Reid (Grenville), King, Calder, Meighen, McCoig, Middlebro, and Robb, and that that portion of Rule No. 10 limiting the number of members of the said committee be suspended in relation thereto.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Joint report of the Librarians of Parliament.—Mr. Speaker.

APPOINTMENT OF DEPUTY SERJEANT AT ARMS.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Serjeant at Arms, with my approval, has appointed Louis Charles Panet, Esquire, to be his deputy during the present session of Parliament.

TREATY OF PEACE WITH BULGARIA.

Hon. NEWTON W. ROWELL laid on the table of the House a copy of the Treaty of Peace between the Allied and Associated Powers and Bulgaria, signed on the 29th November.

ADJOURNMENT—ABSENCE OF THE PRIME MINISTER.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER moved that the House do now adjourn until Monday next at 3 o'clock.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY: May I ask the right hon. gentleman who is leading the House (Sir George Foster) if he can give the House any information as to the probable date of the return to his parliamentary duties of the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden).

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am not prepared to give my hon. friend (Mr. Murphy) that information.

Motion agreed to and House adjourned at 4.40 p m.

Monday, March 1, 1920.

The House met at Three o'clock.

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION.

Mr. SPEAKER: I beg to present a communication from His Excellency the Governor General approving of a Minute of the Privy Council appointing Hon. John Dowsley Reid, Minister of Railways and Canals; Hon. Martin Burrell, Minister of Customs and Inland Revenue; Hon. J. A. Calder, Minister of Immigration and Colonization; and Rt. Hon. A. L. Sifton, Secretary of State, to act with the Speaker of the House of Commons as commissioners for the purpose, and under the provisions, of the Eleventh Chapter, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, entitled "An Act Respecting the House of Commons."

REPORTS AND PAPERS TABLED.

Annual Report of Steamboat Inspection; Annual Report of Department of Marine and Fisheries; Annual Report of the Department of Naval Service; Annual Report of the Fisheries Branch; Order in Council authorizing the payment of Command money to the officials of the dockyard service; Amendments to Radial Telegraph Regulations—Hon. C. C. Ballantyne.

Czecho-Slovak Minorities Treaty: Serb-Croat-Slovene Minorities Treaty; Arms

Traffic Convention; Liquor Traffic Convention; Berlin and Brussels Acts Convention—Hon. Newton W. Rowell.

TREATY BETWEEN ALLIED POWERS AND BULGARIA.

Hon. NEWTON W. ROWELL (President of the Privy Council) moved that 350 copies in English and 150 copies in French of the Treaty of Peace between the Allied and Associated Powers and Bulgaria signed on 27th November, 1919, and laid on the table of the House on 26th February, 1920, be printed forthwith and that the provisions of rule 74 in relation thereto be waived.

Mr. SPEAKER: This motion, of course, can only be entertained by unanimous consent of the House.

The House gave unanimous consent.

Motion agreed to.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

On the motion of Right Hon. Sir George E. Foster the name of Mr. L. J. Papineau was placed on the Committee to nominate the Select Standing Committees of the House in substitution for that of Mr. King.

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE AMENDMENT ACT.

Hon. NEWTON W. ROWELL (President of the Privy Council) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 2, to Amend the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act and to transfer to the Commissioner of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police the powers heretofore vested in the Commissioner of Dominion Police.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING: Explain, please.

Hon. Mr. ROWELL: Mr. Speaker, hon. members will recall that last year a Bill was passed making provision for the amalgamation of the Dominion Police with the Royal Northwest Mounted Police, which amalgamation has now been carried into effect. Under the Ticket of Leave Act, however, certain special duties and powers are assigned to the Dominion Police, and the first section of this Bill is to transfer to the Commissioner of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police those duties and powers, the office of Commissioner of Dominion Police being no longer in existence. The object of the other portion of the Bill is to make a slight change in the pension provisions contained in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act of last year.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

[Mr. Speaker.]

TRIBUTE TO DECEASED MEMBERS.

THE LATE DAVID MARSHALL; THE LATE LOUIS AUDET LAPOINTE.

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before we proceed with the Orders of the Day, I have a sad duty to discharge, that is, to refer to the vacancies caused by the death since last session of two of our members. Mr. Marshall, who was elected for the East Elgin division in 1906 at a bye-election, and re-elected at the general elections thereafter, has been suddenly called away, and we have on this side of the House a vacant place formerly occupied by a very much beloved friend and loyal supporter, not only of the old Liberal-Conservative Government in its time but also of the Union Government since its formation. Mr. Marshall never took a very prominent part in the discussions of the House. He was a man of stirling character and of excellent business ability, and he made his way with his fellow members by the possession and exercise of those qualities. I am sure that my fellow members on both sides of the House will join with me in deploring his decease and in sending to his family our sincere regrets and condolences.

Another member has also been taken by death since the last session of Parliament, the representative of the St. James division of Montreal (Mr. L. A. Lapointe), a man with whom I had a less intimate acquaintance, but who in his day and generation—he was not an old man when called away—served well his native city in many positions of responsibility and trust.

These two gentlemen have both gone from us. Yesterday they were here; to-day they are not. These occurrences may well make us think of the valuations that we put upon life and its purposes. Realities and vanities make up most of this life of ours, and as we grow older I think we come to the conclusion, especially when face to face with these occurrences, that the vanities are far more regarded than the realities, and that we pursue many of the former when we should be devoting our lives to the pursuit of the latter.

May these occurrences be to all of us a warning and a lesson that life is short, that its duties are great and that its responsibilities are heavy, and that it becomes us, more especially as representatives of the people, to play well our part as we pass across this short stage on our march through the eternities.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I add

my tribute to what the Acting Prime Minister has said respecting the memory of our two deceased colleagues. They belonged to different provinces and they represented different parties in this House, but both were alike in this regard, that much of their life was given to public service. It is gratifying to recall that in the case of these late members we had an example of appreciation of public duty such as is given only by those who are willing to incur the responsibilities and obligations of public life.

Mr. Lapointe, who was on this side of the House for a period of something like ten years, gave a great deal of his time not only to the service of his country in Parliament, but also to the service of the municipal affairs of his city. For sixteen years he was a dominating personality in the Council of Montreal. He was chairman for ten years of the Finance Committee. At one time he was a candidate for the mayoralty. During the whole period of his municipal career the financial affairs of the city were conducted with a degree of efficiency and regard for public integrity such as satisfied the most exacting citizens.

Mr. Marshall, who sat on the other side of the House, was known to us, as my right hon. friend has said, not merely as a faithful, efficient and industrious public servant, but also as one of those who have done much to build up the most important of our industries. I am sure that we all join together in conveying to the relatives and friends of our late colleagues the deep sympathy which this House feels at their sudden and unexpected demise.

BOARD OF COMMERCE—RESIGNATION OF JUDGE ROBSON.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Russell): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. leader of the Government if it is the intention to give to the House a statement as to resignation of Judge Robson from the Board of Commerce, and if so, when?

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The papers will be brought down in due time.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY ACQUISITION —THE AGREEMENT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, I observe from the press that the Grand Trunk Railway shareholders have approved the agreement entered into between the Government and that company. I would like to ask my hon. friend, the leader of the Government, if it is his intention to bring down immediately a copy of the agreement?

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, it is the intention.

LORD JELLICOE'S VISIT TO OTTAWA.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (leader of the Opposition): I should like to ask the Acting Prime Minister (Sir George Foster) if he has any statement to give to the House or if there is any official statement forthcoming with reference to the recent visit to Ottawa of Lord Jellicoe and his staff. By whose invitation was it that Lord Jellicoe came here? Has he made a report to the Government, and if so, will the House be put into possession of that report at an early date?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I think I may answer my hon. friend's questions in the affirmative.

VACANCY IN EAST ELGIN.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING: Writs have been issued for the holding of bye-elections in three constituencies. There is also a vacancy in the electoral district of East Elgin. Is it the intention of the Government to issue immediately a writ of election for the filling of that vacancy?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Government will issue a writ in due conformity with the requirements of the statute. As to obtaining any further information, I am afraid that my hon. friend will have to adjourn his curiosity.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY MOVED BY MR. HUME CRONYN AND SECONDED BY MR. ALEXANDER McGREGOR.

The House proceeded to the consideration of the speech of His Excellency the Governor General at the opening of the session.

Mr. HUME CRONYN (London) moved:

That an address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, offering the humble thanks of this House to His Excellency for the gracious speech which he has been pleased to make to both Houses of Parliament.

He said: The announcement in the public press that the duty and honour of moving the reply to the speech from the Throne had been conferred upon me was my first intimation on the subject, and came as a complete surprise. When, a few days later,

the news was confirmed by a kindly letter from the Acting Prime Minister, there seemed no choice save to discharge the obligation with such modicum of ability as in me lay.

Lest, Sir, that expression should be criticised as an ungracious or, at least, lukewarm acknowledgement of the honour thus conferred upon me, let me hasten to add that the predominating feeling in my mind is one of utter unworthiness adequately to carry out the task which devolves upon me on this occasion; to do honour to our new parliamentary home; to depict in mere words what the artist has so well fashioned in stone; to be the first, in a sense to address my fellow members in this impressive Chamber, and in that address I humbly hope to counsel, to encourage, to inspire my fellow countrymen. Indeed, the task seemed to be so far beyond my powers that I was flung into a veritable slough of despond. You will appreciate my relief, Sir, when on Thursday last I was elevated out of that mire by the eloquence of the right hon. Acting Prime Minister (Sir George Foster), the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King), and the member for Beauce (Mr. Béland); because after their tribute to the new parliament building I felt that part of the burden was lifted from any shoulders. My I add a further explanatory note. My ignorance of the usual technique employed was abyssmal, nor did consultation with those of experience and wisdom bring much assistance. A recent political biography described the speakers in the English House of Commons on a similar occasion as "purring ceremonious optimism." This phrase of itself was enough to confirm the repugnance, innate perhaps in one whose forebears hailed from Kilkenny, against adopting that particular feline mode of expression. "Purring optimism," forsooth, may I ask you, Sir, whether you ever heard an Irishman purr, where a government was concerned?

It would not have been a difficult, though perhaps a lengthy performance, to pass in review what Union Government, with or without the help of this Parliament, has accomplished. Such a subject might well arouse the enthusiasm of the speaker, if not of his immediate audience, who must, unless their understanding be wholly warped, be equally aware with him of its extent and importance.

But, in the first place, this task has already been undertaken by members of the Government, perhaps not so frequently or widely as might be desired, but with an ability and eloquence which easily surpass any effort of which I am capable.

Then too, and more important still, the speech from the Throne contains the Government's programme for the present session, and it is but reasonable to suppose that this House and the country at large will be more interested in a discussion of what lies before us than in even a memorable and fecund past.

Having arrived at this view, my first endeavour was to secure an outline of those measures which it was contemplated should be submitted for your consideration, but in this I was unsuccessful and it was intimated there might be some delay before any information would be forthcoming. In the interim, which was a considerable one, my mind naturally ranged over the possible field to be covered. Recalling the comedy produced some years ago under the title "If I were King," I set myself to draft what, as a representative of His Majesty, I should desire brought to the attention of the Canadian Parliament. In this I was in imagination not so much usurping the prerogative of royalty as combining in my unworthy person, like the survivor of the ill fated Nancy Bell, the "Cook and the Captain bold, and the crew of the Captain's gig." In so far, therefore, as my remarks —the product of a single and irresponsible individual—fail to concur in the actual pronouncement, they are made without the sanction of authority, and will doubtless be treated accordingly.

Canada, as has oft been proclaimed, enters this year into a new era. Formal peace—a peace, as the unreconciled irreverent have it, which passeth understanding —has been declared with our arch-enemy and the League of Nations duly incorporated. True it is, one of the chief belligerents—or if you quarrel with my phraseology, one of the largest nations—still remains outside, repeating the famous soliloquy "To be or not to be;" while her leading man has altered his lines to read:

"My League is out of joint: Oh, curses long
That Lodge was ever born to set it wrong."

But we live in hope that this is but a temporary check and that before the year is out a fair and united start will have been made in that noblest of efforts—to banish war from a weary world.

But this new era brings to Canada, in common with other nations, problems and difficulties more pressing and more acute than those which confronted her in prewar days. Material problems connected with her financial status, her future popu-

lation, the development of her natural resources, and those immaterial and elusive problems, still more difficult of solution, which have to do with her mental, moral and spiritual welfare. These varied questions are so interlocked and merge into each other at so many angles, it is well-nigh impossible to treat them apart, but from a legislative standpoint the attention of Parliament must of necessity be directed chiefly to measures dealing with the material aspects of the situation.

Permit me, then, to outline a few of the outstanding problems which to my mind demand our careful consideration. There are doubtless others which to some will appear of more vital import than those I propose to discuss. It would be impossible, Sir, even were I qualified, to cover the whole field, nor have I any desire to pose as a rival to the late all-wise, unlamented and much "wanted" William Hohenzollern.

To meet the heavy obligations incurred by the war (and I decline to delay the House by further definition of these—they are as familiar to us all as is the aspect of the most prominent landmark in our own constituencies) we must adopt such steps as will ensure prompt and full payment. It is significant that in an international memorial submitted last month to the Governments of the Allied and Associated powers, a memorial bearing the signatures of the most prominent financiers of the world, the following statement was emphasized: "No country is deserving of credit nor can it be considered a solvent debtor that cannot or will not bring its current expenditure within the compass of its receipts from taxation and other regular income."

The steps to be adopted have already been set out in the speech from the Throne; they are, in one aspect, precisely those so often commended to the public at large; so often, indeed, one hesitates to again mention them before this assembly. They are like the cardinal virtues, so facile of utterance, so difficult of attainment! Because it is easy enough to tell an audience or a nation that every one must produce and save, that "work" and "thrift" must be emblazoned on the national shield: whereas most of us find it hard to increase our normal output, and still more trying to change the habits of a lifetime and, for the sake of an altruistic benefit, to deny ourselves the luxurious necessities of modern existence. Many of us, too, appear to have forgotten the first lesson in political economy which teaches so clearly that dollars expended on luxuries not only cease to fulfil their proper function but enter into direct competition with those employed in productive trade.

A special committee on currency and foreign exchange, appointed by the British Treasury under the distinguished chairmanship of the late Baron Cunliffe, did not hesitate in its final report to the British House in December to repeat these maxims in the following language: ".Increased production, cessation of Government borrowings, and decreased expenditure both by the Government and by each individual member of the nation are the first essentials to recovery."

It will not, therefore, be less than our duty to consider in what manner the Parliament of Canada may best practice the doctrines which it is universally conceded lead to financial salvation.

Let us first examine the negative branch of the above commands, because economy or thrift is in a literal sense the inhibition of extravagance. On this side the Government can do much. In the first place, its borrowings should either cease altogether or be brought down to the irreducible minimum, and in the second place, every unnecessary expenditure should be ruthlessly vetoed.

Our uncontrollable expenses are enormous; interest and sinking fund alone exceed the total charges on the Consolidated Fund in the year prior to the outbreak of the war,—we cannot possibly lessen these: then there are the sums due for Soldiers' Pensions, Land Settlement, and Civil Re-establishment: even were these controllable the desire of our people is that there shall be generosity rather than niggardliness. They acknowledge that the debt we owe to the dependents of those who have fallen, and to the maimed and disabled, is a more sacred obligation than that engraved upon any bond.

Again, there are the absolutely necessary charges for the defence of this country, whether by sea, in the air, or on the land. There is no need at this moment to enter into a discussion of our national status, because, quite apart from any change in that respect brought about in the main by the wonderful achievements of our soldiers, it is unthinkable that we should longer remain content to sponge upon the over-burdened taxpayer of Great Britain.

Where then can we economize? It is difficult on an occasion such as this to particularize, but in general terms one can assert that no expenditure should be authorized unless it be absolutely necessary and that it also will tend to increased production. A halt must be called in the prosecution of public works which do not come within the

above category, and we must for some years to come make shift to use such fixed plant as we now possess.

Members of Parliament and their constituents should alike refrain from pressing upon the Government their claims,—long delayed though these may be, necessary as they may appear to local interests—until this country is in a sounder financial condition. Deflation of our swollen credits is a more vital matter than magnificent public edifices or memorials, nor can there be any speedier means found whereby the mounting cost of the necessities of life may be reduced.

Outside of these larger enterprises which for the most part would be charged to our capital account, every effort should be made to lessen the drain upon the ordinary revenue. Let us agree that our public service is not overpaid. I imagine the public service will take that as a very conservative statement. It has of late become obvious that our experts can obtain higher salaries than the Dominion awards—there remains, however, more than a suspicion that certain departments are overmanned and that in many directions there is a duplication of effort which costs the country dearly.

So much for the unpleasant subject of economy, what of the positive side—that of Production. The first function of Government under the direction of Parliament is to see that a sufficient amount is raised by taxation to meet the country's annual expenditure. From the comments of the platform and press it is apparent the methods whereby this end can be accomplished will be the subject of much debate and profound difference. Daring as I may be, I do not propose to anticipate that event; suffice it to say that on those who propose radical changes in our customary methods of taxation the burden falls of proving there are other more equitable and equally efficient modes of raising the amount required. So far as my observation has gone, I have failed to discover in any or all of the alternative plans proposed sources of revenue which would suffice to produce anything like the total needed.

In a question like this, as in all matters of business, what is required for clear judgment is above all an accurate knowledge of the facts. While doubtless other hon. members, more able and experienced than I, have at their disposal this essential—yet such is my misfortune or density, I have never been able to find it clearly set forth. It would be to me a profound satisfaction if the Bill (introduced into this House some nine years ago and dropped because of disagreement between the Commons and Senate) providing for the appointment of a permanent tariff commission—were this Session revived and eventually put into force.

It is not often I venture to advance my opinion against that of the former Minister of Finance, but his suggestion made two sessions ago, that certain members of the Government should make personal inquiry on this matter throughout the country, struck me as an inadequate substitute for a body of experts who would study the question year in and year out, collate the facts, and thus permit Parliament to frame a system of taxation on something like a scientific basis.

But, after all, Mr. Speaker, it is but a play on words to denominate taxation as production. There are other measures more truly within that category, whereby the Federal Government can actively aid this essential factor in Canada's welfare. May I be permitted to mention but two of these? The first is the encouragement of suitable immigration to these shores. Nothing within the power of the Government to do can contribute more largely to our progress than an energetic campaign to this end. I would restrict the newcomers to that class who prefer to settle on and cultivate the soil—who are apt to be assimilated, who desire to become permanent citizens, and who will adopt for their own guidance the ideals of justice and freedom which have created for the British Empire its outstanding position in the world. The reputation of Canada and the widespread knowledge of her resources are such that even within the limited class above mentioned, I am confident that tens of thousands of the well-disposed citizens of other countries will be glad to join their fortunes to ours.

The second measure which appeals to me as of paramount value is a generous meed of assistance towards scientific research. Nearly a year ago I endeavoured to impress on the House the importance and urgency of this question. It would be unfair to repeat what was said on that occasion. I was disappointed when through the last session the Government made no move in advance. Each month's delay handicaps us in the race with rival nations, and under the seal of ignorance keeps hidden stores of treasure which might otherwise be at our disposal. How much would not Canada have lost if the scientific knowledge and patience of Dr. Saunders, the discoverer of Marquis wheat, had not been utilized by the Department of Agriculture?

On this one item alone our Western farmers are in pocket many millions; and throughout the length and breadth of this scientifically unexplored land there are many equally golden opportunities awaiting discovery! I venture, therefore, to appeal once more for immediate consideration and broad-minded action on what will be a positive aid to greater production.

Mr. Speaker, my two-word text has been, perhaps, unduly expanded, but the subject can be compressed into the following guiding principles, which will not tax the memory unduly:—

(1) Rigid economy;

(2) Cessation or minimization of Government borrowing;

(3) Adequate taxation on a scientific and equitable basis;

(4) An energetic and discriminating immigration campaign, and

(5) National scientific research.

In addition to these primary subjects which, by reason of our present position, insistently demand our best thought, there are other substantial legislative problems to be brought to our attention. A new Franchise Bill will be submitted and dealt with. This opens up the general question of representation and representative government, and I trust may lead to the serious consideration by a select committee of what is commonly termed Proportional Representation. The philosopher of the House has declared that humanity is on trial to-day, but humanity in this condition, having condemned representative government for all the ills of the hour, is more than ready to heave half a brick through its polished and highly respectable plate glass. Were it not well, then, to ascertain and remedy the obvious defects of a system which leaves large and important sections of opinion unrepresented by permitting local and artificial boundaries rather than the people themselves to determine an election? The threat or boast of a Provincial Premier that the next Federal Parliament shall contain not a single old member holds no terrors for me, knowing (and perchance happy in that knowledge), that "the Clerk of our delight shall hereafter rising look through this same bear garden after me in vain." But, Sir, whatever the Fates may have in store for us—and I use the plural advisedly because as the ancients pictured the Parcae as feminine in gender, so must we in modern political life recognize the metamorphosis wrought by the enfranchisement of women. A change perhaps not as striking as may prevail in Great Britain, but yet great enough to permit the ladies to wield the abhorent shears on the tenuous thread by which we are suspended —whatever, I repeat, these dear Fates have in store, we should, if not as members, at least in our capacity of citizens and voters, believers in the spirit of pure democracy, insist that an equal share of representation be given to each separate elector, instead of its exclusive possession being entrusted to any one class.

As a corollary to fair representation, we should be concerned with the machinery of Government. We should insist that the antiquated and obsolete plant which when in charge of either party creaked and groaned under a pre-war burden, and which, in times of war stress, frequently went out of gear, be relegated to the scrap heap in favour of a more efficient motor. The recent report of a committee of the Senate revives the significant statement of Sir George Murray that our "Ministers of the Crown"—those servants of the people who, in proportion to their responsibility, labour and necessary expenditure, are so fantastically underpaid—"have both too much to do and do too much." That Canada is not alone in this predicament can be gathered from the synopses of various like reports made to the British House of Commons. After reading these one is not surprised at the suggestion made a year or two ago that the greatest need of the English Government was a department of thinking. Shall I be deemed impertinent if I hint that an echo of this suggestion has been heard on our side of the Atlantic? If a reform of our system were to include an improved method for the submission and consideration of Government Estimates we would take a great step forward toward the intelligent control of the country's finances.

The Select Committee on Re-establishment, which did such strenuous and conscientious work at the last session, should resume its inquiries into the position of the returned soldier. There should be added to its duties an investigation into the working of the Pension Act. Let us not delude ourselves with the idea that the problem of the soldier can at any period be deemed static: in its very nature, which is human to the core, new phases, fresh consideration, further demands, reasonable and unreasonable, will arise. It is the part of wisdom that members of this House and the public should be kept in close touch with the entire situation, rather than it should be left in the hands of a depart-

ment, no matter how fair minded or anti-bureaucratic its officers may be.

For much the same reason just mentioned a second Industrial Conference should be convened. Time and effort are never ill spent in an honest endeavour to readjust the industrial situation for the permanent benefit of all parties. The example set by the enlarged Whitley program in England and by the American plan as detailed in Leitch's most interesting book "Man to Man" show what may be accomplished by the democratization of industry. It is freely prophecied that before long Labour will be hiring Capital rather than Capital hiring Labour. Would it not be well for both of these interests to realize what this reversal of existing practices may entail?

The prominent part assumed by Canada in the settlement of the labour clauses of the Peace Treaty, and the fact that she is now a member of the governing body of the International Labour Organization, make it incumbent that we should keep abreast of this great movement. It is of interest to note that of the twelve members forming that body eight are the appointees of the Council of the League and but four were chosen by the votes of the remaining nations. Once again the renown won by our men in the field secured to us the distinction of selection from amongst a score or more of rival candidates.

Here endeth, Mr. Speaker, my review of those material questions which I should like this Parliament to consider, and on that side of the shield, while the situation is not free from peril, there is no need for pessimism. We are incomparably better off than our European Allies; we have at our disposal the resources of a vast and richly endowed land, and we are wont to believe ourselves a virile, sane and industrious nation. Granted that these adjectives can be truthfully applied, there is nought before us to cause undue anxiety. As the Scot has it: let us "Set a stoot hairt to a stey brae." Shall we be the less happy if, for a few years, "We scorn delights and live laborious days?" I trow not, provided our hearts are stout and our minds retain their sanity. But therein lies the trouble: we are all more or less abnormal; just as the war has affected our financial status, so has it upset our nervous system and modes of thought.

During the war Canadians were united by a common danger and a firm purpose: these artificial stimulants, with other intoxicants of more noxious but not less exciting nature, have been withdrawn. There appears to be some danger of disintegration. Not only has the old-time class warfare revived, but new classes and groups have arisen and are vociferously demanding the overturn of established order.

Canada, too, has unfortunately become the refuge for many from the old lands who bring with them as their household gods the inherited grievances of European autocracy. They "still nourish in their bewildered brain that wild, unquenched, deep-sunken, old world pain." But, that they should be permitted to become leaders of any considerable body of citizens, to so poison the minds of their followers as to kill healthy or kindly thought, is a matter for deepest anxiety. Unless we regain our mental poise, there can be little hope of recovery in the body politic and much reason to fear disruption.

The history of the early days of peace following every bitter war shows the existence of similar conditions; and as this war was the greatest and most terrible ever waged, so are the reaction and disturbance more pronounced. The dogs of war, it is true, are in leash, but "those lesser breeds without the law" are still in full cry, and "havoc" is their note. No nation, race or belief is secure from their attack. The more prominent the individual, the more untiring his effort, the more unselfish his aims, the greater his sacrifices, the keener are the progeny of Cerberus to pull him down, to worry him into retirement or death. The man hunt is on! Denunciation and Defamation, Slander and Scandal are the leading couples in the hellish pack!

But, Sir, you may object these are not matters to be cured by legislative enactment. I quite agree. The doctrine that man's moral nature can be moulded by statute is as musty as are the blue laws of Connecticut. What can this House do to remedy so grave an evil, an evil which legislation is admittedly helpless to cure? I believe much can be done by the mere force of example.

We meet to-day in a new building, erected by modern methods, yet imbued with the beauty and stateliness of the past —a gathering place typical at every turn of Canadian life, yet one in which any Parliament of the world might be glad to convene. May we not be persuaded to believe that those fierce flames, which found so much suitable material to feed their frenzy, destroyed not merely an antiquated and hazardous structure, but as well utterly consumed the equally inflammable

and more dangerous vestments—veritable fabrics of Nessus—woven of ancient party strife.

I pray you, Sir, to believe I do not arrogate to myself the unenviable post of judge or mentor, nor is this a curate's plea for "sweetness and light." We have had, and must in the future retain, honest differences of opinion; our judgment on questions of the weightiest import will be widely divergent, and forceful words will be used by forceful men. But let us not fall into the mortal error of mistaking feeling for thought, or of substituting mere passion for argument.

I am confident I speak for many, perhaps for a majority of members on both sides, when I say we have in the past been forced to listen with grave repugnance to attacks made both within and without this House; attempts to stir up racial and religious feeling, to divide or segregate one section of the community or country from the remainder, to malign or belittle those high in the service of the nation; attacks which utterly failed to accomplish the nominal object of the aggressor; nay, rather served to undermine the very cause he purported to uphold. Do not let us forget, however far apart we may stand on questions of policy, we have at least one common cause for unity in that we are all Canadians.

For the Parliament of Canada can never represent the East as distinguished from the West, the English speaking peoples apart from those who love the French tongue, Capital rather than Labour, the city in preference to the country, or the civilian before the soldier. This Parliament should, and I believe does, represent the whole of Canada; a country of which we have every reason to be proud, but one in which, because of its physiographical position, its diversities of language, religion and interests, there is a greater need for the strongest unifying influence.

In searching for an apt statement on this head I applied to my broad-minded and good natured friend, who formerly represented Kamouraska (Mr. E. Lapointe), but who is now to be congratulated on his election to the seat so long held by his distinguished leader. He drew my attention to the sentiment of the talented author of "L'Esprit des lois" or, as some Englishmen prefer to call it, "The Spirit of Nations," when he uttered this phrase: —"La société est l'union des hommes, et non pas les hommes." So in very truth this country of ours is and will only remain a Dominion by virtue of the unity of its citizens and not through the mere existence of the citizens themselves.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to travel over the greater portion of this broad land, and thus to learn, from such personal observation as my faculties permit, something of its attractions and resources. It does not, therefore, astonish me when conversing with my fellow members, whether they hail from Prince Edward Island on the east, British Columbia on the west, or from one of the seven sister provinces lying between, that each and every one is ready, in describing his home territory, to employ the sentiment—if not the graceful words of the classical poet—"Ille terrarum mihi praeter omnes angulus ridet."

An hon. MEMBER: Translate.

Mr. CRONYN: An hon. member demands a translation. There are many happy ones, but I prefer to adopt that of the westerner who, when speaking of his own smiling corner of the Dominion, says in words more blunt—but none the less convincing, "It sure is a bit of God's own country."

It has also formed a part of my life to pay many visits to Great Britain, and while on business bent my mind was ever open to the beauties—I need scarcely say, Sir, I refer solely to inanimate nature—the beauties of the Old Land, whether these were to be found in the mystic atmosphere of the "distresshful" island, in the wealth of colouring of peace-time England, or in the more rugged outlines north of the Tweed. I snatched at each rare opportunity to enjoy the pleasures offered by art, or that more elusive charm of a civilization mellowed by age; not too happily defined by the word "culture."

But on each and every occasion when the home-bound liner neared these shores, I found myself offering a fervent welcome to my native land. Nor was this worship evoked by the sight of the shining flood of the mighty St. Lawrence, or of those Northern hills upon whose purple peaks the deeper shades descended; it was not the memory of the thunders of Niagara transmuted and transmitted for the service and light of ten thousand happy homes, of our vast Mediterraneans bearing the argosies of a continent's commerce, of the unchecked horizon of our fertile prairies here showing the velvety blackness of their fallow soil, there miles of waving grain, richer than the tracery of any goldsmith's cunning; nor yet the intimate friendliness of those fruitful valleys bathed by the soft airs of the Paci-

fic. It arose from a cause deeper even than these eternal glories, from a profound belief that in this country we draw more freely and fully the breath of life, that we have escaped (and thanks to the effort of the former member from Kingston, seem destined yet to escape) that taint of caste which to the outsider seems to permeate and render unhealthy so much of the old world; that in Canada we recognize as the truest aristocracy that of character—I would one could declare it to be the sole aristocracy to which we bow, but the gross bulk of the plutocrat obtrudes—that here there is given to every man an opportunity to develope those powers with which the Creator may have endowed him, and that as we gaze into the sky of our future we find it glowing with the promise of a glorious day.

That belief of mine, is my excuse, if excuse be needed, for making an appeal to my fellow countrymen to unitedly stand guard over this splendid heritage. Let us prove ourselves worthy, not merely of these stately buildings and all they symbolize, not only of our sires the benefit of whose arduous labours we now enjoy but worthy even, if that be possible, of those brave souls

> "Who ventured life and love and youth
> For the great prize of death in battle."

Too long have I, Mr. Speaker, presumed upon the patience of this House where words are our only currency and where, following universal law, an unlimited issue causes a corresponding decline in value. I would—however soon these worthless tokens of mine may disappear from the market of its memory—leave with it one message as a guide in the days to come; a message given literally from the deathbed of an outstanding Englishman, for he died a few days after its utterance, one who was a former Governor-General of this Dominion, and for whom might fittingly have been selected that joyous epitaph—"Glad did I live and gladly die and I lay me down with a will."

I am (perhaps too acutely) conscious that the simple and artless words used by the late Earl Grey will cause the cynic and worldly-wise—"those least erected spirits" —to scoff at them as better fitted for the pulpit or nursery, but I am among those who believe that the same ideals which govern our private lives should as well be the fixed stars to guide us in the rougher seas of politics, or, as Lowell has it "the real will never find an irremovable basis till it rests on the ideal." Here is the message; may it be graven on the hearts of all true citizens:—

> "We've got to give up quarrelling. We've got to come together.
> We've got to realize that we are all members of the same family.
> There's nothing that can help humanity, I'm perfectly sure there isn't, perfectly sure, except love! Love is the way out and the way up. That's my farewell to the world."

Mr. ALEXANDER McGREGOR (Pictou): Mr. Speaker I have the unexpected honour of seconding the motion so eloquently spoken to by the honourable member for London (Mr. Cronyn). As honourable members of this House know, I am not ambitious to be classed among the speech makers, and having but a short experience in parliamentary life, I feel that I should crave the indulgence of my brother members while I endeavour to discharge the duty that is laid upon me.

I wish to say that I regard the honour as being intended more for the important constituency which I represent than for myself, in that sense I accept it, and on behalf of my constituents express sincere appreciation. It is a high compliment to them that I should be privileged at this the first session in our reconstructed, commodious, and beautiful chamber, to second the Address.

I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that every honourable member of this House sincerely deplores the absence of the Prime Minister, and also sincerely hopes that ere long he will be restored to his accustomed vigour. Men come, and men go in Parliament, as they do in other walks of life. Some leave light, some indelible impress of individuality and power. Sir Robert Borden is recognized as one of the really great men of Canada. He has been an outstanding figure in our wide flung Empire, a statesman of the highest rank in the world's estimation.

Naturally, some have differed with him on political questions, but no one ever challenged his honour, his profound sagacity, his political devotion, or his powerful influence. The enormous responsibilities of the past five years have evidently shaken his vigorous constitution, and to-day, he may well be regarded as a casualty of the great war.

The honourable member for London has so completely dealt with the legislation proposed in the speech from the Throne that little remains to which I might refer. He has gone very fully into the financial situation, and the successful financing of our war loans, which during the war, has meant so much to our agricultural, and industrial prosperity.

Our success in financing the war within ourselves, was, I believe, a revelation to the people of this country. It demonstrated the fact that Canada was in the fight to the finish, and not only so, but one year after the signing of the armistice, the men and women of Canada again came forward with their money largely in excess of the amount requested by the Minister of Finance.

I think one would be justified in coming to the conclusion that the people of Canada have faith in the men who are guiding the destinies of the country in the most critical period of our history.

When Union Government was formed one of the promises made, was that returned soldiers would be given the preference of Government positions. In looking over the official records, I find that 338,137 officers and men have been demobilized. Of this number 23,532 men have been placed in positions in the different departments of the Government services, as follows:

Agricultural Department	269
Air Board	8
Auditor General's Department	9
Food Board	18
Civil Service Commission	13
Commission of Conservation	20
Customs and Inland Revenue	959
External Affairs	30
Finance	37
Governor General's Secretaries	2
House of Commons	10
Health	5
Indian Affairs	136
Immigration and Colonization	112
Interior	1,544
Insurance	1
Justice	637
Labour	76
Marine	158
Militia and Defence	2,408
Mines	90
Naval Service	757
Post Office	5,691
Printing and Stationery	158
Privy Council	16
Public Works	1,122
Railways and Canals	588
Secretary of State	22
Senate	12
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment and Pensions	7,364
Soldiers' Settlement Board	1,107
Trade and Commerce	144
War Purchasing Commission	10

Since these figures were compiled 2,000 additional appointments of returned soldiers have been made or a grand total of 25,532.

In addition to this the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment have placed over 129,000 men in various positions outside of the Government services.

At the end of the year 12,327 men were receiving training in schools operated by the Department of Soldiers Civil Re-establishment, and at the same time 11,223 men were receiving training in industries throughout the country.

In the Land Settlement Department 44,278 men have made applications for farms, of which 33,496 have qualified.

$55,000,000 has been advanced by the Government for the purchase of farms and equipment, for those who have settled on the land.

$125,000,000 has been paid out in gratuities to the returned man, and, $40,000,000 has been appropriated to assist the unemployed soldiers during the winter months of the present year.

Up to December 31 pensions paid to returned soldiers and dependents total over $41,000,000.

So I think it can well be claimed that the Government are carrying out their pre-election promises to the returned men.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there is no member in this House, who is not disposed to grant all reasonable assistance to the returned soldiers; the extent of our desire to assist is limited only by the ability of the country to pay. I do not hesitate to say that in my humble opinion, in view of our enormous financial obligations. Canada has been generous toward the returned men, and I believe a large majority of the returned men realize the situation and appreciate the fact that a grateful country has done what it could do to assist them. Personally, I do not take second place to any in my appreciation of our gallant forces and a desire to assist those who require assistance, but I have little regard for those who at the present time are endeavouring to exploit the problems of the returned men.

As the world is groping its way out of the horrors that engulfed it during the eventful years of the great war, many are depressed because the thing we call re-construction does not spring up in a night. There are some who appear to entertain the vain expectation that the countries which were scourged by the scorpions of war, and are heavily burdened with its indescribable consequences, ought to quickly emerge, and, as it were by magic, re-establish themselves in normal conditions. There are others, and these are not few in numbers who imagine themselves to be heaven born reformers, reconstructionists and prophets endowed with unfailing knowledge, of sure cure, and cure-all panaceas, that are warranted to immediately restore the world's social, industrial, commercial, and financial equilibrium, and make every man, woman, and child contented and happy.

I venture to think, Sir, that what we need to-day in this country, in common with

other parts of the world, is a substantial reduction in the crop of political and social agitators, who are keeping the pools of discontent stirred up; and a common sense recognition of the fact that normal conditions cannot be restored by feeding fire with gasolene.

In my judgment there is no short cut, or primrose path to re-establishment, nor is there any quack political nostrum on the market which can be relied upon to give this country, or any country, immediate relief. The only remedy is work and more work, production and more production.

It is gratifying to note, in regard to the world's condition that some progress has been made in the stupendous work of clearing up international problems. The treaties with Germany, Austria, and Bulgaria, have been ratified, and we can hope that ere long these settlements will produce results that will be beneficially felt in all countries that were engaged in the war.

Referring to our own country, I have no hesitation in believing that it came through the war, and so far, through after the war conditions, with a record of achievements, that should be an inspiration to all the people of Canada. Mr. Speaker, our history is the history of the war. We were in it from first to last. We did not wait to be driven into it. We heard the call to duty, even before it was sounded, and responded in men, women, and treasure until the last gun was fired. We have the glorious record of work well performed.

We came out of the war with our unlimited natural resources unimpaired, we have immense potential wealth in our agricultural, mineral, fishery, and commercial enterprises, we have a virile and progressive people, and we should have unbounded faith in our country. We have, it is true, increased financial liabilities, but a very large part of these are in the control of our own people. Our fathers were never dismayed by the mountains of undertakings which confronted them, and as I see it, there is no reason why we should falter in the great work of nation building so well begun by them, and now resting upon our shoulders.

Looking the situation over, I do not see any country whose stability is more certain, and whose future is better assured than our own. We have come through the maelstrom as well as any of them, and better than many, and in this regard we do not accept second place even with the great republic to the south of us.

There was some fear that during the winter months, conditions might be trying. Our valiant soldiers and their dependents were returning and it was said that business depression might set in, and unemployment be unprecedented, but happily the evil days did not come. The Government organizations for taking care of returned men and providing employment, worked smoothly and successfully. Business men generally and employers of labour everywhere throughout the country were diligent in organizing to provide work for returned men and others. There has been expansion instead of depression, and on the whole it is a safe statement to make that we have had more satisfactory conditions than any other country that was involved in the war.

Our trade returns for the twelve months ending with December last show that the total imports of merchandise for consumption and the total exports of merchandise, amounted to the grand total of $2,235,928,072, which is $82,049,160 greater than in the year 1918.

Of the figures for 1919 the imports were $941,007,700; our exports were $1,294,920,372.

Of the imports $607,482,288 were dutiable and $333,555,412 were free. The duties collected amounted to $168,920,659.

The imports of 1919 exceeded those of 1918 by $30,858,560, and the exports of 1919 exceeded those of 1918 by $51,190,600.

In view of the recent depreciation of the Canadian dollar in the United States, we are much interested in the trade with that country. The returns show that in 1919 we bought from the United States goods to the value of $740,580,225. Whereas we only sold them goods to the value of $454,686,294. Needless to say we should endeavour to reduce the adverse balance, by buying Canadian goods instead of American productions.

On the other hand, it is interesting to note our trade with the Mother Country. In 1919 we sold the United Kingdom goods to the value of $528,035,514, whereas we only bought the relatively small value of $87,516,819.

Turning to another subject, may I remark on the fact that we appear to be drifting politically into class divisions. I have no quarrel with the movement; it may be well for those ambitious classes to experience what the responsibility of national government means. They will discover that it is an entirely different thing from government of a class. The truth is simple enough; no class can as a class govern this country, the class will have to cease to be a class, or the country will end the authority of the class.

Mr. Speaker, there is one class of people in Canada, and in other countries as well,

known as the manufacturers, who appear to have a good many hands lifted against them. We find them attacked front and rear, on the right, and on the left; they are attacked coming and going. The principal reason back of these assaults appears to be that the agitators think it will be popular to attack them. Mr. Speaker, I am not here to defend the capitalist or any other class, but I think it is only fair that the man who puts his money into Canadian industry, who seeks to give employment, who does give employment, who creates markets and helps to develop the country, is no more deserving of attack because he makes a success of his business than is the farmer, the merchant, or the mechanic, who makes a success of his business. Why should one class be singled out as profiteers and the other commended as patriots?

During the war the industrial leaders of this country were as patriotic as any other Canadians. They contributed substantially in the production of munitions towards the winning of the war. A few of them probably made large profits, but it is also true that thousands of the workmen in the plants made unprecedented wages, and they are not the only ones who substantially increased their earnings. A large majority of plants, however, I am convinced, did not make exorbitant profits out of munitions, but they certainly did eminently patriotic service for the country.

I think it is sometimes forgotten that as a result of the great war many of our citizens do not realize the extent to which our industrial life was disorganized. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer, briefly, to what happened almost immediately after war was declared, in the county that I have the honour to represent.

In Pictou county we were the pioneers in the iron and steel industry in Canada. We were also the pioneers in shell forging and shell finishing. During the period of the war the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company forged upwards of 15,000,000 shells, ranging in size from the smaller shrapnel, to the 12-inch high explosives, equal to 200,000 tons of steel. Their value would be in the vicinity of $25,000,000. In addition to this they supplied large quantities of steel for other purposes.

The fact that we were able to undertake the forging and finishing of shells and thus keep our forces at the front supplied with munitions was not only a great factor in the winning of the war, but it was also a great factor in our industrial prosperity. Hundreds of carloads of shell forgings were shipped from the plant of the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company to the many shell finishing plants throughout Canada. Enormous quantities of steel and steel products were shipped directly to the Mother Country and to France by the Dominion Steel Corporation of Sydney. All the other steel companies in Canada, I believe, did what they could to assist in the time of need.

It may be interesting to note the total amount of federal assistance given those engaged in the development of the iron and steel industry. Extending over a period of twenty-five years, about $17,000,000 was paid by the country in order to encourage the development of this great industry. The amount collected by way of Business Profits Tax up to March 31, 1919, was $66,747,660. I venture to say that at least fifty per cent of this amount was paid by those engaged in the various iron and steel industries throughout the country. The Government has evidently received in direct cash payments at least two dollars for each dollar they paid out. Indirectly Canada was, many years ago, reimbursed fourfold for all the Federal assistance given towards the development of this industry.

As a result of our being able to undertake this important business, Canada was not only able to supply shells for our own forces, but in addition, we were able to furnish large quantities of munitions for the Mother Country and the Allied armies.

At the outbreak of war the plant of the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company, employing between four and five thousand men, was almost entirely turned into a munition plant. When the war terminated, their business was naturally disorganized, and what is true with regard to the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company is equally true, I believe, of nearly every other manufacturing concern throughout the country. It should be understood that the manufacturers had no option in the matter; their plants were largely under the control of the War Department. Mr. Speaker, I think we should congratulate the manufacturers of Canada in the way they met the situation after the termination of hostilities, or during the reconstruction period. It was evident that while the manufacturers were readjusting their plants there was bound to be a period of unemployment, resulting for a time in hardship to the employees in the larger manufacturing centres. This situation was inevitable. It must be admitted, however, that in most cases the employers did their best to meet the situation, with the result that Canada has less

unemployed in proportion to her population than any of the allied countries.

In looking over the trade returns I find that during the past year we imported steel and iron to the value of $154,021,858. This one item accounts for over fifty per cent of the adverse balance of trade between Canada and the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I have often thought what might have happened if our neighbours to the south were unfriendly neutrals during the years they remained out of the war. What if they had refused to sell us steel? What if they had refused to sell steel and steel products to the Mother Country? Serious as the situation was, it might have been more serious.

In view of the many lessons which we have learned as a result of the war, I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Government of this country will do well to further encourage the development of the iron and steel industry, which has meant so much to the industrial prosperity of Canada in the past, but more especially during the period of the great war.

Perhaps some of us forget the great financial obligations which have been thrust upon us as a result of the war. When we entered the war our national debt was $335,000,000; to-day it is nearly $2,000,000,000. The interest on our national debt at the outbreak of the war was about $15,000,000; to-day it is over $115,000,000. In addition to this we have a yearly Pension Bill of $25,000,000, or possibly $30,000,000.

As our financial obligations have increased, in like proportion our industry and efforts must increase, if we are to meet our obligations and overtake the world-wide shortage of all the necessaries of life. For five years 50,000,000 men have been fighting, and 100,000,000 men turned their attention from their ordinary pursuits in life to the furnishing of munitions and the necessary supplies that enabled our forces to carry on at the front.

In the years that lie before us, capital must be content with fair profits; labour must be paid a fair living wage. If our industrial life is interrupted by strikes the situation will become more difficult. To accomplish the task, labour and capital must co-operate.

During the last session of Parliament an industrial conference was held at Ottawa, representatives of labour gathering together in conference with representatives of capital from, I think, nearly every province of Canada. Mr. Speaker, I believe this was a move in the right direction; it will, no doubt, result in the bringing about of better conditions and a better understanding of the difficulties of both labour and capital. Not only should labour and capital work in harmony, but every province of this great Dominion should carefully consider the problems of the other provinces. The interests of the East should not be overlooked by the West, and in like manner the interests of the West should, and I believe will be considered by the people of the East.

In the past all classes in this great country worked side by side in harmony. There was little, if any, friction. I think it was well understood that when the farmer was prosperous the manufacturer was prosperous, and when the manufacturer was prosperous, labour was content. We can only prosper as a well balanced organization, for we are each dependent on the success of the other.

Our policy must be national, not selfish or sectional. I think it will be admitted by all fair-minded men that those who have legislated for us in the past, regardless of party, were not class legislators.
I believe the men who were entrusted with our political destinies in the past were honest men who did their best having regard to the interests of every portion of this great Dominion.

As a result of the war we have a share of the world-wide unrest which in other countries threatens to destroy the very foundations of civilization, but in that respect we have little to complain of in Canada. It is true we have those who advocate class legislation, and those who would set up one class against another. Such can end only in disaster, and those who advocate such a course are not the true friends of the soldier, of the farmer, of labour, or of the manufacturer. The platform or the policy of any class that is not national and equitable to all, regardless of class, race or religion, should not be considered, and, I believe, will not be considered by the intelligent men and women of this country.

While much has been said of our great natural resources, which I do not wish to minimize, at the same time, I believe the greatest endowment of any country is that of a united, happy, and contented people. The bulwark of a nation is not its army or its navy, but the character of its citizens. We are now clothed with the authority and obligations of a nation; let us as true Canadians demonstrate to the world that we are worthy of that great responsibility. We must not forget that the name of Canada is written large on the map of the world

by the supreme sacrifice made by nearly 60,000 of our brave sons. The responsibility is with us to maintain it.

Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in seconding the motion for an Address in reply to the Speech of His Excellency the Governor General.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that the opening paragraph of the speech from the Throne, as well as the burden of the remarks of the hon. members who have just spoken, should have reference in large part to the assembling of this Parliament in its new home. It would be strange, indeed, if, under the spell of the noble and dignified proportions of this chamber, we were not all impressed with the spirit of the Canadian people in rising out of the difficulties of the past and impressed with the future greatness of our country, if we are but willing to put our hands to the task and make the future all that it lies within the possibilities of our people to make it.

It is no mere formality, Sir, to have the privilege at this time of congratulating the mover and the seconder of the Address on the excellence of their speeches. I am sure that all of us who have heard them believe they have made the most of the occasion and of the opportunity afforded to them. If there has been any limitation in the nature of their remarks, that has been due, one must say, to the meagreness of the legislative programme which the Government has presented in the words which it has put into the lips of His Excellency in the Speech from the Throne. Listening to the hon. gentlemen, I could not help remarking how each of them seemed to regard himself as a prop beneath a crumbling edifice. They made a reference or two to some features of the Speech from the Throne, but for the most part they took care to "get out from under" it altogether. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. McGregor) went entirely into the past; he confined his remarks to giving the House very interesting and valuable statistics on matters of trade, on matters of manufacture, on assistance to the returned soldiers, on munition output, on trade with the United States and trade with the Mother country. He took care, as I have said, to confine his remarks almost exclusively to the past and to give the House a mass of statistics for which I am sure we shall all be very grateful.

On the other hand, the hon. member for London (Mr. Cronyn), who moved the Address in such eloquent, witty and poetic language, went to the other extreme, confining his remarks for the most part to the future, in a constructive and helpful way telling the Government wherein he thought they had been remiss in excluding from the Address practically everything in the nature of constructive legislation. I am sure we on this side of the House will all congratulate my hon. friend that he has been the first to draw the attention of the Government to this omission which will be noticed throughout the country, and, though doubtless not so intended, the remarks of both hon. gentlemen on the Address are a reflection upon the Government in what they have put into the speech of His Excellency to present to this Parliament at this time.

If one examines the speech from the Throne, one cannot help being struck at the outset with the fact that His Excellency's advisers appear to be infinitely more concerned with external affairs than with the business of this country. Omitting the opening section to which I have just referred, let us take the other paragraphs in the speech from the Throne and see what they include. First, there is a reference to the League of Nations, to commissions and mandatories. Then there are references to the Treaty with Bulgaria and to other possible treaties with Hungary and Turkey. The next is a reference to a conference in Washington, and next a reference to the confusion and uncertainty arising out of conditions affecting the League of Nations. There is a passing reference to Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, and then comes another reference to the European economic field. The next section deals with confusion and dislocation again, and then we come to the International Opium Convention, and finally we are reduced to two tiny concluding paragraphs which contain all in the way of constructive legislation which the Government has to offer to the country at this time.

I could not but be struck the other day, with the President of the Council (Mr. Rowell), being the first to present a document to this Parliament, and at his laying upon the table of the House a copy of the Treaty between the Allied and Associated Governments and Bulgaria. We are all interested in Bulgaria, but I could not help thinking that it would have been more in accord with the wishes of the Canadian people if the first document to be presented to this Parliament had been for the pur-

pose of ratifying and approving the agreement between the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the Government of this country, instead of one of ratification and approval of this particular treaty.

The Government thought well to give to the shareholders of the Grand Trunk Railway Company in England the right to approve an agreement of the terms of which the members of this House, with the exception of the ministry, have no knowledge even at this time. Sir, I submit that the people of Canada are concerned primarily with their own affairs and are entitled to have placed before their representatives in Parliament at the earliest possible moment documents of so vast importance as the one to which I have just referred.

But, Sir, there is a further limitation in the speech from the Throne which serves to reflect the mind of the Government in another particular. The speech discloses an entire absence of any policy on the part of the Administration in regard to the economic, social and political questions which are uppermost in this country at the present time. The hon. gentlemen who have just spoken on the Address drew the attention of the Government to the unrest in Canada, and spoke of "agitators" and so on. By so doing they helped to bring to the attention of the Government that it is high time we had in office in this country an Administration capable of propounding some policy which would help to bring that unrest to a speedy end.

Having referred to the first part of the speech from the Throne, I now come to the legislative programme which it outlines. What does it amount to? It says:

> The ratification of The International Opium Convention renders it necessary to obtain legislation to carry into effect its provisions relating to the sale of opium, cocaine and other deleterious drugs.

No doubt that is important, perhaps important enough to be included in a speech from the Throne, but I submit that the people of this country are much more concerned at this time with the question of food than with the question of drugs, and that it would have been much better if the ministry, in advising His Excellency what should be brought before this Parliament for discussion, had propounded some policy which would help to relieve the high cost of living, instead of skirting about that great issue and dragging in small affairs such as legislation for regulating the sale of drugs.

The reference to the Dominion franchise is the most important in the speech. As my hon. friend from London (Mr. Cronyn) has said, it will raise in this House the whole question of representative and responsible government. My hon. friend in that remark touched upon what I conceive to be the most important of all matters which we have to consider in Canada at this time. During the war we got far away, in procedure and parliamentary methods, from the ideas of representative and responsible government as they have been held in the past, and we shall not find a solution for the unrest of our time until we have in some very considerable degree restored those safeguards of liberty, freedom and popular rights which have been so much neglected by the present Administration.

Take the only other reference in the speech from the Throne to anything in the nature of constructive legislation:

> Other Bills will be presented for your consideration, including a Bill respecting Copyrights and Bills providing for the amendment of the Patent Act, of the Loan and Trust Companies Acts, the Indian Act, and the Exchequer Court Act.

That is the whole programme. While these Bills may be important enough, I submit that what is needed in the interests of this Dominion at the present time, more needed than any amendment to the Patent Act, is such an amendment of the tariff as will bring relief to producers and consumers. But the Government has not thought well to mention these questions which bear upon the needs of the country and are of vital importance. They have simply skirted around the vital questions and have dealt only with external matters or matters of petty concern, with which the attention of this House should not be taken up to any extent at this time.

The two refer nces to "confusion" and "dislocation" which the speech from the Throne contains suggest that what we must consider above everything else is how we can make our way out of this confusion and dislocation into something that will better represent the ordered system of affairs which we ought to have. In this Chamber to-day we have before us a visible embodiment of what can be done, when the minds of men are put to it, in the way of reconstruction. We have here something which symbolizes the resurrection to a finer life, out of the ruins and ashes of the past, which is possible in connection with our

material environments. There is nothing in the way of material environment which we dare not hope to improve in this country.

Sir, unfortunately it is not only our material environments which have suffered during the war. There has been another loss, the greatest of all—the loss of human life, and the impairment of mind and body to many thousands of men who have suffered during this war. That is a loss which can never be made up. It is part of the infinite mystery. It belongs to the sacrifice which has been the price of freedom through all the ages. But the loss that we have suffered in material things and the losses we have suffered in human life do not make up the sum of destruction in this war. The war has also destroyed, as my hon. friend from London has said, much that is sacred and venerable in all our institutions, religious, political, and of every other nature. That indeed has been one of the most serious of all the effects of the war and to a very large extent accounts for the great unrest that exists in the world to-day. In faith, men "have faltered where they firmly stood." This is true alike in State and Church. Men's faith in government is shaken, and in religion, and even in themselves. What we speak of to-day as Bolshevism had its origin in a country where they have had least in the way of free religious and governmental institutions to cling to. Wherever such has been the case, there the world has suffered most. What is needed to-day to bring about a change in conditions is a restoration of the faith that has been weakened, faith in an over-ruling Providence, faith in our political institutions, faith on the part of men and women in themselves.

That brings me to the point which I should like to make in answer to the hon. gentlemen who have spoken so eloquently of the restoration of these halls of Parliament. It is not the restoration of the Parliament buildings that is needed so much as the restoration of our parliamentary system of government. Mr. Speaker, of all that we have inherited through our British connection there is no possession so highly to be prized as the British system of government. The British constitution has been the model for our own. All members of Parliament from the day of Confederation down to the present have spoken of the greatness of that constitution. Its ancient origins is something that we reverence. We reverence even more the spirit of freedom which is conserved through that constitution. To the Fathers of Confederation and to this Parliament, it has been, as Sir Wilfrid Laurier once said on a memorable occasion, as a pillar of cloud by day and a pillar of fire by night to lead this nation towards greater unity and nationhood.

But, Sir, the greatness of an institution, as of an individual, lies in its spirit; and an institution, no matter whether it be a material structure such as this or whether it be a constitution, which has lost the vital spirit that has lent it greatness, may become the very opposite of what it was intended to be. Instead of being a citadel of freedom it may become the home of autocracy or, what is perhaps worse, the abode of indecision and inaction in all things. We have suffered in this country, it is true, as a result of the war, but I regret to say, in part also, as a result of the inadequacy of the Administration to meet the needs of the country. That our political institutions, in common with all the other phases of our national life, should suffer through the action of war was inevitable. What is most unfortunate is that the loss is greater than it should have been, and this by reason of the failure of the administration to deal with the affairs of the country as they should have been dealt with.

I should like to point out wherein it seems to me this Parliament and the Government have ceased in large measure to be representative of the will of the people. That, after all, is the supreme, the fundamental fact which confronts us. If I do not deal with other matters that have been touched upon by the mover and seconder of the Address, it is because I feel that the restoration of our political life, and also in large measure of our social and economic life, is dependent on Parliament and the Government being in the truest sense representative of the will of the people. And it is because, throughout this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific, people believe that the Government does not represent their will, that we hear the demand which we on this side of the House desire to voice for a new Parliament and a new Administration.

Mr. Speaker, let me draw the attention of the House to some of the essential conditions of parliamentary government, and show wherein during recent years we have wandered far from a compliance with these conditions. First of all, under any system of parliamentary government, the House of Commons, the elective chamber, should be a representative assembly. To say that an assembly is representative implies that its members have been returned under a fair franchise and on a policy which is

known and defined and which has been placed before the people.

Now, Sir, will any one pretend that this Parliament to-day is representative in that sense? Let us go back to the franchise under which hon. members seated in this House to-day secured their return to Parliament. Let us examine the methods by which the representation of the people has been effected and ask ourselves the question whether that franchise was in accordance with the spirit of the constitution or was not in fact in direct violation of it. Take the War-time Elections Act—for it was under that Act that Parliament was elected. Consider the circumstances under which that measure was passed in this House.

Hon. gentlemen who were in the last Parliament will remember that Parliament had exhausted the period allotted to it by the constitution. The constitution of Canada lays it down that five years shall be the period of time for which a parliament shall sit, and the time of Parliament could not have been extended for a single day or a single hour beyond that period except by the consent of hon. members on this side of the House. Except by the unanimous resolution of both Houses of Parliament there would have been no amendment of the British North America Act extending the period of parliament for another year. If any hon. gentleman doubts that statement let him read the language of the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) himself, at the time the matter was under discussion. The Prime Minister took care to point out that it would be impossible—and that he would not suggest it—to have an extension of the period of parliament except by the unanimous agreement of both Houses. What were the conditions under which unanimous agreement was arrived at? What was the condition on which the Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who was leading the Liberal party in this House, consented to an extension? It was that Parliament in meeting another year would avoid controversial issues during the progress of the war. That consent was given on the highest grounds of patriotism and on the unequivocal understanding that in no way was Parliament parting with the right of the people to control, but rather that Parliament might take a position which throughout the country it was felt at the time was obviously desirable, namely that there should be as little in the way of party strife as was possible during the period of the war. Let me read to the House the words of Sir Wilfrid Laurier in giving consent to the extension and ask hon. members whether, hearing his words, they believe that the spirit of the Constitution was violated in the action that was subsequently taken by the administration. The words to which I refer may be found in Hansard in 1916, February 8, page 634. The matter had been fully discussed between the Rt. Hon. the leader of the Opposition and the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, and the Prime Minister had given repeated assurances that the Government had no intention to do anything but simply "carry on" for the next year, as was necessary in the circumstances. Sir Wilfrid, having in mind the interests of the people, whose servant he was, and whose servant every hon. member of this House at that time was, said:

> I would observe, first of all, that it is not proposed here to alter the principle of the constitution. It is not proposed to override the control which the people have over parliament. It is simply proposed to suspend for the time being the operation of the constitution. If it were proposed to make away altogether with that principle which is embodied in the constitution, certainly I would oppose such an attempt with all my might. But no such thing is proposed. This measure simply proposes that the constitution shall be suspended for twelve months, at the expiration of which time it will resume its full force.

Mr. Speaker, mark these words and ask yourself the question: Was the spirit of the constitution lived up to or not?

> It is not proposed to override the control which the people have over parliament.

Sir, do you wonder that the leader of the Opposition of those days felt that he had been grossly deceived; felt that the House had been grossly deceived; felt that the people of the country had been grossly deceived, when, after an understanding of this nature, hon. gentlemen who occupied the treasury benches of that day undertook to change the whole franchise which was the means of entry of the people's representatives, at the people's will, into this House of Commons, and to place upon the statute books one of the most infernal pieces of legislation that have been enacted in this country? I have used a strong term but I do not think it a bit too strong. But I will not trust to my own language to express my conception of that legislation. Let me quote the language of one who until almost yesterday was a member of the present administration. My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) spoke during the debate upon that measure, and several other gentlemen who occupy the Treasury

benches to-day also recorded their views upon that occasion. I might quote the language of one and all to show what their impression of that legislation was, but I think the words of my hon. friend (Mr. A. K. Maclean) meet the case so completely that further quotations are unnecessary. What were the hon. gentleman's words? They will be found on page 5596 of Hansard of 10th September, 1917:

> The Bill before the House proposes to disfranchise arbitrarily a portion of the people of the country. . . . This legislation is objectionable in principle, and I deny that there is anything in the world to justify its introduction or its enactment. . . . A proper regard for the future of this country and for our good name among the nations and peoples of the world compel one to oppose the measure. It is not founded upon any principle of a substantial character. . . . I maintain that history will adjudge the act contemplated by this Bill as a blot upon our National career. And, unfortunately, it comes at a time when we are writing glorious and imperishable pages of our history which will be the future epics of this young nation.

Mark these words, Mr. Speaker.

> A proper regard for the future of this country and for our good name among the nations and peoples of the world compel one to oppose the measure. History will adjudge the act contemplated by this Bill as a blot upon our National career.

And yet, Sir, it is to this "blot upon our National career" that the Administration owes its return to power, and it is as beneficiaries of this "blot upon our National career" that hon. gentlemen opposite continue to occupy the Treasury benches and to draw the emoluments and enjoy the dignities, privileges and power attaching thereto. Is it any wonder, Sir, that the people of Canada have lost confidence in this Administration? They never had any confidence. How could they, when the Administration was returned to power through a violation of the most sacred right which belongs to a free people—the right to a just and honest franchise?

But, Sir, if that legislation is to be spoken of as a blot upon our country, what is to be said of that other piece of legislation, the Military Voters' Act, whereby the ballots of soldiers across the seas were so manipulated as to aid in the return of hon. gentlemen opposite? What is to be said of a piece of legislation which, if not so designed—though it would even appear that such was the intention—was at least used as a means not of furthering the will of the people of Canada but of preventing their will being accorded expression. It has been openly stated in this House, and it will not be denied by hon. gentlemen opposite, that as a consequence of that legislation whole bundles of votes of soldiers overseas—votes by bundles—were taken and put into this riding, and into that riding, and into another riding, at the instance of some committee that was in the confidence of the Administration. That was not done at the will of the brave men who were fighting overseas; they did not know, many of them, where their votes were to be recorded.

Mr. ROBERT H. BUTTS (Cape Breton South and Richmond): Oh you!

Hon. Mr. KING: I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, I did not gather the purport of his observation. If the hon. gentleman desires to ask a question I shall be very glad to answer it.

Mr. BUTTS: Y-o-u.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): Prohibition would be a good thing here.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: His case is a bad one. Perhaps the hon. gentleman is a little dry.

Hon. Mr. KING: The hon. member evidently feels that he is not in a position to make a statement that he would care to have the House listen to. If he wishes to resort to other methods of showing his disapproval of my statements I will not have the slightest objection. I would ask him, however, to show due regard for the dignity and decorum of Parliament.

An hon. MEMBER: Take your medicine.

Hon. Mr. KING: I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that both the principle and the practice under the Act in question to which I have just referred have been defended by one of the members of the Administration openly in this House, and, by their silence, other members have acquiesced in both the principle and practice of taking votes from men overseas and assigning them to different constituencies without the knowledge or consent of voters abroad or electors at home. And what has been the effect of these Acts and these methods of dealing with the people's franchise? The effect is that Parliament has lost altogether its representative character, and in the country the people have ceased to have the faith they should have in our whole system of parliamentary government. Instead of regarding Parliament as the forum in which a nation's rights are to be maintained and its freedom preserved, forums have sprung

up all over the country which the people themselves are using as pulpits from which to pour their contempt upon Parliament, when in times such as these every arm in the land should be sympathetically outstretched towards Parliament in an effort to promote the great work of reconstruction which is so much needed.

Speaking on the subject of the franchise perhaps I might at this moment say a word in reference to the Government's promise in the speech from the Throne to bring in a new Franchise Bill. It is unfortunate for the country that the Bill referred to will owe its origin in part to some whose names have been associated with the kind of legislation I have just described. But let me assure the Government that if it will bring in a Bill which will help to restore public confidence in our political institutions; if it will bring in a Bill which will be honest and fair and true to the rights of the people, it will find the Opposition ready to assist and to expedite the passage of that measure. But, Sir, if a Franchise Bill is to be introduced in a form which will constitute another blot on our country's name and fame, whatever means the Government adopts to pass it, they must expect to find hon. gentlemen on this side prepared to resist to the utmost of their power legislation prejudicial to the fundamental rights of the people.

The first question we would like to ask the Administration is why should there be a new Franchise Act at all? The old Dominion Elections Act has been on the Statutes for twenty-five years. Administrations representing both political parties have been returned under its provisions. Why then do we need another Act? Why should anything more be necessary than to amend the provisions of the present statute and bring them into conformity with the needs of the country? The Government may have reasons for its proposal and we will await those reasons. But I point out to the Government now so that they may take due notice of it, that if there is any endeavour to substitute a system of Dominion enumeration for the provincial lists which have been followed in accordance with the spirit of our constitution, the Government will have to give a pretty clear and satisfactory explanation before a measure of that kind will meet with the approval of the House and of the country After the experience the country has had with Dominion enumerators, care will be taken before the franchise of our people is again placed in the hands of the Administration for manipulation as it may see best by its own creatures. So much, Sir, in reference to the franchise and what it stands for.

Let me now say just a word in regard to the application of the franchise in making good representation in Parliament, for which purpose it is intended. How, under the franchise in relation to the different vacancies that have occurred, has the Government "carried on," so far as representation in this Parliament is concerned? Since the present Administration was returned to power in December, 1917, thirteen vacancies have occurred, but hardly any were filled until the advent of this session. First, the war was made a pretext for not allowing the people representation in constituencies that had been vacated, and to a certain extent the country acquiesced in this. One would have thought that the moment the war was over the Government would immediately have sought to make good the lack of representation by bringing on by-elections in the several constituencies. Did the Government do that? No. One pretext gave way to another. When the war was out of the way the next excuse offered was the necessity of passing a new by-elections Act. When the by-elections Act was passed did the Government attempt to put it into force so as to secure representation in this House for the people of those various constituencies? No. They waited almost until the very day before the opening of the last session before they issued writs, and the Act was so drafted that the vacant constituencies were without representation for almost the period of that entire session.

I think my hon. friend from Kingston (Sir Henry Drayton) and myself were in this Parliament last session for about two weeks. Why did our constituencies not have the privilege of being represented through the whole of last session? Had the Government's plans not miscarried there would have been no representation of those two constiutencies. At the very last moment the Government brought in a measure that was not referred to in the speech from the Throne, the Grand Trunk Railway Bill, consideration of which prolonged the sitting to such an extent that these two constituencies were represented for that short period of time.

But how about the constituencies of Assiniboia, North Ontario, Glengarry and Quebec East? They were all without representation in the last session. Not

only that, Sir, but the constituencies of Glengarry and Stormont, North Ontario and Assiniboia were without representation for three entire sessions. I have here the dates at which several vacancies occurred and the by-elections took place. Glengarry and Stormont was vacated on April 13, 1918, and the by-election announced on October 27, 1919. In other words, five hundred and sixty-two days elapsed before the writ was issued, and then a further period elapsed before the return of the member. I think my hon. friend who is in the House to-day (Mr. John W. Kennedy) had the privilege of sitting for two or three days—that was the whole length of time that the people of his constituency were represented in this Parliament from the time the Government assumed office.

Then take the constituency of North Ontario, which became vacant on May 25, 1918. It was December 9, 1919, before the by-election was held, making a period of five hundred and sixty-three days during which the people of that constituency had no representation in this Parliament. In other words, they were without any representation during the last three sessions.

Similarly Assiniboia, one of the largest of the western constituencies, was vacant almost from the moment at which the Government took office, and yet until the day of the opening of this session, three days ago, not a soul was here to speak on behalf of the people of Assiniboia. Three hundred and ninety-nine days elapsed before any writ was issued for that particular vacancy.

Then take the constituency of Quebec East, which was vacated through the death of the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier. Through that entire session and the next until my hon. friend, formerly the member for Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe) was elected to represent the constituency held by his leader for the previous period of forty-three years, it was without representation.

Similarly the constituency of Victoria-Carleton was represented in this House for only one or two days last session, when it should have been represented for the entire session.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, Glengarry and Stormont, North Ontario and Assiniboia were not represented at all for three sessions; Quebec East was not represented for two sessions; Prince County, Prince Edward Island, Kingston, Victoria City and Victoria-Carleton were not represented for the greater part of one session.

Then coming down to the present time, since our last meeting of Parliament four vacancies have occurred, those in Timiskaming, Kamouraska, St. James (Montreal) and East Elgin. The constituencies of Timiskaming and Kamouraska were vacated respectively on September 22, 1919, and October 14, 1919. Why are not these constituencies represented in this Parliament at this time? There is only one reason—that the Government by deliberate intent put off the possibility of representation of these ridings as long as it possibly could. It waited until almost the very day before this Parliament was called for the present session to issue writs for the filling of those vacancies. In the case of Timiskaming the electors were a long time without representation through the protracted illness of the former Minister of Railways and Canals, the late Hon. Mr. Cochrane. One would have thought that had the Government cared at all for the representation of the electors they would have been eager and anxious to give them their right to be represented here at the earliest possible date.

During the last two weeks we have had the two vacancies that were referred to this afternoon by the right hon. the Acting Prime Minister (Sir George Foster)—St. James and East Elgin. Why is it that a writ has been issued in the case of one and not in the case of the other vacancy? I asked my right hon. friend at the opening of the session to-day if he would tell this House and, through this House, the people of the latter constituency, when they would have the right to be represented, and he gave me a reply as evasive as it could possibly be, saying nothing and making no promises one way or the other. I would ask my right hon. friend when he does reply to my speech, as no doubt he will, to tell the people of East Elgin when they may expect to have the right of representation in this Parliament which it is their privilege to demand.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, that having regard for Parliamentary Government in the matter of representation, if you look at the laws under which this Parliament has been returned, or if you look at the way in which those laws have been administered, you will find that there has been a complete demoralization of the whole business of parliamentary representation as contrasted with what it should have been were we anxious to preserve intact our political institutions.

There is this to be remembered at all times, Sir, in regard to by-elections: They are a means of keeping the Administration

in touch with the country and of giving it the views of the people on great public issues. Have we not all observed how jealously England guards the rights pertaining to the representation of her people in Parliament? We watch our newspapers to see the results of by-elections in the old land as they occur from week to week or from month to month; and in the meantime no attention whatever is paid to the necessity for holding by-elections in our own country. If we are to preserve the spirit of the constitution, which stands for the right of representation of the people in Parliament, we must seek to give to the people the right of representation as soon as possible after a vacancy in an electoral district occurs.

There is one other point that is of importance in considering the essential conditions of parliamentary Government. Parliament should be not only a representative assembly, but also a deliberative assembly. It should be a means of keeping the people informed of the public business and of having all matters of concern to them freely and openly discussed. I shall not attempt to present in detail a statement of the extent to which there has been demoralization in this connection during and since the period of the war. I shall point out, however, three very obvious particulars which are of importance if we are to have a restoration of our political institutions.

Take first the Speech from the Throne, to which we have just listened. If that time-honoured custom has any purpose whatever, it is that of acquainting Parliament, and, through Parliament, the people, with the questions that are to come up for discussion and consideration here. Well, Sir, I have only to mention the last session of Parliament and what took place then to direct the attention of the House and the country to how far we have departed from that important safeguard of a people's rights and liberties. The most important measure that was put through this Parliament last session—the most important financially in the history of Canada—was the Bill for the acquisition of the Grand Trunk Railway system; yet in the speech from the Throne of last session no mention whatever was made of the Government's intention to bring down legislation of that kind. How were the people of the country to be expected to anticipate the bringing down of such an important measure? Had reference been made to it in the speech from the Throne, we should have had an opportunity to hear from different parts of Canada an expression of opinion in regard to its merits and the legislation itself might have been vastly improved as a consequence. I say at once to the Acting Prime Minister that if the Government has other legislation in contemplation at this session of which no mention has been made in the speech from the Throne, we hope that the Government will announce to the House at the earliest possible moment what that legislation is to be. That is owing to the House; it is owing to the country.

Why, Sir, what an occasion of surprise it is to us when almost the day after His Excellency delivers the Speech from the Throne an announcement—it appears on the Order Paper—is made that the Government intends to introduce two amendments to the British North America Act. I shall not now discuss the proposed amendments; I shall not question what they are or what is the necessity for them. But I should like to point out that on only six occasions since the days of Confederation has the British North America Act been amended. If when the Speech from the Throne was delivered it was the intention of hon. gentlemen opposite to bring down an amendment to the British North America Act, they might at least have had the courtesy to tell His Excellency of it and to have had His Excellency so inform this House and the people. The amending of the Constitution is no small matter; it is a much more important matter than the amending of any drug Act, any copyright or patent law, or any of the things that are spoken of in the speech from the Throne. It is in one sense the most important matter which this Parliament can be called upon to consider. So I say, Mr. Speaker, that in these matters we have been departing altogether from the principles of parliamentary government. If you seek the cause of the unrest which prevails throughout the country, you will find it in these departures from a system of representative and responsible Government.

In this connection I may, perhaps, appropriately say a word in regard to Supply. The voting of Supply is the only way in which the people can exercise their control over Parliament and Parliament its control over the Government. We have all observed that in previous sessions, while items of supply might be brought down early or late, at the very end of the session just when members were leaving, further large appropriations were asked for. Well, Sir, under such conditions it is impossible for the people to exercise the control which they should have over public expenditure;

and we on this side of the House hope that the Government will this session, so far as they can possibly do so, bring down their Estimates on the earliest possible day; that they will not in the dying days of the session, when the House will have practically no opportunity of considering them, bring down appropriations of further millions of the people's money.

Final decisions upon matters of national import should not be made by ministers in their private rooms; should not be made without opportunity being afforded to the House of Commons to consider them in the first instance. After all, it is the public business that we are discussing here, and the country has the right to have submitted to it all that is essential in regard to large transactions, before those transactions are finally put beyond the power of this Parliament. I refer again to the Grand Trunk railway agreement. That is one of the largest transactions that this country has ever undertaken. What position are we in to-day? We who sit here in the House of Commons as the representatives of the people have been put in the humiliating position during the last fortnight of reading from cable despatches of approval being given by English shareholders to an agreement with the Government of Canada —an agreement concerning the terms of which we as members of Parliament have not the slightest knowledge. I ask if that is what is owing to the House of Commons; if that is what is owing to the people of Canada? I hope that it is not too late for the ministry to consider the advisability— notwithstanding the fact that at the last session of Parliament they said that they would not accord that right to the Canadian people—of laying on the table of the House that agreement and of asking for its approval, just as they are asking the House to approve of the Treaty of Peace between the Allied and Associated Powers and Bulgaria.

Mr. Speaker, there should be an end to Government by Order in Council. Because of the extent to which the Administration carried on Government by Order in Council during the period of the war, it may be difficult for them to realize that this method of Government—the method followed in the old days, 80 years ago—is not the method of Government which we have come to regard as free and representative Government. During the war, Government by Order in Council may have been necessary and may have been tolerated to a large extent by the people; but the time has now come when, if we are to have Government in the true sense of the word, that Government must be by Parliament and through Parliament; it must not be by the substitution of the diplomacy of Cabinet councils, carried on by Cabinet ministers in their secret chambers, for the free discussions and questionings of the ministry in this House in regard to public affairs.

If we are to restore the deliberative aspect of this assembly, ministers should be in their seats in the House where they can answer the questions put to them in regard to public business. The Prime Minister should be in his seat to answer questions with regard to matters of policy. I hasten to express the sympathy which all of us have with the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) in that, through the impairment of his health, he is prevented from being here at this time. I hope that no hon. member will endeavour to misconstrue my reference at this moment as being in any way inconsiderate. Indeed, I think a lack of consideration was shown by his colleagues in virtually compelling the Prime Minister to remain at the head of the Government, in spite of his protests over and over again that he was not in a position to attend to public affairs and that he wished to be relieved from that duty altogether. It was a mistaken kindness to him and to the country to ask him to assume a nominal leadership when it was impossible for him to assume any leadership at all. I might remind the House that during the period of the war and since the war the Prime Minister as well as two or three of his colleagues have been not merely out of this House but in large part out of the country. That is the system which has grown up, and it shows the indifference of the Government to the method of carrying on Parliamentary representation here. What is happening at this very moment? If what we read in the newspapers to-day is correct, two of my right hon. friend's colleagues are down in New York discussing the business of this country with the Prime Minister.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No truck or trade with the Yankee.

Hon. Mr. KING: Why should we have to go to New York to deal with questions that affect this country? The ministers should be here so that they can answer questions. It is astounding, when we see on the other side an endeavour to revive the old cry "No further truck or trade with the Yankees," that our ministers

rush off to New York to discuss what is to be the policy, if there is to be any policy of the Government for the next few months to come.

What are the consequences of the frequent absences of the Prime Minister? One is the rumor that the Prime Minister has either conditionally or absolutely tendered his resignation; that he has no intention whatever of returning to Parliament or of occupying a seat in this House. That rumour may be wholly false, and I hope my right hon. friend will give the House some definite statement on this all important matter. But the circumstance that it is so persistently stated that the Prime Minister has no intention of coming back; that he is merely holding the bridge, so to speak, until his colleagues can find someone to take his place, is having an unsettling effect throughout the whole of this country. What is another effect arising out of the same cause? We are told that not only are we to have the Acting Prime Minister (Sir George Foster), who is present in the House to-day, as the leader, but during the evenings or during other periods we are to have an acting leader of the House in addition.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Is that a rumour or a fact?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That we hope to find out during the course of the next few days, but the fact is that we do not know whether we are facing a Government without a head or facing a Government with three heads.

Unfortunate as we are with regard to the Prime Minister, we are almost equally unfortunate with respect to the personnel of the Cabinet. Conditions at the present time remind one of the conditions as they were prior to 1896 when the Government of that day went to pieces. The only difference is that at that time there were seven bolters who went all at once, and to-day there are seven of them who have disappeared, one by one. At that time the political edifice was dynamited from within; to-day it is crumbling to pieces. That is the only difference. Let me read the names of the resignations there have been of ministers: first, Hon. T. W. Crothers, on November 7, 1918; then, Hon. T. A. Crerar, June 16, 1919; Sir Thomas White, July 9, 1919; Hon. F. B. Carvell, August 1, 1919; Hon. S. C. Mewburn, January 15, 1920, and Hon. A. K. Maclean, February 23, 1920. Now it is rumoured that the Prime Minister himself is to go. Why, Sir, that is a small ministry all in itself, a ministry of very considerable proportions, and with the Government beginning to split up as it is in that way, the public mind is kept in a restless condition to see who is to be the next one to come out. In that way, we are never sure exactly where we are.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Providence may choose.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: While the Government has been indifferent in the regard mentioned, it has been equally indifferent so far as the deliberative nature of this assembly is concerned, in withdrawing ministers to the other Chamber where they are beyond questioning altogether. We have at the present time in the Senate no less than three ministers holding portfolios, the Minister of Labour, the Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, and the Postmaster General. In times like this, of all times, the minister who holds the portfolio of Soldiers' Civil Re-establisment should be in this House where he can be questioned, and so should the Minister of Labour; but these gentlemen, along with the Postmaster General, are taken over to the other Chamber, so that the people's representatives here are put in the position, when they ask questions on many matters, of being unable to obtain authoritative replies at the time information is so necessary in connection with public discussion.

Then there has been the further tendency of the gradual shifting over to irresponsible commissions, boards and delegates of one kind or another, of a great deal of the business that should be carried on by the Government itself. I heard a gentleman say the other day that he thought the time had come when we should have government by the Government, instead of government by commissions, delegates and boards of different kinds. The effect of all this is that, in one way or another, instead of the business of Parliament being discussed here in a deliberative fashion, the country is being committed directly and indirectly to policies of which it has no knowledge, by persons who in no way owe responsibility to the people through their representatives in this House.

There are just two further matters to which I will refer, and I think I can promise the House that I shall be through by six o'clock. I have spoken of the representative nature of this deliberative assembly. Let me say a word in regard to what I think the spirit of the Constitution demands with respect to the representative

character of the Cabinet. Canada is a country of wide geographical areas. Up to the time of Confederation it was a country of scattered provinces and territories. The work of nation-building ever since has consisted in welding into one Dominion the various provinces and territories, and cementing between the parts, bonds of friendship, mutual understanding, and common interest. The representative character of the Cabinet has been one of the most effective means to this highly important end, so that it is essential we should have a Cabinet that will represent in a general way the various important considerations of race, religion, economic interest and provincial right and concern. I shall not speak of more than one of these, but every Cabinet that there has been from the time of Confederation up to the present has had regard for the different elements that go to make up the nation in a way that will tend to unite and cement together the different portions of the Dominion.

We have representing the province of Quebec in this House two hon. gentlemen whom I see opposite to me at the moment, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne). Both these hon. gentlemen are English-speaking. There is not in the Cabinet a single representative of the French-Canadians in this country.

An hon. MEMBER: What about the Postmaster General?

Hon. M. KING: I hear someone say "What about the Postmaster General? Well, Sir, we cannot say that the Postmaster General represents the French-Canadians.

Mr. LAPOINTE: He could not get ten votes in any riding in Quebec.

Hon. M. KING: The Postmaster General has removed his r sidence from the province of Quebec altogether, and has come to reside permanently in the province of Ontario; but more than that, the Postmaster General ran in two constituencies in the last election when the voice of the people was heard in the matter of representation. He ran in the constituency of Laurier-Outremont and was defeated there by a majority of 1,247. He ran in the constituency of Champlain and was defeated there by a majority of 6,623. In the face of that, can it be said that the Postmaster General represents the French-speaking element of the province of Quebec?

But that is not the most serious feature. From the confines of the city of Montreal right through to the Atlantic ocean there is not a single Cabinet minister, with or without a portfolio, in the Government. The province of Nova Scotia has no representative in the Cabinet; the province of New Brunswick has no representative in the Cabinet; the province of Prince Edward Island has no representative in the Cabinet. That is to say, something like 3,000,000 of the people of this country are without any representation in the Government, so far as their province is concerned. How in the face of a situation like that, can we longer talk about representative government in this country? Why is there no representation? The answer is plain. The people have lost faith in the Government, and the Government has lost faith in the people; neither has any longer any faith in the other, and yet hon. gentlemen opposite would have us believe they are carrying on representative government in this country. No, Sir, if we wish to remedy the unrest in this country let us have a government that is representative of all classes and of all provinces in Canada.

Just this word in conclusion, for it helps to explain all the rest. What is the most fundamental of all principles underlying responsible Government? It is that of collective cabinet responsibility—that there should be a cabinet with a known policy; that its policy should be known and defined as well as its members. Will any one pretend that hon. gentlemen opposite have a defined policy? Why, there are as many policies as there are members in the Cabinet. There are as many opinions as there are members in the Cabinet. When the Prime Minister talks of resigning, one aspirant for the leadership will make a speech in which he will announce a policy regarding trade or some other question, but the other members of the Cabinet do not necessarily follow him. Other aspirants announce other policies. We have no voice of the ministry as a whole, on any great question of national policy. Not only that, but among the Government's own followers in the Senate and in this House, there are those who are framing up new policies for the Administration, showing that they have no faith in the Government any longer. The Government press, which has been behind the Government all along, comes forward with suggestions for a new alignment of parties, so that somehow, in some fashion, we can get back to some system of Government where we will have a Cabinet with a known policy able to carry on the business of the country in accordance with the country's wishes.

What lies at the back of everything else is the absence of any collective cabinet responsibility. How is that to be remedied? Why is there no Government policy to-day? Hon. gentlemen know the reason very well. The Government is composed of two factions, two groups of men of different attitudes of mind, and their job for the last year or two has been, not to find a policy, but to see how they can get along without a policy so they can hold together. If there is any doubt on that question let the ministry answer.

When the war was over one would have supposed that the Prime Minister would have made some statement to the House as to what his post-war policy was to be. The ministry was elected as a war ministry, and when the war was over its purpose was gone. It had no policy at any time other than to carry on the war. If it had I should like any member of the ministry to state what it was. I say it had no policy except to "win the war," and when the war was won it had nothing further to say as to what it represented in the country. One would have supposed that under these conditions the Prime Minister would have stated to the people of this country that the Government would carry on a little longer until demobilization had been completed and that he would then issue a statement of the Government's policies for post-war conditions and would appeal to the people and give them an opportunity of approving those policies. That would have been the proper constitutional method, but was that done? No, that chance was lost, and from the moment that chance went by, the Government began to lose the confidence of the people; it began to lose its ministers one by one, it began to lose by-elections one by one. It became a crumbling edifice until to-day there is only left a remnant of what one could call a united cabinet.

What is the position as stated by the Government itself? The people of this country were prepared to allow the ministry to carry on for a session or two for the purpose of demobilization. That would have brought the situation up to the beginning of last session. Then the job for the Government would have been limited to getting through that session.

My hon. friend the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) will recall that he and some of those who came into the Government as Unionist Liberals held a meeting and discussed how they could stay longer in touch with those who represented the other element of which the Cabinet was composed. When that meeting was over, my hon. friend gave out a statement as to its result, which appeared in the press throughout the country on October 1. I shall read only one paragraph of that statement:

> The meeting expressed unqualified approval of the war policy of the Union Government, and the Government is congratulated on its success.

That was self-congratulation.

> The concensus of opinion was, as the members were elected to support Union Government, it is their intention to continue to do so, and the hope was strongly expressed that the Government would be able at an early date to evolve a progressive policy satisfactory to the country to meet the after the war conditions.

Note that. Here is one section of the ministry saying to the other section of the ministry and to the country that they strongly hope that in some way or another the ministry will be able to frame a policy to deal with post-war conditions. Was there ever such an exhibition of cabinet incompetency as is expressed in those words? Well, that was sufficient to keep the Government together through last session. Then we came to the Christmas recess, when the job was to hang on until another session came. That became pretty difficult. Matters grew more and more tense in the Cabinet, as my hon. friends know, and finally there was pretty nearly an explosion. The papers came out on December 15 with headlines such as these: "Sir R. L. Borden to retire from public life—Will make announcement to gathering of supporters—Heeds Medical advice—Parliament will meet in February with new Premier and leader of Unionists." We all remember what consternation there was when it was said that the Prime Minister was to resign. Why did he not resign? The answer is to be found in the newspaper headlines of the following day "Couldn't find successor, so Premier sticks." They have been looking for a successor ever since, but have not found one. Then came the statement which the Prime Minister issued himself before he went away on leave. It appeared in all the papers and is well known to every hon. member of this House. I shall read only one paragraph. It is a sort of political last will and testament by the Prime Minister. To quote:

> Sir Robert Borden desires that the situation as here outlined—

He had been outlining what took place in the Cabinet.

> —shall be placed before his supporters in Parliament, and he considers it essential that they

should approve of the arrangement which his colleagues have urged and which he has accepted.

It was the purpose of the Prime Minister to have set forth to the country during the recent session the policies for which the Government would stand during the life of the present parliament. During his illness, and just before his departure, he embodied his proposals in written form, and, on the second of October, the day before he left Ottawa, he submitted them to a gathering of Government supporters. It was his desire that these proposals should be taken into consideration by those present and that at a further gathering, the suggestions of senators and members should be placed before him, after which he intended to formulate these policies from his place in parliament as controlling the action of the Government during the period mentioned.

Some of the proposals thus presented have since been carried out by action taken during the recent session. Sir Robert Borden desires that after due consideration of the advice and suggestions of the supporters of the Government in parliament the policies as finally accepted shall be presented to Parliament and to the people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is the present situation. The Prime Minister has gone away. He has left some document which is to be discussed by his followers in Parliament. He has set out what he thinks should be the policy of the party, and if all cannot agree on that policy as outlined by him, then he and they must part company. That, Mr. Speaker, is what it amounts to. In other words, instead of the policy being decided by the party's followers, or by a convention representative of the people belonging to the party, the Prime Minister, as an individual, lays down what is to be adopted, and if it is possible to secure agreement on his policy they will carry on. But what does this document say? "During the life of the present Parliament,"—another couple of years. That is the proposal that is put before the country at this time. This Government and this House, as unrepresentative as it is, is to be continued for another couple of years through some policy that is yet to be framed and that is still unknown. Why, Sir, a position of that kind is impossible, and, in the opinion of the people, will prove intolerable.

There is no remedy for such a situation except the remedy which the constitution provides; that is to say, at the earliest possible moment there should be an appeal to the people of the country so that the will of the people shall be known and voiced by a parliament and government that is truly representative. Sir, we have passed the time when people exist for the sake of governments. People do not exist to-day for the sake of governments. On the contrary, governments exist to give expression to the will of the people. Having this fundamental principle in mind, therefore, I beg to move, seconded by the hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria, (Mr. D. D. McKenzie), that the following be added to the Address to His Excellency:

We respectfully submit to Your Excellency that the conditions under which the Government was formed and the present House of Commons was elected have now passed away, and that new conditions have arisen which are not being adequately met. The regrettable protracted absence of the Prime Minister, the widely accepted belief that it is not his intention to return to the duties of his office, the makeshift arrangements for the direction of important departments to which no minister has been regularly appointed, the attempt to carry on the public business when the three eastern Maritime P.ovinces are entirely unrepresented in the Cabinet—these and other things operate to produce a condition of uncertainty and instability from which a vigourous and efficient administration of the Dominion's affairs cannot be expected.

We respectfully submit to Your Excellency that in the interest of the peace, order, and good government of this Dominion such a condition of our public affairs should be brought to a speedy termination, and that the only effective remedy is to be found in an appeal to the electors at a general election.

We, therefore, respectfully represent that Your Excellency's advisers should forthwith bring forward the promised Franchise Bill for the enrollment of the electors and give it precedence over all other business, and that upon the enactment of such a measure as may be necessary, and the making of temporary provisions for the urgent public service, they should take the proper constitutional steps to obtain Your Excellency's approval of an appeal to the people at the polls.

I submit this resolution, Sir, as being fundamental in the way of what is necessary in the reconstruction of our political institutions.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE E. FOSTER (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, observing the time honoured custom which it is a delight for me to follow this evening I beg to tender my congratulations to the mover and to the seconder of the Address in reply to the speech from the Throne and to add my words of felicitation to those that have been uttered by the Leader of the Opposition. These two gentlemen have acquitted themselves in a thoroughly workmanlike manner. They have shown themselves proficient in parliamentary oratory and they have produced a structure which

in beauty of language, in finish, in diction, and in practical sound suggestions and common sense will stand well on the records of Parliament with similar efforts from Confederation to the present day.

Now I must make some comment in a discursive way on the different points that have been raised by the leader of the Opposition, but I do not wish to spend the entire evening in replying to the hon. gentleman, and he will excuse me if, after some more or less extended comments upon what he has said, I take up certain subjects somewhat beyond the line of his criticism. It is said that the wish is father to the thought and I imagine that as my hon. friend expressed the view that the edifice occupied heretofore by the present Government was a crumbling edifice, his observation was prompted by the desire that it should crumble and that he might speedily see it crumble. Well, an edifice may or may not crumble, but there is one structure which will not crumble or decay, and that is the good, efficient, courageous work which this Government has performed since it came into existence. That monument is indestructible.

My hon. friend was not satisfied with the speech from the Throne. In all my political experience I have not known a leader of the Opposition to be other than dissatisfied; it is the business of the leader of the Opposition not to be satisfied with the speech. Nor was my hon. friend satisfied with the gentlemen who moved and seconded the Address; his congratulations to those gentlemen were followed by criticisms of them. My hon. friend declared that one of the gentlemen dealt with matters away in the past and that did not please him, the other gentleman projected himself into the future, and that pleased my hon. friend still less. Evidently the only thing that is secure to my hon. friend is the little bit of the present upon which he stands. Neither his past nor his future has very many charms for him in either retrospect or outlook.

The leader of the Opposition objected to so much of the speech being taken up with allusions to external affairs. My hon. friend is behind the times. Where has he been living this last five years?

An hon. MEMBER: In the States.

Sir GEORGE E. FOSTER: Where has my hon. friend been living during the time in which Canada has been so very much taken up with external affairs. I observe sitting opposite me one hon. gentleman who passed several years, and under trying circumstances showed his devotion to the cause of Canada and the Empire, in foreign fields. Let me tell my hon. friend that Canada has been largely living abroad during these last five years. It has been living in the hearts of its soldiers, living in its prayers for their success and their welfare, echoing their desire for victory for the cause which they championed and glorying in the reputation and the honour which those brave men conferred upon their country and ultimately brought back unsullied when the cruel war in which they fought was at an end. Why should we disjoin this Canada of ours from the part we have taken in external affairs in the last few years which, may I not hope, is but the beginning of that common world-wide interest which helps to make a people less provincial and directs them into the life movements and currents of the great body of humanity of which they form a part?

My hon. friend found one reference in the speech from the Throne which was sweet to his taste and that was the allusion to the Franchise Bill. The allusion was sweet to his taste because it gave him an opportunity to go back to the warmed-over porridge in the kettle which has already been dealt with, a matter which has been fought out and fought out, with the result that the various theories and imaginative processes of my hon. friend have been exploded over and over again. However, the subject served for a foundation for some criticisms by my hon. friend and seemed to please him. He was very much concerned as to this Government's constitutional way of conducting the affairs of the country, and he based a complaint against the speech from the Throne in that he did not set forth the various changes in the tariff which were to be made during this session of Parliament. Now my hon. friend might very well have known, had he thought for a moment, that it is dangerous work to put a tariff schedule in the King's speech. It has never been done, I believe, in this or any other country. Consequently I think that part of his criticism fell rather short.

He deplored the waste of material, the waste of human life and the waste of moral and religious fibre. No one can deplore that more than myself and gentlemen on this side of the House in common with all other hon. members. War is cruel, and wasteful. Its effects are not confined to the year in which it rages, they remain and burrow deep into human nature, and on the

average they do not elevate, but they depress and degrade our humanity. There are great bursts of heroism, splendid feats of gallantry, great occasions when the soldier loses all thought of self in the mighty cause for which he is waging war and venturing his life,—those are high and brilliant gleams in the general gloom, but war in the end and on the average depresses and degrades humanity.

But what are we in this Parliament to do to restore the religious faith and moral fibre of the nation? In ourselves we may seek to restore it; in others it must be a process between themselves and their God—between themselves and their own conscience, which in each is the voice of God. We must all pray and hope that this great cruel war will not have so far wasted the faith, the religious fervour and the moral strength of our people that we may not quickly restore ourselves, our country and the world to the basis upon which we stood when this war commenced.

My hon. friend quarrels with the autocratic methods, the indecision and the inadequacy of the administration. I shall deal with that a little later in a general way, and yet with special reference to his criticism. He calls for a new Parliament and a new Government, and bases his demand, amongst other things, upon this foundation: that as the result of an agreement between both sides of the House a year's extension of the Parliamentary term was allowed; and then he declares that the most infernal piece of legislation that stands to the record of any Government was in that year of extension perpetrated by the Parliament of Canada.

Now, I want to ask my hon. friend if when the Parliamentary term was extended a year, it was extended with the condition that Parliament should be shorn of any one of its rights? One of the rights of Parliament is legislation upon the franchise, and that extension of life was a year's extension with full powers, and without restriction. In the full possession of those powers Parliament enacted a piece of franchise legislation which, whatever my hon. friend may think, was well received by the vast proportion of the loyal people of this country as a necessary piece of war legislation.

In referring to the proposed Franchise Bill my hon. friend gave us a promise that if we brought in a proper Bill—that is, one which pleased him—he would support it; but if we brought in an improper Bill—one which did not please my hon. friend—then there would be war to the knife; or if we did not adopt certain provisions we must give very good reasons why. We shall bring in a Bill which ought to satisfy my hon. friend, and which ought to satisfy his friends on his side of the House if they are reasonable, as I believe they will be, and we will welcome his and their aid towards its perfection. My hon. friend spoke of the provincial franchises and of their adoption, but I think we are face to face with somewhat of a new condition in that respect; however when our Bill is brought down the House will judge as to its foundations and what is built upon these foundations.

My hon. friend declared that Parliament has not only ceased to be representative but that it has ceased to be deliberative. Well, that is news to me. Deliberation consists in two things: Thought over the measures which shall be adopted, and free expression of views with reference to such measures. We are not responsible for gentlemen on the other side of the House if they do not apply their thoughts to our measures, and we have not controlled any fair expression of their views upon these measures. In what respect, then, has this ceased to be a deliberative assembly? I think my hon. friend's criticism is not quite just in that respect. He instances as a reason why that the Grand Trunk agreement, while it has lately been submitted to the shareholders of the company in Great Britain, was not submitted to this deliberative assembly, and he finds fault with us in two directions: First, that the agreement was not mentioned in the speech from the Throne last session; and second, that it was not submitted for the approval of the House. Had my hon. friend exercised his memory a little he would have recollected that a certain distinguished leader of the Liberal Government and party in this country at a certain time introduced into Parliament a most important Bill, and one which has had most important consequences, to wit, the Grand Trunk Pacific measure, and that although that measure was formed in the minds of the Government and many of their supporters at the time when the speech from the Throne was written no mention of that legislation was made therein. So there are lapses on his own side.

But there was a reason for the omission of any mention of the Grand Trunk agreement in the speech from the Throne last session. That agreement and the legislation upon which to found it depended upon an agreement being reached with the Grand Trunk authorities, and although nearly two

years had passed while the question was being discussed more or less, no arrangement had been come to when the speech from the Throne was read, and consequently no legislation could be promised with reference thereto. After the session had proceeded for some time an agreement was arrived at. It was only then that it was in a condition to be brought down to Parliament, and it was then brought down. As to his quarrel with the Government because they have not yet submitted the Grand Trunk agreement to the deliberation of the House of Commons, well, what was submitted to the House of Commons, debated in the House of Commons and passed by the House of Commons, was the legislation which authorized an agreement to be made, and laid down the conditions of that agreement. So that every bit of pertinent information with reference to it was deliberated upon and passed by this House and is known to hon. members if they studied the legislation which was passed. But the agreement itself will now be laid on the table.

The hon. gentleman also found fault with the Government in that while they had made mention of an opium convention in the Speech from the Throne, they had made no mention of proposed amendments to the British North America Act. Well, before the very first working day of the session announcement is made under the Notices of Motion upon the Order Paper that amendments will be asked to the British North America Act therefore my hon. friend and his friends have all the information at exactly the same time as they would have had it if the proposed legislation had been mentioned in the Speech from the Throne. It is a question of choice whether the information should be given in the Speech from the Throne or otherwise; but there is no grievance on the part of the House of Commons because of prompt and early notice not having been given by mention of the proposed legislation in the Speech from the Throne. Neither in the Speech nor in the mere announcement of the title of the Bill are the provisions of the Bill made known; consequently my hon. friend and his friends are just as far ahead as they possibly could have been had notice been given in any other form than that which was actually adopted.

Mr. hon. friend gives us that old, well-worn bit of advice and caution: Bring down your Supply early. Well, we have heard that for thirty years from both sides and under all Governments. It is always a pious resolution, that the Supply should be brought down early. Generally it is brought down early—not all of it, but the most of it. But the House of Commons is a pernickety association of individuals in some respects. If we were to bring down the whole of the Supply and put it on the Table to-morrow it would be the last days of the session before a militant Opposition would do more than discuss all manners of issues except the real nature of the Supply itself. That is a phenomenon that we may all think over and account for as best we can. But I agree that Supply should be early put before the House. I agree also with the suggestion made by my hon. friend who moved the Address this afternoon (Mr. Cronyn): That some method might be devised to provide that after the Estimates have been presented to the House they shall be examined by a committee or some body of that kind and put in proper shape so that we may understand them better and be enabled to come to better conclusions upon them. If we are allowed to remain a little while longer in this crumbling edifice that my hon. friend so pathetically described this afternoon, we may find some method by which improvement can be made in that respect.

My hon. friend contends that it is time that Government by Order in Council should cease. I will take that up a little later and deal with it somewhat more exhaustively than I can at this moment.

The hon. gentleman went on to declare that ministers should be in their seats. So they should. But the difficulty is for us all to do just what we should do. If ministers were always in their seats, atrophy, dislocation and delay might result in other important respects which bear a close relation to the promptness with which the business can be put through Parliament. The members of the House have a perfect right to demand that a fair proportion of ministers should be in their seats; that ministers, certainly when their own departments are under consideration, should be here. But it is practically impossible, having regard to the duties which are laid upon ministers to-day with their large departments and the multiplied demands which are made upon their attention, absolutely to tie themselves to their seats in Parliament during all the hours that Parliament is in session. There must be some reasonable give and take in respect to that matter.

But my hon. friend goes on to develop his thesis by saying that the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) should be in his place, and his argument, if it meant anything, was: No matter what are the conditions;

no matter what the state of his health, you are not doing your duty to Parliament unless you have your Prime Minister in his seat now and constantly during the session. I do not think that the good sense of the House or of the country will march easily with my hon. friend's opinion in that respect. I have alluded once before somewhere to the pathetic side of the life and work of a Prime Minister of this Dominion; for it has its pathetic side. My hon. friend is young and strong and the future is before him. If he ever gets out from the light and free atmosphere of criticism and assumes the burdens of the office of Prime Minister of this country, he will find that they are nerve-racking and body-racking; that they involve body toil and body pain; that morally, mentally and physically there is a strain upon the man who holds that office, all of which call for sympathy rather than criticism when the strain proves to be too great to bear. And if that is true in normal times, when we have storms and ebullitions only under shelter of the wings of peace, what must be involved in these duties in times such as we have lately gone through, when the war winds blow, when currents and counter-currents come alternately; when immense responsibilities must be assumed and quick decisions made?—What the duties of the Prime Minister must be under these conditions I know, because I have sat by and have seen. I tell you that in my heart of hearts, as in the heart of hearts of all of us, there will be a spot free from censure, free from criticism, free from stern rebuke—a spot in which is generated human nature's just recognition of merit and of toil. This I say of what must fairly be our attitude with regard to the Prime Minister. We have not failed to recognize the responsibilities devolving upon the Leader of the Opposition in time of peace or in time of war. His also is a brain-racking and a body-racking office, and my sympathies went out to the old chief who lead the battalions of hon. gentlemen opposite for so many years, when in his advancing years I noted how the sense of the responsibilities and of the burdens which he had to bear grew upon him. I knew that in his mind and in his heart there were struggles of statesmanship but little known to those who could see only what was apparent from the outside.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition says that certain Ministers should have been here last year and the session before that. He asserts that the Prime Minister and several of his Ministers were not only out of this House but out of Canada: That they were in Europe, and that they should have been here. I challenge that position and I ask the judgment of the people of Canada upon it.

I ask the judgment of the people of Canada on that statement with a full impression and conviction that the people do not agree with my hon. friend in that respect. If 500,000 of the bone and sinew, the flower of this country, left home and business, went across the seas, spent their years, their blood, many of them their lives, for the cause for which we were all fighting, and gained the cause, who shall rise and say that the responsible ministers shall not, after the victories of the war, strive to make certain the victories of the peace? If the dictum of my hon. friend holds good, Lloyd George would have tied himself down in Downing street. Did he? The Italian ministers would have tied themselves down in Rome. Did they? The United States President would have confined himself to Washington. Did he? Not simply a responsible minister, but the head of that country, thought—and his country agreed with him—that when the lines were to be gathered up after war's ravages and peace was to be framed and tempered to the conditions of the time, it was no less a person than himself, with his authority and his representative position, who should be on the spot to lay the lines of peace. Surely my hon. friend cannot hold to the dictum he has laid down. If he does, he puts himself in the minority in this country and in the world.

My hon. friend first mentions some things as rumours. Then in that geometric or arithmetic progression upon which we go from less to greater, his next sentence makes of those rumours facts, and on those facts, whose mothers were rumours, he founds an argument for an indictment of the Government. Imagination is a fine servant, but a bad master; and imagination is the mother of rumours, and rumours are mischievous and generally as far off from facts as it is possible to get them. There would in fact be no spice in a rumour if it were a fact. Rumour is not a fact, and thereby it allures, and it catches, and it does not tie you down to argument. It is so easy to say: So-and-so told me such-and-such. Off it goes; nobody is responsible; but it is on its trot; it is started in the race, and it goes to the uttermost parts of the world. And so on all the rumours which he then makes into facts, he founds the pleasing proposition that there was a Government seated opposite him that had one head, two heads, three heads—the first,

very respectable, having one head; in the second place a monstrosity, having two; in the third place, a very hideous monster with three heads. The Government has one head and one only; it has not two and it has not three. But while one head is away, another, very humbly and in a very poor way, undertakes to do, as far as he can, what the real head would do if he were present. And under the circumstances of the present, when the sick man is absent searching for a return of the health which has been shattered by his devotion to the duties and responsibilities of office, the onerous responsibilities of the war, one of the members of his Cabinet undertakes to fill his place, however unworthily, by the good grace of his fellow-members and his supporters and of the House as well. My hon. friend would surely not object to that.

As to the proposition which he adds to that—and that rumour developed into a fact with which he clenched his argument that there was a one-man proposition somewhere and that in this whole business there was a concealed design, and not a healthful one—let me set my hon. friend's mind at rest. The right hon. leader of the Government is away, unfortunately, and with regret we say it, in search of a very much shattered health. On the conditions of two or three or four months free from the cares of office, as far as he can be free, depends entirely whether he shall ever lead this Government again or not. But there is nothing up the sleeve; the fact is absolutely that and nothing more. If a kind Providence permits and health is restored in reasonable time, we shall have the leader of the Government back again.

My hon. friend objects to having members of the Government in the Senate. Since when? Is his party behind him in that respect? Have a Senate and have no member of the Government in it? It has not been so in the past; it will not be so in the future. The more the Senate is useful, the more it will demand that responsible members of the Government shall be in the Senate to state their policy, and their policy will be carried out in that way. Since when did my hon. friend develop this strange theory that because a man was not successful in a constituency for the Commons he could not represent his province in the Senate? Such a theory does not stand on good ground. The Senate is not a body elected by the electors. A senator is a man appointed under the constitution from a certain province, who represents his province, and Mr. Blondin, a member of our Government, as surely represents his province as a senator as the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Beland) represents his province on the electoral basis in the House of Commons.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is too much.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: But the last argument that my hon. friend adduced to show that our hon. colleague did no longer represent Quebec, was that he had moved his family and was living in Ottawa. My hon. friend suffers from a lapse of memory. How long did my right hon. friend, now deceased, who led the party that my hon. friend now leads, have his family and his abode in Ottawa? Did he cease to represent his province because he lived in Ottawa? For a man who conducts a large department and who is not very close to his home, it is absolutely impossible to get along without having his family here if he intends to enjoy the amenities of family life and to have the help and aid that family life gives him when he is carrying on those responsible duties which devolve upon him. So it is no argument at all to say that because a man lives in Ottawa and not in his native province he therefore as a member of the Government does not represent his province.

My hon. friend finds fault with commissions. He says that there have been too many of them, that they are autocratic, irresponsible, and lead to situations which are not founded on legal and responsible grounds. Now, commissions have been plentifully appointed during the war in all countries that were engaged in the war. My hon. friend will not dispute that for a single moment. How many commissions were established and carried on in the United States, for instance, during the war? —most important commissions dealings with some of the greatest interests of peace or war in that country. The same holds true of Great Britain, of France, and all the other great warring countries. Our commissions are of two kinds. A commission is either administrative or advisory. If it is advisory, it is appointed by the Government and reports to it, and what is done is done on the responsibility of the Government. If it is administrative, it is established by Order in Council, which lays down the powers and duties placed in its hands by the Government, which duties it carries out, and beyond which powers it cannot go. So he must revise somewhat our opinions about commissions on these grounds. The Government is always responsible. In the case of an advisory com-

mission, the Government either accepts or rejects its recommendations. In the case of an administrative commission, the Government lays down the scope and lines of the powers the commission is to exercise.

Geographical representation is outraged, my hon. friend says. I am not going to contest that, except that perhaps the word is rather an extreme one to use. There are many things done in time of war which project themselves into peace times. It is not always possible to bring them at once strictly into conformity with the lines followed in peace times. My hon. friend then goes on to say that there is no collective Cabinet responsibility. My hon. friend does not sit in our Cabinet. Absolutely he does not. I have never seen his face there, neither does he walk along the corridor or have a seat by the outside door. The Cabinet itself is sworn to secrecy. So how does my hon. friend know that there is not collective Cabinet responsibility? If he will take my word for it—and I am sure he thinks I am fairly honest, and that what I say would, according to my lights, be a true saying—never since Union Government has been formed has there been any line of policy adopted on which the Cabinet has not stood as a unit. What does my hon. friend mean by collective responsibility? Evidently, the responsibility of the whole Cabinet for every policy of the Cabinet. Take our policies as they have been developed in the last two years and a half, policies of magnitude and of far-reaching importance. Behind all of these there has been solidarity on the part of the Government. What about the Opposition? I know what was in my hon. friend's mind; at least, I think I do. I think he had some reference to those troublesome things called tariff policies, and that when he was speaking of possible differences he was thinking of differences with reference to bases of a tariff. How does my hon. friend stand in that regard? Is he all-collective with his party on possible tariff conditions? Was it ever so with the party now led by my hon. friend? I remember the long years before 1896 and the well developed and arduous struggle, and a fine struggle it was, of the Liberal party from opposition into power which they attained in 1896. During all those years of struggle, in the nest where little birds are supposed to agree two birds nestled side by side. One was always squawking "Eliminate Protection. Free trade as they have it in Great Britain." The other was more prudent but chirped once in a while " Keep your feathers from being ruffled, it will all come out right; there will be a little bit of protection in the end." In 1896 the bird that had done all the squawking before was bundled out of the nest, and the other took possession of it and kept it until 1911. No one knows that better than my hon. friend, or my hon. friend who sits behind him (Mr. Fielding). My hon. friend says that we were elected in 1917 on the sole platform of prosecution of the war. He is not absolutely correct in that. He goes a certain distance, but he does not go far enough. We were elected, indubitably, pledged to carry the war to a victorious conclusion, but we were elected for other purposes besides that. We had a platform, which was put out in 1917. My hon. friend has read it, and I make the assertion here to-day without fear of contradiction that the platform was far broader than simply the prosecution of the war, and that it has been lived up to by the Government and the party supporting it.

Then my hon. friend comes to his later proposition. He echoes what I have seen in the newspapers, what I have heard from the platform, a sort of impression which some people try to persuade themselves into accepting as truth, that the Cabinet during the last year or more has been in a tense state, ever on the point of explosion, and that its troubles have been vivid, continued and irreconcilable. Where does my hon. friend get his information? He was good enough to tell us. He gets it from the headlines of the newspapers. Now, God bless the newspapers in so far as they go right and do not waste too much paper, in these days when paper is very scarce, in big forty or forty-six page issues. But the last place to which I would go to get the solid basis for a political or any other platform would be the headlines of the newspapers. The headlines, however, are sweet to the taste of my hon. friend. One headline flares out: "Tense condition in the Cabinet;" another follows it with this: "Explosion almost took place yesterday in the Cabinet;" and a third conveys the statement that "Borden would be out but he could not find a successor." All this is contained in the headlines. Now, my hon. friend is younger than I, and I am sure he will take it in good part if I advise him to avoid the headlines of the newspapers as a basis for his political information and policies.

My hon. friend concludes with a resolution wherein he states a present policy of himself and of his party, and the gist of that

resolution is that with all possible speed we should immediately put through a Franchise Bill and then appeal to the country in order to get the opinion of the people afresh and obtain a new Parliament and a new Government. Does my hon. friend see no lurking shadows of future disaster to himself and his party if the suggestion should be acted upon and within a fortnight or three weeks we were put to the test of a general election? Was the success of his party at the last general election so great, so striking, that it makes him all of a hunger for another contest? Or is this a bit of fine strategical camouflage under a pretty well-founded assumption, as he reads things, that the vote will not carry in this House and that he will have all the honour of declaring for a bold and vigorous strategy without exposing himself to any of the disaster which might follow from a realization of what he pleads for? However, I am not going to discuss that point further to-night. Having wearied the House to this length, I shall make a few remarks on what is, after all, the gist of this whole campaign with reference to the present Government. The gist of the whole campaign is to get in full swing rumours, headlines, statements, whether true or false, assertions of every kind, allegations, and, in short, anything at all that is calculated to create the impression that this Government has had no strength, has done nothing in the two years of its existence, has been an uncourageous, an indecisive and an inadequate Administration. Is not that the sum and substance of it? Is not that what is sought to be impressed on the people largely in order that, under such an impression, the downfall of a really good and honest and efficient Government may be brought about? I propose, with the indulgence of the House, to devote a few moments to a very brief statement of some things that have been done since the election of 1917, and I think I shall be borne out in the assertion that a campaign of thoughtless and baseless, and in some respects, mischievous, if not malevolent, criticism has been and is being levelled against the Government.

The Government has suffered, and why? Because its members have been too busy to travel over the country to refute these false statements and misrepresentations on platforms. For instance, put a man in the War Department at Ottawa during these last four years of war, with all its responsibilities and trying circumstances, with its nights and days of unremitting toil, and then ask him to leave his desk, his bureau, his directing seat, and go through this country on weary weeks of combatting these criticisms and misrepresentations. He would be recreant to his duty, recreant to the trust the country had reposed in him if he attempted this. It is to his disadvantage, it is to the disadvantage of the Government that this cannot be done. But it is a case in which the Government must do its duty in regard to the work which is immediately before it, no matter what the people may be saying outside. We have taken that resposibility. We have been up against that disadvantage, and we are up against it to-day. But truth is still truth, and the people of this country are, I think, on the whole, sensible, fair-minded and truth-loving. Now that the war is over and some of the hardest problems of peace have been met and put in the way of solution, the Government will find its methods and means to place the whole truth before the country. And when the whole truth is heard and the whole matter is made plain, misrepresentation will not score a victory, but rather an honest and efficient devotion to duty will carry the approval of the great fair-play-loving body of the Canadian electorate. I stand here to-night, with the experience I have had in public life, and make this assertion, which I believe to be absolutely true: That no Government since Confederation has faced greater responsibilities and met them more efficiently, or has so fair a record in performances, as this Government which has carried through the work of the war. No Government that I have known has more fully carried out the pledges that it made upon the platform upon which it was elected than has this present Government; and I propose to prove both these assertions if the House will give me its attention.

We may divide the work of the Government into three branches: The home work and policy, the war work and policy, and that other body of administration and policy which has to do with both home and war work in the way of support, amalgamation, and co-operation; and I want to briefly draw attention to what has been done under these three headings. The first article of the platform upon which the Government went to the people in 1917 was: A vigorous prosecution of the war. What fault has my hon. friend to find with the Government in that respect? Did it lack courage, or initiative, or efficiency, or loyalty, deep and abiding, to the men whom it sent overseas? Did it suffer those men to go into the

war unequipped? Did it give them insufficient food, or equipment, or clothing, or medical care? Were those men nursed when they were sick, were their wounds cared for when they were struck down? Is the Government at fault in any of these respects? When there were influences abroad in various parts of this country to endeavour to cause the Government to ease up with respect to its war measures, to go no further and to refrain from the last irrevokable step which was necessary if the ranks of our men were to be kept up, the Government displayed the courage of its convictions. Its members took their political lives in their hands. They went to the country. They pledged themselves to that policy which the situation called for and they have carried it out ever since. You ask for proof. Talk with our generals that have lived and fought upon the battlefield. If you ask for further proof talk with the generals of the Allied Army who have seen our men fighting and toiling on the battle grounds. Talk with those who have had charge of the great helping institutions of the war—the nurses, the Red Cross Society, the Ambulance and First Aid organizations, all those activities which go to solace and comfort and healing of soldiers. Ask these authorities whether Canada was to the front or to the rear in all of these respects? I say that no further words are required to prove that the Government has fulfilled its pledge in regard to the war and fulfilled it most efficiently.

The second article in our platform was Civil Service reform; the extension of the Civil Service Act to the Outside Service, with the abolition of patronage, and a preference for returned men in making appointments. That pledge has also been fulfilled to the letter. A National Government has existed in this country since 1867 and the Civil Service has been a subject of debate and examination during all the intervening years. No Government up to the time of the present one has been either willing or strong enough to take hold of the Civil Service and to establish it on the basis of merit rather than on the basis of party patronage. This Government did that. It has passed legislation classifying the Civil Service and has entirely eliminated the power of patronage—has made merit the foundation for appointment, has made efficient work the foundation for promotion. Is the Government to be found fault with in respect to that far-reaching measure of reform?

In respect to a preference in the matter of appointment of returned soldiers, up to the present date 24,000 returned soldiers have been appointed to the Civil Service, of whom 7,500 have been made permanent. In that respect the Government has shown itself strong, and persistent, and faithful to the promise it made.

For many years in this country there has been a growing feeling that the Dominion should have a Health Department. We started out with an Immigration Department to bring immigrants to this country, while all the time death was taking its toll of the young from month to month and from year to year. The finest way to build up the population of any country is to care for the births that take place in it, and to preserve and cause the young life to grow up in a native constitutional atmosphere into good citizenship. What waste there has been in this respect in the past medical men and publicists can very well tell. Well, Sir, this Government has established a Health Department, and has added to it a Child Welfare Bureau, and has followed that up with a Housing Scheme under which $25,000,000 is advanced by the Government, in co-operation with the provincial authorities, for better housing in this Dominion. Better housing means better homes and better health conditions—longer life, and more life in the homes of the country.

Technical education has been alluded to by my hon. friend (Mr. Cronyn) who moved the Address. In organization measures with respect to technical education this Government has taken the first step. A sum of $10,000,000 has been appropriated to the purpose. Contracts have already been entered into and are being made with the provincial authorities to put into operation the work of technical education. That is a great step forward. Who denies that in this country there are great hidden forces lying right by our hands of which we are oblivious, but which gentlemen of keen research will spy out and bring to the light, and which the skilled hand of the technically trained man will set into the work of development and progress? These hidden powers are tremendous in a country like Canada, and with resources such as we have these are vitally necessary to the full prosperity and development of the country.

So along with technical education we have the Industrial and Scientific Research Council, a body of honorary members comprising amongst them the best of our scientific men in ability, in training and

in experience, giving their work for nought, yet not stinting their labour. This Scientific Research Council, side by side with technical training, marks in its establishment an era in the progress of this country, and if we are wise we will utilize it in practical application of brains to business. I am not insinuating at all that business men have not brains, what I mean is that the brain power which animates and impels the chemist and the delver into nature's secrets to discover these hidden forces and to invent methods for their utilization must be applied to the business and productive development of our country. Is the Government to be blamed, to be called indecisive, inadequate and without policy because it has laid the foundation for progress in this most important and vital matter?

It was a plank in the platform of 1917 that women should be enfranchised. The first pledge of this nature ever given by a Government on its appeal to the people was endorsed by the people and has been redeemed by the Government, and to-day women are enfranchised in this Dominion. Large are the spaces to be travelled and long the time required before a great reform like that comes to its fruition. The bud which is just ready to blossom requires the warmth of the sun's rays to bring it to full efflorescence. So in this long march towards women's enfranchisement this war—where women stood side by side with man, ministered to his wants, shared his dangers, mothered his sick and his wounded and sacrificed their heart's blood for the sake of victory—acted as the sun's ray, and gave that added heat which was necessary to bring this bud into perfect efflorescence, and we now find that almost without exception women's enfranchisement is an accomplished fact in Canada as throughout most forward nations of the civilized world.

This Government has had the courage of its convictions in relation to prohibition. The importation of liquor was forbidden in 1917, for two reasons: To ensure the saving of our money, and to secure not lessened but improved efficiency; manufacture was prohibited in 1918; transportation to forbidden areas was prohibited and Canada was protected from an influx of whiskey from the United States by a thirty day embargo—all this being done under the powers of Orders in Council founded on the War Measures Act plus statutory enactment. Now that those orders have been dispensed with the Government again comes to the rescue.

While the provinces must be their own judges, yet if they want the importation of liquor into their territory stopped we have passed legislation which will implement and carry out that desire. There is the Government's record with reference to prohibition.

In shipbuilding my hon. friend who sits to my right (Hon. Mr. Ballantyne) inaugurated a bold and vigourous policy, and about $70,000,000 is being expended in the production of a fleet of fifty or fifty-one freighters, part of which fleet is now ploughing the seas carrying the produce of Canada to foreign countries. No Government would have adopted such a policy if it were inefficient, indecisive and spineless. Does my hon. friend chide us for that addition to the transportation facilities of this country? No; neither will he nor the country at large object to such a policy.

Now I come to that vexed question—the high cost of living. I notice my hon. friend not long since in speaking on the subject dealt pretty strongly with it. He is a student, he has had a wide range of reading and a wide range of observation as well, and he understands, I believe, the foundations of this subject better than do a great many of us. So I was struck as well as a little amused when I noticed how carefully he skirted on the outer edge of that question in some speeches he has been making recently. I think he did allow to shine through some light of his conviction that there were greater causes than are generally thought of for the high cost of living, and that it is a problem of such magnitude that solutions favourable and practicable have not yet been found in any country. Every country that has tried to crack this nut of the high cost of living has failed in the attempt. First Germany, with an organization unequalled and an obedience to law unequalled as well, tried it, and the grossest failure was the ultimate result. Amongst other countries that have tried to keep down the high cost of living is the republic to the south of us. But that high cost has not yet gone down; it has on the contrary gone up. It is somewhat comforting to know from the statistical statements covering all the great countries that the elevation in the cost of living from 1914 to this present time is less in Canada in some cases by one hundred per cent, and in other cases by higher percentages, than in most of the other great countries. Undoubtedly they have skilled experience, scientific and practical men in all those countries, but although they have given of

their best in their attempts to solve this problem they have not yet solved it. The reason is that the underlying causes are so world-wide and so varied that this sick world must become convalescent before prices can come back to normal.

Among all the causes of the high cost of living, the least canvassed and probably most potent are the inflated credits and currencies of the world. Where there is an overplus of money and a shortage of commodities, the prices of commodities will go up, and vice versa. Russia is the most striking example; Germany is following fast in her footsteps; all the countries of the world are in somewhat the same position. Only the healing of time, the getting back to better conditions of credit and of currencies, greater production and greater thrift will gradually bring the sick man from the bed on which he lies prone to-day and give him successive impacts of health and strength until he becomes his normal self again.

As to production, what has this country done? What has this Government done? I want to say just here that when I talk about governments doing this or that I have not in mind the exclusive and autocratic point of view that the people have nothing to do with these things. It is the accordant action of the Government and of the people that makes these problems soluble; in proportion as the Government and the people work in harmony, these problems become more easily anl more perfectly solved.

In its efforts toward increasing production the Government has been untiring; it has been generous, wise and successful. Various tariff changes have been made, all in the line of trying to reduce the cost of production. The Government, through the Department of Agriculture, has generously provided an advance of $3,000,000 to give assistance to the people in those districts who through seasonal difficulties have been deprived of their seed. The Board of Grain Supervisors in 1917 and 1918, under the able leadership of their chairman, Dr. Magill, bought, sold and managed the wheat crop of Canada, and not a word of criticism has been uttered against their integrity, the success of their work, or the manner in which it was carried out. If you scan the history of other countries you will find that enormous troubles have taken place in these respects. Courts of law, courts-martial, and commissions are investigating in other countries enormous frauds which have taken place with reference to the people's food supply. Last year the Canadian Wheat Board was formed. It does practically the same work as the Board of Grain Supervisors did during the two preceding years. This year as well there is no intimation that matters have not been efficiently and squarely carried out—so much so that the Council of Agriculture for Canada and various large agricultural associations and organizations have not only approved the policy which was so efficiently carried out in time of war, but have asked that it be continued in the time of peace.

We have had a Food Board which did good service. The Department of Agriculture has made strong, uniformly consistent efforts in these lines. The sum of $10,000,000 advanced towards agricultural education is being expended in co-operation with the provinces. Twenty million dollars has been allocated to good roads—and good roads aid production; they are of the greatest service and aid to the farmer.

My hon. friend has criticised control. What is the ground of his criticism? Does he mean to say that during wartime no measures except those which are found in the regular statutes of a country should be invoked by a Government; that a Government must depend upon those laws, or others to be from time to time enacted by Parliament to carry out its emergency war measures? He cannot mean that, because no country carries on war under such conditions. In Great Britain, in the United States, in France, Italy, Japan—everywhere—extraordinary measures and extraordinary powers which would have been frowned upon or not permitted in times of peace are carried out and exercised when the war emergency comes and where changes are almost instantaneous. And so food control, control of the packing industries, fuel control, control of imports and exports, have been exercised in all warring countries as they have been in Canada, under war measures and legislation for the defence of the realm.

With reference to the purchase of war supplies and equipment, this Government established a War Purchasing Commission, through whose hands hundreds of millions of dollars have passed for the purchase of food and equipment for war purposes and supplies for the Departments in time of peace. These purchases have been successfully carried out to the satisfaction of the great body of the people. The names Sir Edward Kemp, Sir Hormisdas Laporte, Mr. Galt, and Mr. Gundy, whom unfortunately we lost about a year ago, will always stand in that Commission as guarantees of efficiency, of economy, and of honest and honourable service.

Now, coming to the after phases of the war, has my hon. friend anything to find fault with in the matter of the demobilization of the forces of this country? When the armistice was signed, some 340,000 Canadians were on the other side of the Atlantic. During part of the time of their demobilization I happened to be in Europe and I saw what went on with reference to our soldiers as well as with reference to the soldiers of other countries. I am entirely of the opinion that no country in the world more expeditiously, more efficiently and more smoothly demobilized its soldiers than did Canada. More than 20,000 soldiers' dependents have been repatriated at the country's expense.

We have financed our part in the war, paying out $1,600,000,000 in that account. Two billions of dollars were raised through loans subscribed by the Canadian people themselves, or about $270 per capita.

My hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie King) was denouncing the Government, saying that it did not have the sympathy and confidence of the people. I wonder how it was that the people of Canada, the hard-headed business men of Canada, raised two billions of dollars for this Government and entrusted it with its expenditure if they had as bad an opinion of it as my hon. friend says they have. Not only have we done that, but we have enlarged the area of taxation as no other government has done before, on the basis of business profits, of income and of other war taxation. We have extended credits, and these credits have enabled the selling of our own produce. A courageous, some say a foolhardy adventure, but to my mind, under the circumstances, absolutely necessary, and I believe it has had and will have the very best of results.

I might speak now and lastly of what has been done for the soldiers after demobilization, in the way of vocational and other training, in the way of medical and hospital care, in the way of appliances, orthopedic and otherwise, for soldiers that have been maimed, in the land settlement arrangement under which hundreds and thousands of returned soldiers are making their application, undergoing their training and being settled down into the production on the soil, one of the finest of productions that we have in this country. I might speak to you—and it would be a revelation to any one who had not read it—of the re-establishment work in this country, of its far-reaching effects, of the numbers that come under its tutelage, its training and its care. Suffice it to say that already the Land Settlement Board which selects men returned and trains with pay and allowances, advises in choice of lands, stock and implements, and loans the necessary funds, has already qualified 34,000 for settlement and advanced $55,000,000 in loans.

As regards Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, let the following facts sink into our minds and make their proper impression: 104 hospitals and sanitoria are being directly and indirectly operated. 6,520 In and 1,634 Out patients are therein on strength of department. 8,993 average outside clinics have been operated per week in December, 1919. 27,602 were on strength of department for vocational training December 31, 1919, and of these 20,107 were disabled and 7,495 under 18 years. 3,988 are training in curative workshops. 12,327 were training in Schools Department and outside during the last week of December. 11,223 training in industries. 114,728 net applications have been received by Information and Service Boards to December 27, 1919. 106,061 have been placed in employment—92% of total. 3,496 applications and 2,717 placements in professional and business sections have been made. 762,322 inquiries have been dealt with in Information and Service Branch. 7,000 tuberculosis cases have been treated and 75% enabled to resume useful occupations. 42,679 re-training courses have been granted, of whom 23,966 are in training, 9,455 courses have been completed and 3,096 discontinued.

Canada's record in this great work stands away over and above that of any country that participated in the war and in it. She has spent so far about an even $40,000,000.

I rest my case. I have thought it wise to put some of these general observations before the House and the country, not because I feel that this Government has not made errors and mistakes. It has made many of them; what Government has not? But I do think that it is in the interest of fair, honest playing of the game that what has been done should not be hidden under misrepresentation or clouds of false criticism, but should go to the people for their calm examination. And if that is done, I for one feel that I can entrust my stewardship that of the Government to the judgment of my fellow citizens in this Dominion of Canada.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, possibly at this hour and after having heard a number of excellent speeches this afternoon and to-night, the Government would not con-

sider it amiss to adjourn and take up this debate to-morrow afternoon. It is now almost ten o'clock, and we have heard a very elaborate speech from the leader of the Government, and I think it would be hardly fair to ask an amateur like myself to reply to it at this late hour. I would, therefore, be obliged if the leader of the Government would agree to an adjournment and let us take up this debate to-morrow afternoon.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Taking into consideration the extreme youth and inexperience of my hon. friend, I am touched by his appeal, and I shall be pleased to agree to his moving the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. McKENZIE moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Hon. S. F. Tolmie, Member of the Electoral District of Victoria City, B.C., and Minister of Agriculture, introduced by Sir George E. Foster and Sir Henry Drayton.

On motion of Sir George Foster, the House adjourned at 9.48 p.m.

Tuesday, March 2, 1920.

The House met at Three o'clock.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Report of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ended 31st March, 1919.

Copy of the International Opium Convention signed at the Hague, June 23, 1912, and ratified January 10, 1920.—Hon. Mr. Rowell.

Copy of agreement between the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada and the Government.—Hon. Mr. Reid.

Copy of Air Regulations.—Right Hon. Mr. Sifton.

PARLIAMENTARY RESTAURANT.

On motion of Sir George Foster, Messrs. Steele, Stewart (Hamilton), Douglas (Strathcona) and Tobin were appointed to assist Mr. Speaker in the direction of the restaurant so far as the interests of the Commons are concerned.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Consideration of the motion of Mr. Hume Cronyn for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the proposed amendment of the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie King thereto, resumed from Monday, March 1.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, although somewhat familiar with the House of Commons for the last almost twenty years, still, coming to this new Chamber, I must confess to you, Sir, that I do not feel just quite as much at home as I used to feel, and I must crave the indulgence of hon. members on both sides of the House and yourself, Mr. Speaker, while attempting to discharge the duty which now devolves upon me to continue the debate upon the motion before the Chair.

Let me at once, Sir, revert to the time honoured custom of congratulating the mover and the seconder of the address, and to assure you in doing so I am not indulging perfunctorily in any old-fashioned custom that one regards merely as a matter of duty. We are proud, Mr. Speaker, of our Parliamentary institutions, traditions, and customs, and we are always zealous that the duty of moving and seconding the address in reply to the speech from the Throne shall be discharged in a manner becoming the House of Commons of Canada. It is therefore a great pleasure to be able to congratulate the leader of the Government upon the manner in which the hon. gentlemen selected by him have discharged their duty.

From the hon. member for London (Mr. Cronyn) we expected the kind of address that he has given us, for we have heard him before, and know him to be of a literary turn of mind, and it is sufficient for me to say that he has done justice to his former reputation in this House.

My good friend who represents the grand old county of Pictou (Mr. McGregor) has not in the past troubled us very much with speeches, and being a very patriotic and zealous Nova Scotian, although differing from him in politics, I was very anxious indeed that he should do justice not only to the good old province of Nova Scotia but to the grand old county of Pictou. I am glad to be able to say to my friends in Nova Scotia that the traditions of our province have been well lived up to in the speech of my hon. friend.

My good friend from London (Mr. Cronyn) was during the study of his speech and in the delivery of it reminded of that good old phrase of Scotch thought, that it

required "A stoot heart to stay brae." No doubt he realized that it required a particularly "stoot hairt" to face the "stey brae" of saying anything laudatory about the present Administration. But I must do him the justice of saying that he faced the brae very well;—whether or not he made the grade is another matter.

I shall not, Mr. Speaker, confine my congratulations entirely to these hon. gentlemen. I must congratulate the House, and particularly the Opposition, upon the very able and comprehensive speech of the leader of the Opposition (Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King). Under our institutions the Opposition is recognized as a part of the machinery of Government, to the extent of its leader being paid, and properly so, out of the funds of the country. The whole House, therefore, must be pleased to know that we have in the person of the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition one who is well qualified to discharge the duties pertaining to that office and in the doing of it to follow along proper constitutional lines. I congratulate the hon. Leader of the Opposition, therefore, upon his very excellent speech of yesterday. It opens up a new vista for the Liberal party; it gives them confidence in their leader, in his capacity and in his ability to blaze the way to greater things for Canada than Canada has ever known.

It would be carrying coals to Newcastle if I were to congratulate the old veteran—old, I mean, in parliamentary practice—who so ably and so well leads the remnant of the Government in this House (Sir George Foster). I wish, Sir, that the reply to the able speech of that hon. gentleman had fallen into abler hands than mine.

I listened to the right hon. gentleman's speech with a great deal of interest. I have tried to analyze it and to pick out of it whatever meat might be found in it. After sleeping over it last night and thinking over it a little this morning I find that if you strip the speech of its clever "Fosterisms" there is not enough left for a decent burial. I shall refer later to the observations of my right hon. friend. It would be folly for a youngster in politics like myself to say that the way in which the leader of the Government delivers his addresses in this House is not able, is not masterful. I shall not attempt to do so; I shall simply make this passing observation: The leader of the Government began wrong some eighteen years ago; he has kept wrong, and I fear that he will end wrong.

We cannot forget our surroundings, Mr. Speaker, on this occasion. We cannot forget the grandeur of the magnificent building in which we find ourselves. The builders of this splendid temple have provided not only for the present, but also for the future greatness of this country. No matter how great Canada may become; no matter how splendid its proportions or its material development or how large its population, for all time to come we and our children after us will have in this building, if God spares it to us, a temple worthy of the great country of which we are so proud.

This is a fair and proper time for some stock-taking so far as our country is concerned. Let us observe, Sir, what has been done; let us observe what it is possible for us to do in the future. Let us hope that this country will live up to the great expectations which the fathers of Confederation had in their minds when they started out to lay broad and deep the foundations of this country. We have in Canada magnificent lands, great areas of country extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific. We have mineral wealth, forest wealth, agricultural wealth, and we have a great people. Let us hope that we shall continue to utilize and husband our lands and resources, our facilities for transportation, and all that goes to make for the building of a great nation. Let us hope that our statesmen and our people will set themselves to the task of building up a great country, of building up a citizenship worthy of the Mother Country and its institutions—institutions which have made for this country a home of safety, happiness, and prosperity for its citizens. The fathers of Confederation laid the foundations of our transportation system, of the settlement of our vast stretches of country and of the building up of a nation within the bounds of Canada. Let us hope that no divisions of any kind will tend in the slightest way to mar the growth of our country, it unity, its prosperity, its greatness, or to make them less than what the fathers of Confederation had in mind in the days when there was consummated that union of which we are so proud and which we hope will ever be kept intact. Some differences of opinion may prevail among the different parts of Canada; some policies may be regarded as not of application to the whole country. But if we hope to be a nation, Sir; if we hope to grow up as a country; if we hope to be united from the Atlantic to the Pacific, we should so devise our plans and policies of Government as to bring about a reason-

able degree of success and prosperity throughout the whole of our Dominion.

I should like now to devote some time to the speech that was made by the leader of the Government yesterday and to the remarks of the member for London (Mr. Cronyn). I have no criticism to make of the speech of my hon. friend from London. He said that the old methods of Government were breaking down; that those old methods had fallen short of meeting the necessities of the country and that something new had to be brought in.

My hon. friend has not told us what that new thing is going to be, and if he finds the machinery of Government and of the party to which he belongs breaking down, I would invite him to pay attention to the manner in which his Government and party are breaking down and to give up talking about principles in the operations of the old parties.

I am not admitting for one moment that the principles of Liberalism have fallen down or that anything in connection with the Liberal party in this country has fallen down. On the contrary, it is strong and vigorous and willing to carry forward the responsibilities of party in connection with the affairs of this country as it has done of yore. If my hon. friend finds that that party to which he belongs is falling down upon the job; that it is not equal to carrying on the government of this country; that there is not that cohesion or unity amongst the members of that party that is necessary in order to enable it to carry on a common policy and purpose, let him admit the corn and say that they must look around for something new in order to carry on the affairs of government along the lines of party. But I will not admit that there is any occasion to say that, so far as we on this side of the House are concerned, there are any signs of decay, of falling short, or of inability to carry on the business of the country in a party way and along party lines.

There was a time in this country—and I suppose the time is not yet gone—when the Tory party stood for something in Canada. Such men as Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir Charles Tupper, and Sir John Thompson, stood for something in this country. They were great men in their day and generation, and there are in Canada to-day men who are proud of their history and of their doings. Is the hon. member for London (Mr. Cronyn), with one stroke of the pen, going to wipe off the map the existence and history of such men as leaders of a party and to build up something of some fanciful character, the character of which nobody knows, which has no beginnings of days or end of time so far as we can tell what he has in his mind? That is about all I have to say as regards the speech of my hon. friend, so well delivered, so worthy of him, so worthy of the institutions of this country, and so worthy of the excellent manner in which he discharged his duty.

Let me say a few words about the speech which was delivered in this House so ably and well by the acting leader of the Government yesterday evening. It has been said by the leader of the Opposition that we have not in this country to-day that strength of government that we should have in order to deal with the various important questions that loom up in Canada and with which we have to deal. My right hon. friend answered in his usual easy fashion, pointing out that the Government were all right; that they were perfectly sound, and that no man should pay any attention to rumours in his country; that he and the chosen few who are treading the narrow way with him alone knew what was going on in this country, and the the people of Canada would have to wait until the good time came when he thought proper to tell them something about the Government. He tells the leader of the Opposition that the door of the sick chamber (because I would call it the sick chamber) is well barred; that nobody can get in; and he told us that the bulletins that the newspapers were putting out were unreliable and not the truth, and that we knew nothing about the real condition of the sick person in the sick chamber. Doctors are very zealous about the atmosphere in a sick chamber, and very often they turn people out of a sick chamber. Apparently, whoever is in sick chamber now must be showing some of the symptoms which a person shows when the doctor turns the visitors out, because one after another of those who occupied that chamber are being turned out and we see them wandering at large, and we must come to the conclusion that they are turned out because the nervous condition of the patient will not tolerate any longer their presence in the sick room.

It is well known to doctors and to us all that when a person is sick he becomes nervous, and some things that used to be quite tolerable to him would not be permitted at all within reach of his touch or vision. When conditions grew unhealthy in the sick chamber, there were some

people sitting around whom the patient did not like, and when you see such men as Mr. Calder, Mr. Sifton—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. McKENZIE: —Mr. Crerar and other men sitting around, the sick man would say: "What do these Hebrews here anyhow; what brings them into this place?" And the situation is that they are turned out. You will pardon me, Mr. Speaker, mentioning these hon. gentlemen by name, because I have no reference to them as members; I was referring to them in an imaginative way as men being turned out of a sick room, and I ask your pardon if I have transgressed the rules of the House. That is the condition in which we find the Government; but the leader of the Government is becoming so easily satisfied now that he says: They are perfectly all right, and they could always get along in that way; it was only following an old custom that there should be a full Cabinet and that every department should be manned. The right hon. gentleman has discovered that they can get along without them and that it is a saving of money and time and many other things that we should get along in this country without the whole Government. He pointed out yesterday that it does not matter so much about the body if we have plenty of heads. Would it not be well to ask some of the friends of the Government what they think of the present Administration? It would not do for myself to give any opinion of my own, because I am honest enough to say to you, Sir, that my opinion might be, to some extent, prejudiced. But the Administration has a few friends in the country; they have people who always thought well of them and we want to know what they say about the present Government of Canada. The leader of the Government would be quite willing to put the editor of the Montreal Gazette on the stand and ask him questions about the administration of affairs and the kind Government that we have in this country. He would say that it is quite fair to call as a witness the editor of that paper, because it is an old responsible newspaper in Canada; it is a paper that is familiar with the affairs of this country, and that has always been more than fair to the Tory party. He would admit that it is quite proper to call that editor and ask him a few questions in respect of this Government.

Let us put the Gazette on the witness stand, but before doing so, I want to read to this witness something that appeared in the editorial columns of his paper not long ago. The Gazette said that the Union Party was not united, that it had outlived its usefulness, and that having accomplished its purpose it was reverting electorally into its original elements. Here are the exact words:

> The art of government is most difficult under the best auspices, but a leaderless ministry, destitute of policy, must be the despair of its friends. The public memory is short and public gratitude an unknown quantity. The electorate requires a guide, a policy, an association with those who invite its confidence; and the Government offers neither guidance, nor principles, nor familiarity with the people. The situation is not suddenly precipitated. It began with the conclusion of the war, since when futile efforts at permanent coalition have more than once been made, and minister after minister has dropped out until the situation has become difficult for the Government and despondent for its supporters.

That is the statement made by that tried and true friend of the Government. Now let me ask the witness some questions.

What about the leader of the Tory party in the House of Commons? The reply is "It has no leader; it is leaderless."

What about the policy of the Tory Party? "It has no policy."

What about the opinion in which it is held by its friends? "It is the despair of its friends."

How is it as a guide for public business and public policy in this country? "It offers no guidance."

What about the principles of the Government? "It has no principles."

How does it stand with the people? "It has no familiarity with the people at all; the people never knew it."

What about the present general standing of the Government? "The Government is in a difficult position and its supporters are despondent."

That concludes the direct examination of this witness, and I would invite my right hon. friend at some future time to put this witness, his friend, under cross-examination and see if he has anything to take back of what he said in such plain words.

I am going to call one more witness, and it is no less a personage than the Hon. Robert Rogers, who at one time adorned the benches of this House and stood high in the counsels of the Tory Party, and stands high to-day, I have no doubt, in the counsels of that party under certain of its colours and flags and phases. Before calling this witness let me read what he said the other day when he was talking about this Government openly and plainly in the

great city of Winnipeg, before a gathering of his Tory friends, no doubt. He is reported as follows:

> The Hon. Robert Rogers, a former colleague of Sir Robert Borden, who claims that he was the first to propose Union Government, says that the Union Government is "a Government of tinkers and jobbers, a Government of second-hand dealers, their energies almost entirely devoted to second-hand theories that are the product of the diseased brain of some poor unfortunate uplifter."

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE: Who is the uplifter?

Mr. McKENZIE: There are so few uplifters in the Government that it is not hard to place him. I will leave it to the jury to put their finger on the uplifter. I do not agree, however, with Mr. Rogers that the uplifter has any diseased brain. I think his brain is very active. It is not so much the brain that is at fault, as the channels in which that brain is directed. We might ask Mr. Rogers a few questions: What position, for instance, he held in the Tory Party. He would answer that he was Minister of the Interior, and later, Minister of Public Works, and that he stood high in the counsels of that party.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE: Also minister of elections.

Mr. McKENZIE: If we ask him why he left the party he would refer us to his letter of resignation which we all remember very well, and which appears on Hansard, in which he said that he was leaving because he wanted to get from under the crash that was coming in this country, due to the inaction and lack of ability in the Government of which he was a member. That was the reason he gave for leaving. In the face of that evidence I would ask my right hon. friend who leads the Government if it is not time he took serious thought as to whether this Government is such a substantial structure as he would seem to think it. If it is my privilege and my duty to address this House, it is also my duty and my privilege to warn my right hon. friend that this structure with which he is so satisfied is but a house built upon the sand which, when the storm comes and the rains descend and strike upon it will fall, and great will be the fall thereof. If he chooses to stay in that house after I have warned him, and prefers not to dig around a little and put stones under the corner to prop it up a little, when the crash comes and he loses his political life he will not be able to blame me.

Referring a little further to the speech of my right hon. friend, he was very sore, very sorrowful, and in great pain apparently, about the lack of sympathy in this country with public men, and particularly with prime ministers. As he was speaking I could not help asking myself, Is this a real Damascene conversion or is it a mere moment of weakness? I remembered, as we all remember, that there were times when he was not so sympathetic with prime ministers as he is now. Be that as it may, it was somewhat peculiar that from speaking of the lack of sympathy with prime ministers he immediately turned to birds and eggs in a nest. I presume, however, he will sometime explain how these thoughts were conceived. Now, there were some remarks in the Rt. hon. gentleman's speech with reference to ministers, and it is only well that his observations should be fairly and properly answered. He brought the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) severely to task for suggesting that ministers of the Crown should be in their seats. There may be, and I am sure there are, occasions when the business of the country demands that ministers shall not be in their seats but shall be attending to matters of importance elsewhere. I cannot conceive, however, of any circumstances that can render it impossible for a minister of the crown at some part of the day during the session of parliament to give some time, half an hour or an hour, to the proceedings of the House, particularly in the early stages of the sittings, so that any hon. member who was desirous to ask questions of the minister might have an opportunity to do so, in order that all necessary information might be vouchsafed the public. That is all that the leader of the Opposition meant, and I think it is only fair, if we are to have responsible government at all and if the operations of government departments are to be known to the public through the proper channel, that at some time during the day—not every day perhaps, although that would be highly desirable if it were possible—ministers of the crown should be in their places to answer such questions as might be properly put to them in regard to the administration of the affairs of their departments. Now, in regard to the position of the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) possibly my right honourable friend (Sir George Foster) did not quite clearly apprehend the observations of the leader of the Opposition, and I feel that some explanation is necessary concerning his remarks anent the absence of the Prime Minister. I am sure that I myself, as a Nova Scotian,

have always had the greatest possible admiration for the Prime Minister and I sincerely regret his enforced absence from the House. The same regard, I have not the slightest doubt, is held for him by every hon. member on this side of the House; and I think that nothing could be more unjust to the leader of the Opposition than to imply for a moment that he was finding fault with the Prime Minister because of his absence in the exigencies of the occasion. What the leader of the opposition suggested was that the leader of the Government should, if possible, be in the House, he being the man who is responsible to the people and on whose shoulders the people have placed the burden of conducting the Government. Under the present circumstances it seems that this is not possible. But there are various rumours in regard to the Prime Minister's desire to be relieved of his office. We have no other means of obtaining information in this country—on our side, at all events—than through the medium of the newspapers and reports which go abroad in the press of the party to which the right honourable gentleman belongs; and when those reports, purporting to come with authority from headquarters, stand uncontradicted, we have the right to believe the statements they contain. From these reports we learn that the Prime Minister was willing and, indeed, anxious to throw off the responsibility of leading the government, by reason of the state of his health, and that pressure was brought to bear upon him to renounce this privilege. He was cruelly prevailed upon by his friends to remain in his position regardless of the effect his enforced stay in office might have upon his health, and this, in order to prolong for a few years the life of a decayed, a decrepit, and a marked-for-death administration. These are the observations which the leader of the Opposition expressed, and I cannot entertain the idea that the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government would purposely put a false construction upon this his words. He may possibly have misunderstood what was said, but I want to make it perfectly clear to him and to the country at large that the Prime Minister has the deepest possible sympathy of his friends on this side, and that whatever time may be necessary for him to spend away from the House in the interests of his health, no matter what inconvenience it may involve, we shall concede him ungrudgingly; for it is our common desire on this side to see the Prime Minister restored to his former vigour. I hope that this will satisfy every one within the sound of my voice that the leader of the Opposition had nothing in mind but the opinion to which I have just given expression.

We trust that we shall hear from the hon. gentlemen who have gone as plenipotentiaries from the Government to meet the Prime Minister in that most holy city of New York, where, it seems, every great thing appertaining to this country of ours must now transpire. Halifax is the capital of Nova Scotia and has for a long time been regarded as a highly loyal city. The Prime Minister was there. Why did not the representatives of the Government choose that city as the place in which to interview the Prime Minister? No. They had to ignore Halifax and bestow on the city of New York the honour which belonged to the capital of Nova Scotia. However, we hope that they have good news to bring us, and that the Prime Minister will come back and some day before long resume his position at the head of the Government.

Now, there are several points in the speech of the leader of the Government to which I might refer, but I do not think that it is necessary that I should deal with them at all. There is one point, however, upon which I must touch. The leader of the Opposition charged the Government and its supporters with not having been elected to the House on a proper franchise, on the ground that the War-time Election Act was not the proper, democratic and free kind of franchise that we should have in this country, it having deprived a great many citizens of the right of passing judgment upon the Government. We are told that if Parliament being allowed to exist for another year through extending its constitutional limit it could do just as it pleased. I join issue sharply with the leader of the Government on that point, and say that when the end of the five years came for which we were elected, those who were in a position to elect members to this House should not, by reason of an extension of the life of Parliament for another year, have been deprived of that right. If one year was added to the life of Parliament for war purposes that did not authorize the Government to change the jury that would pass upon it and impanel a new one. It is as if, during a criminal trial, the jury should be changed when things began to look bad for the accused. On the charge and on the evidence, the jury in the box would have to find him guilty but they turn him out, let him

loose in the town and give him the privilege of finding a jury that will bring in a verdict in his favour. That is what was done in this case. The Government took to themselves the right of cutting off the vote of every man that they thought would be opposed to them, finding a panel that they were perfectly sure would vote for them and bringing in a verdict in their favour. After having found that panel they wrote out a verdict in their own favour and got the foreman of the jury to sign it while, in regard to the distribution of the votes, as was told yesterday, bundles were put here and batches there, designed, placed and arranged all in accordance with the wish of the Government and where it was thought they would do the most good. That was not democratic or fair, nor did it secure a proper expression of the will of the people of this country. That is the position we take and that is a position which has not been answered by the right hon. the leader of the Government who says that although there was a year added, that year was to be made use of in the same way as the rest of the parliamentary term for which members were elected.

The leader of the Government claims great credit for what has been done in regard to technical education. The right hon. gentleman knows very well that the technical education policy of this country did not have its origin in anything that was done by this Government or by the old Tory Government. He knows that it is the product of the policy of the Liberal party, that we pressed this policy upon them day in and day out and that they made no move until at last they had to do something to meet the demands that were continually being pressed upon them. I must submit that so far they have not done much to carry out the ideas which were formulated by the Liberal party in connection with this matter.

The same thing is true of shipbuilding. Every member of this House knows that during the Liberal administration, under the premiership of the late right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, we had a shipping and naval policy in this country. It is well known that during the first four or five years of this present Administration, and up to the time they started shipbuilding, we were pressing upon them, day in and day out, the necessity of carrying out such a policy. They left it until the very last days of the war and until the cost of shipbuilding had gone up to a point four times what it was when they came into power. Ships are costing this country at the present time four times what they would have cost if the policy of the Liberal party had been carried out and if this shipbuilding programme had been carried forward at the time when it would have done the most good and entailed the least possible cost to the country. These are things for which the hon. gentlemen opposite are trying to get glory to-day.

The Union Government is trying to get glory for having encouraged agricultural production. If there is any credit due to anybody for the policy of the present Administration in connection with agriculture, that credit is due to the present Minister of Customs because in 1912 he brought in a vote of $10,000,000 which passed this House and received the support of Liberals and Conservatives. The right hon. gentleman has such hard scratching to find some reason for his existence to-day that he has to go back to 1912 and patch up a claim that this Government has had something to do with an agricultural policy with which the present Administration has had nothing whatever to do.

He says that they have done great things for the returned soldier and that the returned soldier is satisfied. I want to join issue with my right hon. friend there and to put in the witness box the returned soldier himself. If my right hon. friend reads the literature that is published in this country from day to day and month to month of the leaders of the great body of returned soldiers, he will see what they think of the Administration. The leader of the Government has been deluged with requisitions, petitions and demands asking him to dismiss the minister who had charge of this work. That is the way in which the returned soldiers are satisfied with the conduct of the Government. The Government, if they are doing good things, are most unfortunate in the way in which their acts and favours are received by those upon whom they are professing to bestow them. They have not one friend among the returned soldiers and if to-morrow they sought their opinion by means of a plebiscite, they would be wiped out of existence, horse, foot and artillery. That is where they stand with the returned soldier.

4 p.m.

Then, they claim that they are entitled to credit for the great things that they have done for the Civil Service. There has never been such a muddle in this country, or in the whole world, as there is in con-

nection with the Civil Service to-day. Let my right hon. friend ask those who sit around him from Ontario and from Nova Scotia, but particularly from the great province of Ontario. We have heard members from Ontario expressing themselves here as to what they thought of the Civil Service and its administration. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken), the editor of the newspaper called the Sentinel, has expressed himself in this House time and again and he has said that the legislation in regard to the Civil Service is the most stupid that was ever put upon the statute books of this country. That is the opinion which prevailed to a very material extent among hon. gentlemen supporting this Government in so far as they have support from anybody except by force of circumstances. These are matters, Mr. Speaker, for which this Government claim great praise and credit and I think I have stated clearly that they are not such as to satisfy the requirements of any well balanced or sound thinking administration or that there is anything in the reasons put forward by the right hon. the leader of the Government which would justify him in thinking that all is well with the Administration that he for the present leads.

I wish to say a few words about the general policy of the Government as well as the general policy, on trade and other matters, of the Liberal party. We are questioned as to what our policy is. We are told that we disagree amongst ourselves. All we have to do is to recall the history of that great party from 1896 down to 1911 when it had charge of the affairs of this country in every phase, every line, of Government and to ask the people of Canada to put the confidence in the Liberal party that they reposed in it in those days. As we made a success of the Government during those days and built up the country in a way in which it had not been built up before, we ask the people to place the same confidence in the same men, with the same policy, the same principles and the same desire to honestly and well serve their country.

That is what we say about our policies to the people of this country. When we met in convention in this city last August we confirmed those policies, and they are to-day the policies of the Liberal Party from the Atlantic to the Pacific. We have not one policy for the Maritime provinces, another policy for Quebec and Ontario, and still another policy for the West. Our policies are intended for one united people, and we refer to our past record as an earnest of how we propose to carry out those policies in the future.

The right hon. gentleman who leads the Government tells us that what we read in the newspapers is idle gossip which we cannot believe. I do not go that far with him, because the newspapers containing those reports stand very faithfully behind him and his Government and give the very best possible account of whatever redounds to his credit, and therefore he has no reason to give a black eye to the press by calling their reports idle twaddle or gossip which nobody can believe.

The newspapers tell us that the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Meighen), recently made a speech in Quebec in which he said the country would have to be protected to the hilt; then he moved towards the West, and at Winnipeg found he had to change his tune, as we in coming from the Maritime provinces to Montreal have to change our watches to have the correct time. When the hon. gentleman reached Winnipeg he found he had to put a new record in his gramophone, and the burden of his address was no longer protection to the hilt, but only moderate protection. I suppose had he continued further West by the time he got to Saskatchewan and Alberta there would have been no trace of protection at all in his speeches. I would warn my hon. friend to be careful lest some day he puts on a Quebec record at Calgary or Edmonton and finds himself in a bad mess indeed, because the Quebec record which he played to the shoe manufacturers will not do for the Free Traders of the West. So far as the Liberal party is concerned, we have no occasion to change our tune, for the simple reason that from the West to the East we have only one sound policy to commend to the attention of the people, and we believe that when they see fit to restore us to power that policy will bring back to this country the same prosperity that it enjoyed during the fifteen years the Liberal party was in control, and will revive in the people that faith in the Government which was once so strongly entertained by them.

It is true, Sir, that we have not the great leader of the past years. Men die, but principles never, and we hope on this side of the House that, as we have been faithful in the past to the leadership of the great man who has left us and to the principles which he espoused, there is enough Liberalism in the country to give effective support to those same principles

and to compel the same success which we had while proudly marching forward under the leadership of the great man who has left us. We have to-day as our leader a man chosen in a democratic way by the whole country, a man who is in touch with the people, and who is willing and capable to carry forward those policies that will meet with the approval of our great democracy.

Before closing, Sir, there is one matter I wish to point out to the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government. He found great amusement yesterday that any one could suggest for a moment that anything about tariffs should be mentioned in a speech from the Throne. A great many of our people, much to their sorrow, will remember that in the years gone by the right hon. gentleman himself had something to do with the finances of this country, he having been Minister of Finance in the year 1894. In the speech from the Throne at the opening of Parliament in that year, prepared under the eye of the right hon. gentleman who now leads the Government and who at that time was an important member of the Government, we find the following passage:

> At an early date a measure will be laid before you having for its object the revision of the duties of customs,—

It is a most extraordinary thing that the leader of the Government found such a fund of merriment yesterday in the suggestion that anything about customs should be mentioned in the speech from the Throne.

> —with a view to meet the changes which time has effected in the business operations throughout the Dominion. While my ministers do not propose to change the principles on which the enactments on this subject are based, the amendments which will be offered for your consideration are designed to simplify the operation of the Tariff and to lessen as far as can be done, consistently with those principles and with the requirements of the Treasury, the imposts which are now in force.

That, Sir, was prepared and put in the speech from the Throne in that year by the right hon. gentleman who made such fun yesterday of the suggestion that the people who are groaning under the present heavy taxation and the high cost of living, and who are looking earnestly and anxiously for some relief from the Government and Parliament, could expect any expression of opinion of that kind in the speech from the Throne. We had a right to expect it, we had a right to believe that an effort would be made to better the condition of the people and to make Canada a country easy to live in and attractive to the proper kind of immigration from all parts of the world. Do not let us forget, Mr. Speaker, that while we have a population of only some 8,500,000, we have a country extensive enough to support over 100,000,000 or the same population as that of the United States. Therefore it is the duty of whatever Government is in power to make conditions such as to invite the right class of people to come here.

Talking about trade questions, I am willing, Sir, that we should have the freest possible intercourse with every country in the world.

Let me say this to the Government and to the country—and I am not particular in what way it will be understood; in fact, it can only be understood in one way—that while I am anxious for the widest possible trade with foreign countries, I would not trade to the extent of one five-cent piece with any country which will not recognize my Canadian dollar to the full face value of that dollar. If this country is loyal to itself, loyal to its principles, loyal to its institutions, it will stand by Canadianism in the matter of having any trade with any country that will not recognize the Canadian dollar at its full face value as international currency. I am not in favour of any restriction of trade, but I am in favour of Canada's trading where there is fair trade where she is properly treated. If there is any reason why any country is willing to sell goods to us and yet will not recognize the face value of the dollars with which we pay for them, that reason should be clearly stated. Although this condition of things has existed for some time and has caused the loss of millions to the people of Canada, not a word has come from the Government with regard to the making of any effort to bring about better conditions or to relieve the people of Canada of this great drain upon their resources. I am not saying whether or not the Government could do anything, but surely they could make an effort; surely they could satisfy the people, if it is possible to satisfy them in that regard, of what should or could be done concerning the adverse exchange conditions which have prevailed during the last few months.

I again thank you, Sir, and the members of the House for the patient attention with which my remarks have been received. I hope I have made it clear to everybody in Canada that the Liberal party has only one standard, only one principle as applied to all of Canada. That principle, which admits of no place for sectionalism or anything of that kind, is Canada first, Canada last and Canada always.

Mr. HERBERT M. MOWAT (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, in interjecting a few remarks at this stage into an interesting and vivacious debate. I take the place of other hon. gentlemen who were to have spoken at this time, and my remarks will have the virtue of brevity.

As the extending of congratulation to the mover (Mr. Cronyn) and the seconder (Mr. McGregor) of the Address has not become trite at this early stage in the debate, it is not out of the way for me to say that we have in the mover of the Address (Mr. Hume Cronyn) an example to most of us in this House. The hon. member for London is a reader of books and a thinker along the lines of that which he reads, and although he has not troubled the House—or, rather favoured the House—with many remarks during past years, he is able, when called upon, to bring the mind of a cultured student to bear upon the subjects dealt with, and to deliver a speech which is an occasion of pleasure to all who hear it and which will go down in the records of the House as one of the best that at all events the younger members have heard.

In the member for Pictou (Mr. McGregor) we have another kind of speaker, namely, the business man who deals in a concise way with the questions that he is so well capable of dealing with and with which he is perfectly familiar. The hon. member for Pictou, when he tackles a business question, is like the description of his celebrated forbear spoken of by Sir Walter Scott, Rob Roy, when he said: "My foot is on my native heath; my name, McGregor."

It gave pleasure on this side of the House to see the unmistakable warmth of the reception accorded to the Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie King) by his own friends. He contributed a speech which was able from a debating standpoint; perhaps in only one respect did he transgress the amenities of debate. The fact that he was warmly applauded by his supporters is readily accounted for, because this is the first time that he has taken his position in the House as Leader of the Opposition. It is natural that when he took his first flight his supporters should be there heartily to applaud him.

But I must say that in the speech of the Leader of the Opposition there are some things to which I cannot give support. During the last few years we have learned a great deal in this country about the principles of "safety first." These words have been placed before the people on bill boards and in any place where there is a possibility of danger, with the result that the people have become more cautious and accidents have become less frequent. If ever a safe motion was introduced to this House, a motion which was absolutely innocuous to my hon. friend and his supporters, it is the amendment which he has offered to the motion for an Address in reply to the speech from the Throne. Of course, every one who is beaten wants to have a new election. That is a well recognized principle of human nature; the man who loses the race always wants to have it run over again. In a certain game on which I am not at all an authority I have been told that the man who has been losing all the evening is the man who wants still another round of jackpots when everybody else wants to go home. My hon. friend and his supporters know very well that there is no possible chance of such an amendment carrying.

But I want to go further with my hon. friend. I want to point out to him that he is not prepared for an election. If he will go to the province from which he comes and will consult the party leaders there, he will be told straight that he is not prepared for an election. When my hon. friend says that he wants an election, does he mean that he is prepared for an election in the constituency of North York, where he has been invited to become a candidate instead of in his temporary sanctuary in Prince Edward Island? If that is what he means, then I tell him that if he expects to be elected there he never was more mistaken in his life.

My hon. friend has not been here regularly. Where has he been during the war? For he seems not to have learned the great lesson of the war that no campaign, no sortie, can be successfully carried out unless ample preparation is made. The most successful leaders in the war were those who knew their details; those who had for weeks and months made their preparations so thorough that nothing was left undone to ensure success. That is the great lesson of the war. That being so, I ask my hon. friend to inquire into what took place not very long before he came into this House. Has he heard at all of an election in a celebrated constituency in Saskatchewan, known as Assiniboia? If he has, he will know the danger of being unprepared. His friends sent to that constituency two of his present supporters who have attained a respectable position in their party.

But of these two one was the father, if I may so state the position of a motion in re-

gard to absolute free trade, a motion which, from what I can hear, from his previous remarks and from his proclivities in his province, I imagine, was not concurred in by the hon. gentleman (Mr. McKenzie) who has preceded me in this debate, not concurred in by the hon. member from Sherbrooke (Mr. McCrea), and not concurred in by some others whom I see sitting opposite to me and who are smiling as I now speak. But he was the person sent to Assiniboia to support the Liberal candidate there against the farmers' candidate. He was so unprepared and these gentlemen who went out as his emissaries were also so unprepared that they were like the "Babes in the Wood;" they were apparently absolutely without any protection and comfort, and the result was the election of a man against the candidate of my hon. friends opposite to the tune of a majority of about four thousand.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Great victory for the Government.

Mr. MOWAT: If that is the sort of an election which my hon. friend is in such a hurry to bring on, the sooner he brings it on the better. I shall not support the amendment because, much as I regret to say it, I do not believe in its sincerity. But I should like to support any motion which would bring on an election now, because at the present time my fortunes are linked up on this side of the House, and if there were an election now I have not the slightest doubt that there would be a repetition of the result of the election of 1917. I see humour and risibility depicted in the faces of my hon. friends from Quebec. I am not at all sure that the result in Quebec would be the same as before.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Will the Government have candidates in the three bye-elections which are about to take place?

Mr. MOWAT: The hon. member for North Cape Breton and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) deems it proper at times to throw the charge, if it be a charge, or sneer, if it be a sneer, across the floor of this House at members on this side as being the Tory party. It may please him to do so, but I can assure the House and the country that such is at present not the case. So when my hon. friend (Mr. Lapointe) from Quebec East, who seems to have arisen to a high place, although I do not know what it is, in the councils of his party, asks me questions about what the Government are going to do, I may say that I am not in the confidence of the Government, but no doubt they will answer for themselves.

Mr. LAPOINTE: You will see what will happen.

Mr. MOWAT: My point is that the position of my hon. friend who moved this amendment is such that we on this side cannot believe that he really wants that we should support it and bring on an election two years after the last one.

My hon. friend made some remarks which were not at all generous toward the member of the Government (Mr. Blondin) who comes from the province of Quebec. I am surprised at that, because if there is one thing more than another to which we should now direct our attention, our hearts and our heads, it is to bring about a better understanding and rapprochement between the English and the French-speaking peoples. I have no hesitation in saying that because I have always believed it. But I was amazed, and I think we on this side were all very much surprised, to find the ungenerous allusions to the defeat of the Postmaster General in the last election treated with more applause than any other remarks made by the leader of my hon. friends opposite.

Mr. GAUVREAU: We know him all right.

Mr. MOWAT: I ask what my hon. friends mean by that. Do they mean that because they know that Mr. Blondin was defeated by those majorities, the allusion to which defeat caused so much cheering, of 6,000 in Chambly and Verchères and 1,200 in Laurier Outremont——

An hon. MEMBER: You have the wrong county.

Mr. MOWAT: Did they mean that, knowing that the reason that Mr. Blondin was defeated was because he held the very opinions as to the prosecution of the war that the majority of the people of this country support? That was the reason he was defeated. In holding that view, do they mean, because elections on those opinions are profitable in their province, forever to continue this dissension between the peoples of this country? I can attribute no other reason for their action. They must know and I assure them sincerely that we on this side think it is a great calamity that we have not French-Canadian members in the Government of Canada to-day. The reason is that there are no French-Canadian supporters of the Government elected to the

House of Commons, from Quebec, so how can there be French-Canadian members of the Government? But it is not too late and I have no doubt that there are members of this Government who would freely and willingly retire to-day if they could rest assured that members of the French-Canadian race would be elected and would so act in harmony with the present Government that they would take their accustomed places in the Cabinet Council. So I am surprised that applause should be given to such a statement. It is true that political feeling runs high, but my hon. friends opposite must remember that while majorities were large in the province of Quebec in favour of a man holding certain principles, there were large majorities in the other provinces just because other men held different principles. There were Unionist majorities of 20,000, 16,000, 14,000, I think more than that in the city of Winnipeg, overwhelming majorities. General public sentiment demands that racial dissensions between the two peoples shall stop and that large majorities because of the holding of these strong opinions shall cease, and that all the people in this country will get together to do what we know is our duty, which is the dearest hope of most of us, namely, to first uphold the honour of all Canada.

I did not notice in the speeches made by the Leader of the Opposition and his follower who so chivalrously made way for him, an invitation which was given out last year or perhaps the year before, and which had for its figurative expression " a light in the window." That was a genial invitation to return. to Liberals who had formerly been with the party which now calls itself Liberal. He said that there was a light in the window and that the latch string was on the outside of the door. It is perfectly obvious that that invitation has not had any great effect. It has brought only two of that class of members from this side of the House and they had made up their minds fairly definitely before the invitation was given. The trouble with the Liberals who were thus invited was that they were not sure of the treatment they would receive after they went back in response to the light in the window. The house was all right. We helped to build the house, but the point is that you cannot live in a house unless the coal bin is pretty full and there is enough in the larder, and we did not see any particular reasons for having a good social time in the house in which the light was put in the window. The consequence was that there were not many defections from this side, and perhaps it is because the hon. member for North Cape Breton and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) has seen the futility of repeating the invitation, or because my hon. friend who is now his leader is not of the same hospitable character as his predecessor that that invitation has not been mentioned again. It is important to refer to some extent to that, because I think that it is a proper time now after two years, that I should make some observations regarding the first of the cleavages which we saw two years ago.

Political cleavages in parties are not unknown in Canada. They have generally occurred owing to a large mass of the people of one party hoping for commercial advantages, or on the other hand, because of some religious question which has stirred the hearts of the people. The Liberal Party and the Liberal Government of 1878 lost thousands and thousands of supporters who thought that their commercial welfare would be better served by more Protection, and the great majority of those supporters never came back to the party. The Conservative party in 1896 lost a very considerable number of its supporters, who objected that the Dominion Government was interfering with the rights of a province in the matter of separate school education. There we have an example, in the first place, of commercial advantage, and in the second place, of religious fervour, which are the two chief causes of cleavages in parties. Then we come to 1917, when for the first time we had a great world war, which was more potent than any other factor in creating cleavages in parties. It is true that some of us had to separate from our old friends, and we have been referred to as " The prodigal son," as the boy who has strayed away, or, setting the theme to music, " Oh, Where is My Wandering Boy To-night?" But it must be remembered that it was not only one boy who left the old home, but most of the boys. Anyway, "the" boys, the best boys, left the party because of its policy in connection with the carrying on of the war. If you will look at the election results you will see that the vast majority of the Liberals who could not follow their old party on this issue were elected without the help of the military vote. If you look at the other side of the House you will find that only two Liberals were elected in Ontario, the greatest and most populous province in Canada, on what might be called old party lines, and the others come from constituencies in which, for racial reasons,

feeling was aroused to a very great extent against Great Britain. I am not competent to speak of other provinces, but as a general result the vast majority of the Liberal-Unionists candidates were elected. We on this side of the House cannot object to those who are left calling themselves the Liberal Party if they like, because everybody has the right to call himself whatever he chooses, but it does seem absurd that those who are in the minority should attempt to make out that we have not been treated properly on this side of the House, and that we have been absorbed into a party by another name. As a matter of fact, while we have been over here we have been well received. We have found no attempt at proselytizing. Our opinions have been received with civility, and furthermore, we have found something that has amazed us, and which would have amazed some of my hon. friends opposite had they come over here, and that is that there are more real Liberals on this side of the House than there are on the other. I will go further. I have found men on this side of the House who call themselves Conservative for party reasons, who are more radical than any I have ever found among my old friends the Liberals. I have been astounded to learn of the uprooting that some alleged Tories on this side of the House were willing to do in one way or another, so one is naturally bound to come to the conclusion that these old party names stand for nothing when a great cataclysm comes and a man takes the course he thinks is right. I am quite aware that the so-called Liberals, if they will not mind my using that term,—anyway, the Liberals,—have been saying disagreeable things, as they have a right to do, about defections and turn-overs, but I can assure them that there is nothing on this side of the House that has given offence to those Liberals who went out for the principles of which I have spoken. Not only have we been well received, but we have heard nothing of the extreme views which my hon. friend from Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) attributes to our colleagues on this side of the House. They have not tried to rub in, so to speak, their own particular opinions. I have heard that there are some strong party men on this side, just as there are strong party men on the other side of the House, who would prefer to be alone, but, of course, they have been civil enough not to let us find that out, except that we have heard some reference here to-day to certain efforts of a former Cabinet minister hailing from Winnipeg. So far as our colleagues on this side of the House are concerned, we have had very pleasant relations with those with whom we formerly disagreed.

The war changed things in many ways, and with the exception of those who had the most tense political feelings and political inclinations, the war made men think as they wanted to think without regard to political party trammels.

It is proper for me now, I think, after two years, and as the subject has never been discussed in Parliament before, to give a short history of the rise of the cleavage in the Liberal party, and I can do it best, and it seems to me it would be the most convincing to those who are listening to me, by giving my own personal experience. In September, 1917, returning from my usual summer vacation, when one does not read many newspapers, I was surprised to find that there were some people in the country who were opposed to Canada taking further part in the great war. I discussed this matter with three men of political prominence, candidates under the leadership of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and I expressed my views, because I held them definitely and strongly. I said "We cannot let Canada down now that we have sent her in; we cannot let our boys at the Front get discouraged and weaken; we have to send more men." The first man replied, "Of course we should, but what has that to do with politics?" Then he told me he had been going around among the people and had found that conscription was unpopular, and that Conservatives who did not want their sons to go to the Front were going to vote for the Liberal party if the Conservative party stood for conscription. The next man, who was also a candidate, agreed that many Conservatives who did not want their sons to go to the Front would vote for the Liberal party to avoid conscription, and he gave instances to show that conscription was not going to win. These men were of that type. I shall not mention their names, but I am not abusing any confidence because anything which they said to me they will say at any time. They thought that while it was proper for Canada to continue her effort in the war, as was done afterwards by the Union Government, the more important thing was that the Liberals should get into power. That disposes of two from whom I got opinions. The third to whom I spoke—a candidate afterwards—rather shocked me when he said: "Well, I think we have done enough; let Uncle Sam do the rest." Well, I do not care to express

contempt for any man, but if ever I felt like doing so in my life it was on the occasion of this assertion. If these be candidates of the Liberal party, I felt, how is it possible for us, who think differently from them, to march in double harness with them again unless they change their minds? We could not endorse any policy of non-support of our men who were in the war and so there was an election. Now, mark this: The Liberals who left their party were as convinced as those who remained in it that conscription was an unpopular issue. They thought that they would be defeated, but apprehension of defeat did not alter their intention and determination that the war should be fought to a successful issue. So it came about, in an imposing outburst of public enthusiasm, that the Union Government, which was pledged to continue the war, was sustained except in one province. None were more surprised than the Liberals who had run as candidates in support of the Union Government, and I must say that the result was gratifying to them. When a prominent member on the other side made a remark in Ottawa last winter that the Liberals who left their party had done so for their personal aggrandisement I assured him he was wrong. We were elected through the patriotism of the people, in Ontario at any rate; but at the time we ran there was no idea of personal gain at all. We had played the political game before, but on that occasion we claim that we played the game of what was right for Canada without regard to the political party to which we belonged. I therefore give no credit to men like the three of whom I have spoken; they were wrong in their heads as well as in their hearts. They made a bad guess politically. They thought they were going to win and they lost, and I give them no credit for possessing any right principle or anything else to boast of. It was a pure political game with them. As I say, they were of opinion that they would win, but they lost; and it now ill becomes them to throw slurs at those who thought or acted differently from them.

I shall now conclude by saying that while this is not a political party on this side of the House—most of us have voted against the Government repeatedly, although the Government has not been sensitive on that point, knowing that our hearts and our allegiance were generally in the right place—while we are not a party, I do not see why we should not become one. Men of like opinions, men with the same ideals in regard to the future of Canada, men who do not wish to see racial dissension or cleavage in the country, if they can meet on this side for two years and have no serious disagreement as to what is needed for good government, regardless of former party shibboleths, may very well compose a party. While therefore we are not yet a party, if there is any proposal that we should become a party and the leaders can devise a policy consistent with the ideals I have seen on this side, I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberal-Unionists are going to join that party. We are assured there will be nothing new which will be inconsistent with anything we were ever told in political meetings on the Liberal side. I ask my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie King) now seriously—nay, humourously—did he ever hear political principles of a liberal kind discussed in a Liberal political meeting? No, he did not. Well, neither did I. We always played the party game. We were party men; and what a lot of rot it is to talk about Liberal principles or Conservative principles all the time! We were party men. But sometimes in a crisis we cannot be party men, and if we can find something better to substitute for what exists there is no reason why we should not take it. And we will take it. I, in common with the Liberals on this side, have had pleasure in supporting this Government, and supporting it enthusiastically, even though it be unpopular. During war I do not want to support a Government merely because it is popular. I want to support a Government that does the right thing even if it is going to be unpopular. And what a number of unpopular things this Government has had to do! One thing after another, which would almost strain to breaking point the ordinary man, these men in the Government benches, heedless of party politics, caring not whether their actions might incur the disapproval of their supporters or constituencies, or what effect those actions might have in the event of an election, have day in and day out framed policies and passed measures—Orders in Council, if you will—that were bound to be unpopular, but which were in their belief for the ultimate good of the country. The only thing that saved Canada during the war was the fact that there was a Government that was not afraid to do things that would be unpopular. And I mistake very much the temper and the generous spirit of my fellow-countrymen if they will not ultimately support a body of men such as compose the present

Government. It is true that at the present juncture criticism is freely indulged in. Attacks are made in every quarter; everyone is abusing everyone else—the Bolshevists condemn the Government. The returned soldiers abuse the pacifists. But when this state of feeling subsides, I have enough faith in my fellow-countrymen and enough confidence in their gratitude to know that they will support the party that did the right thing whether it was popular or not. I admit there is some talk of the unpopularity of the Government at the present moment, but that does not bother me a bit, because we know that it is merely a passing cloud. While it is fostered by my friends on the other side—sometimes, I regret to say, not altogether fairly—I know it is but transient. And when the next election comes, whether at the time demanded in my friend's motion, or a little later—probably a little later—the present Government, comprising men who formerly held different political views, is going to be swept ultimately into power again. The history of Canada shows that the people have favoured keeping governments a long time in power during the last forty years, and history will repeat itself at the next election. Then, my hon. friends, I think, will be somewhat ashamed of themselves when they go down to defeat—except in one province—because they did not try to unite with us to put an end to dissension, to throttle the racial feeling the moment it appeared, and to lend their support to a government working for the advantage of the whole country and of the whole Empire, and for the well-being of mankind at large.

Mr. LOUIS JOSEPH GAUTHIER (St. Hyacinthe-Rouville): Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to speak in my own language on this occasion but before entering upon any remarks I wish to answer very briefly the speaker who has just preceded me (Mr. Mowat). The hon. gentleman says that we are not ready for an election and he concluded his remarks by stating that whenever there should be an appeal to the people the Government he is supporting would come back triumphantly to power. If it is true that we are not ready for an election, and if the Government is sure to come back triumphantly to power, why do they refuse the amendment of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition
5 p.m. (Mr. King)? We do not ask a dissolution because we hope to come back to power; we ask a dissolution in order that the people shall have an opportunity to say whether or not they have any confidence in this Government. We do not care to come back to power but we want to fulfil our duty. That is the difference between us and the hon. gentleman. He says also that now is the time to try and get nearer to the province of Quebec. Speaking in my own name, and for my province, I will quote the words of one of our public men who says that the province of Quebec is not in a state of mind to enter into any conference; it has been misjudged; it has been badly treated; it has been slandered; it is waiting for its hour and after that it will confer but not before.

The hon. gentleman says that whenever the Government shall be ready to propound a policy, that policy will appeal to the people of Canada. Yesterday the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government (Sir George Foster) told us that they had a policy but the hon. member for Parkdale who supports this Government is not aware that there is a policy. He tells us that there is going to be a policy propounded and in advance he tells the country that he is going to support it. I believe he is a bad supporter of the present Administration as he was a bad supporter of the Liberal party. If he desires to come back to the Liberal fold we will receive him because the door is open, but if he should be only as good a supporter of the Liberal party as he is of this Government we will not rely very much upon him. I will now proceed with my remarks in my own language.

Mr. L. J. GAUTHIER (St. Hyacinthe-Rouville) (translation): Mr. Speaker, the mover of the address in answer to the speech from the Throne told us that the war had destroyed the old order of things political in this country and that Canada was entering into a new era. That is exactly what we believe, that is precisely what we maintain and that is also what the leader of the Liberal party, the leader of the Opposition, has submitted to this House and to the country in moving for the dissolution of Parliament.

He laid emphasis on the fact that the hybrid alliance which gave birth to the government we have been enjoying since 1917 had brought about the overturn of the old political order of things.

What is the present situation and how did it originate? For the winning of the war, the constitution of the country had to be battered in; to win the war, individual rights had to be done away with; to win the war, the constitution had to be

suspended; individual sacrifices had to be appealed to, in order to achieve victory and bring to a triumphant conclusion the cause supported by the Allies. These hon. gentlemen that sit on the Treasury benches maintained that, in order to have a free hand and plenty elbow room, all the existing laws had of necessity to be suspended and the Parliament of this country had to give up its prerogatives, so as to hand over to ministers sitting in the Unionist cabinet the full control of public affairs.

Aware as we are that, in order to build up that Unionist party and that Union government, all men of good will had to be appealed to; when we call to mind that sincere Liberals, for the time being, severed connection with and cut loose from their party to join hand in hand with men they had hitherto opposed, it is most regrettable to find that the acting Prime Minister of this country has deemed it fit to slap them in the face, as he did yesterday. How so, Sir? The Acting Prime Minister told us that in 1917, not only was the Unionist party elected on the platform of prosecution of the war, but that the new allies had agreed on a political programme, and that the election of 1917 was won not only to carry the war to a victorious conclusion, but on a well-defined political programme. Is there a single individual, out of this House, who is going to believe—for in this House under our rules, one is bound to accept the statements made by an hon. member from his seat, and so far as I am concerned, I am bound, so long as I sit here, to believe that the Acting Prime Minister did really make a statement borne out by the facts—but let me ask the hon. members who sit within these precincts whether there is a single individual, outside this House, when not bound by the rules of the House, who would believe that my hon. friend, the member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. W. S. Fielding), a former Prime Minister of his province, one of the outstanding figures of the Liberal party, a minister of Finance for fifteen years, who has waged war on the protection tariff so dear to the hearts of these gentlemen, who is the man, I say, who is going to believe that the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's did really come to an understanding with the Acting Prime Minister on a well defined political programme previous to the election? Had such an understanding been reached, how happens it that my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's severed his connection with and cut loose from the Unionist party, and returned to the party fold, sitting now in the ranks of the Liberal Opposition?

In the reference to the words fallen from the lips of the Acting Prime Minister, and directed to those colleagues of his who supported him in times of stress, it strikes me that it was paying them a very poor compliment to say that they proved false to and have gone back on the pledges given prior to the election of 1917. By no means, Sir. Who is going to believe that the hon. member from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) did really forswear his allegiance to free trade, in order to adhere and subscribe to a pre-arranged political platform of the hon. gentlemen? Who is going to be fooled into believing that the former Minister of Agriculture who is now sitting alongside the representatives of the United Farmers, and old Liberals, old oppositionists to the present Government, had joined the Union government with a well defined political programme?

Oh no! these gentlemen may well try to throw dust in the eyes of the people, they may well try to belittle the grandeur of those who, in a moment of distress, believed in the sincerity of the scattered remnants of the Tory party, believed at a time that really their help was necessary to enroll the live forces of the nation, to enlist our youth and send 500,000 of our sons to the battlefields of Europe, while draining the wealth of the country; of such men as the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's, as the hon. member for Red Deer, as my hon. friend the member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) who, in a manner to which I will later call attention, has just left the government which he had joined. These men had believed that their help was necessary, and because they believed that their help was necessary I bow to them for the course they took; I recognize that they obeyed the dictates of their conscience. But, after having accomplished the work for which they had abandoned their party, when they think proper to come back to that party, it seems to me that they deserve other treatment at the hands of those whom they have helped to retain power, that they deserve other treatment than to be told that when they entered the Government there was a perfectly definite political programme which they deserted before its realization.

I am bound to believe that there was a programme, but I doubt very much whether the public will give much credence to this statement of the Acting Prime Minister.

It is said that there exists a general uneasiness in the country. To this the

Acting Prime Minister answers, well, the cost of living has risen in all countries, we suffer as they suffer elsewhere. This is no answer. Mr. Speaker, allow me to point out a clear proof of the uneasiness which obtains in the country. You see at the end of the benches, on your left, men who sit in this House aloof from the parties. Why have they been elected to this House? What is the reason of their aloofness? The reason is that there exists at this moment in the country an intense uneasiness caused by the faulty legislation, by the scandalous administration, of the present Government. The people are looking about in search of a remedy. These United Farmers of Ontario, who have awakened the political hopes of the farmers of Canada, on what have they built their hopes? These political hopes are born of contempt for broken promises; they are born of the fact that a Minister of Militia, in the first days of December 1917, with a view to capturing the votes of the farmers' sons and of the farmers of Ontario, went over that province exhibiting an Order in Council, and declaring that he, the Minister of Militia, had obtained it so that the sons of farmers would never go to the war. The election took place. The Unionist party was returned. And the result was that immediately after the proclamation of the vote, the farmers' sons were called to arms notwithstanding the Order in Council, which had been repealed in spite of the promise of this Minister.

And you wonder now that among the people, when men holding public offices are capable, in order to gain a momentary success, of making game of the public confidence, of treading under foot their promises and their oaths, you are astonished that there is uneasiness?

Well, the uneasiness is taking shape. To-day it is to be seen in the claims of the farmers grouping themselves into a unit, and deciding that henceforth neither the party in power nor the party in opposition are capable of satisfying their hopes and their ambitions. And as is the case for all class movements, the responsibility for this movement rests upon the Government, by reason of their policy, their legislation and their administration.

The greatest crime with which I reproach those who sit on the ministerial benches, is of having started in this country this movement, which is setting classes against each other and stirring up throughout the country a turmoil of which no one may foretell the consequences.

The uneasiness is wide spread, you say; yes, it is, and it is becoming more and more so. And, Sir, what comforts me now is to see that in the maelstrom which draws in province after province, in this orgy of folly, of destruction which rouses province against province, which rouses race against race, regions, classes, against each other, alone the province of which I am one of the representatives, remains at its work, continues to love the soil, continues to cherish its institutions and, notwithstanding the abuse which has been heaped upon it, gives its calumniators, its persecutors the example of true patriotism, by remaining attached to the soil, intent upon work, and developing energy, in order to bring about the production which is so much needed. That is the answer to the slanders and insults cast upon the province of Quebec.

The right hon. Acting Prime Minister used an unfortunate expression, when, speaking of the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition, he called it "'camouflage". If the action of the leader of the Liberal party may be termed camouflage, there is a stand of the Government which I look upon as deserving much more to be so characterized.

I know that within these precincts it is rather difficult to speak openly, but I shall not disguise my thoughts, whatever the outcome. If there be any camouflaging, it is in representing the Prime Minister of this country as being so broken in health as to prevent his taking his seat in this House for the last three sessions, and in saying that he requires two different kinds of attendants, for the Prime Minister, since his stay in Europe, has developed an immoderate liking for international and foreign affairs. Therefore he has an attendant for external affairs and until recently had two more for the home policies.

As regards external affairs, I am bound, as I said a moment ago, to take the hon. Acting Prime Minister's word and to acknowledge that the Prime Minister is sick, and that is the sole reason for his not being present. But can you possibly imagine that the people will believe that the Prime Minister is so ill that he cannot attend to the business of Parliament when they hear that he has gone away on an imperial mission with Lord Jellicoe to establish naval forces in all the colonies of the Empire? If he is too ill to come to this Parliament how is it that they throw upon him the burden of discussing the naval policy.

We cannot believe that Lord Jellicoe took Sir Robert Borden away with him simply on account of his own personality. Nobody would believe that, because Lord Jellicoe

has other business to do than that of looking after a sick man. He simply took Sir Robert Borden with him because he is Prime Minister of Canada. Here is a man who, according to the description given by the Acting Prime Minister, is unable to follow the sittings of this House and who, however, is being overburdened with the consideration of the whole naval policy. But that is not all. Our Prime Minister comes back to the American continent, he calls at Halifax and immediately upon his arrival at New York, he is met by his two attendants for home affairs who discuss with him during two days the policy which is to be adopted by the Government of this Dominion.

I always thought that public life involved for those who entered it, the sacrifice of every hope of home life, of their profession or business in favour of the common weal. But I never fancied that when a public man became ill, everybody should strive to hasten his death. Such a thought never occurred to me. However it seems to be the case; if we are to believe the statements made by the right hon. gentleman from the opposite side of the House. Here is a sick and feeble man who, according to press reports and conversations among his friends, is gone to South Africa when he has not actually reached New York, who has arrived in Florida when he is still aboard Lord Jellicoe's ship, who is supposed to be in New York and is found the next day in London, who when reported to be still in London is in Halifax and in New York when they look for him in Halifax. Nobody can see him. It is jugglery, witchcraft, camouflage.

I was never a supporter of the Prime Minister, but had I been one of his friends, I think I should have treated him better than his so-called friends do to-day. I should have shown some compassion, even for the sake of decency if he were not sick. But personally I believe he is ill, because the hon. Acting Prime Minister gave us his word and we have to take it.

Now there is one observation the people will not fail to make. The leader of the Opposition, as in duty bound, moved an amendment to the address in reply to the speech from the Throne, asking for the immediate dissolution of this Parliament, on the ground that it does not, and neither does the present Government, represent the people.

The right honourable Acting Prime Minister calls that strategy, though suspecting it is rather camouflage. Then the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat) is sure that the Liberal Opposition is not ready for the fray and that if we had an election in the near future the present Government would be returned by an immense majority. I take for granted the statement made by the acting Prime minister that the Government cannot agree with the strategic move of the Opposition. The Government and their supporters will go to the people with the same platform upon which they were elected in 1917 and the member for Parkdale says that if we had an election to-morrow the Opposition would be crushed.

Well we fully realize the bearing of hon. gentleman's argument. We are perfectly well aware that the Liberal party, in order to live up to its war time obligations, suffered the Government to encroach upon the prerogative of Parliament, upon the rights of the representatives of the people, upon the franchises of the people; and we realize that public opinion instead of giving us credit for such sacrifices and generosity, and because it has been poisoned by a salaried press, is under the impression that the Opposition is not any better than the Government. In spite of this and of the agitation of the united farmers and of the efforts of the Government to hold on to power, notwithstanding what may happen, we are ready to take a risk. And why? Because above the Unionist, Farmers' or Liberal parties there lies the public interest. We much prefer that a new parliament should be the outcome of the election, a house truly representative of the people and conducting the affairs of the country according to the wishes of the people and in the interest of the people, rather than our being returned to power and taking Sir Robert Borden's heritage, which is far from being enviable.

The Opposition may well take a pride in their action. Still that which denotes broadness of mind and magnanimity is greeted by our opponents with unkindness and contempt. Whatever the Union party may say or do, we shall have to go back to the form of responsible government, to the government by the people. Personally I think there is nothing more pitiful in what is going on under our eyes in Canada at the present time than the fact of the acting Prime Minister being forced to defend an indefensible case and being absolutely unable to make his views prevail. It is not customary with me to praise my opponents, but as far as the right hon. Acting Prime

Minister is concerned, I think he fully understands the bearing of our leader's declarations. He realized his position was a difficult one and accordingly marshalled all the resources of his imagination, all his expertness in dialectics and parliamentary training. May I be allowed to state that he sorely disappointed us? It is not surprising. Such an accomplishment exceeded even his means and resourcefulness. The stand taken by the Opposition is unassailable, but that which the Government forces the Acting Prime Minister to defend is anti-constitutional and inimical to the principles of responsible government. No one in this House knows it better than the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government in the absence of one who ought to be here to-day.

May we not entertain the hope that in the councils of a party which boasts of having attracted the best brains in the country, there will be among its leaders some one who, in order to preserve our system of responsible government, will impress upon the minds of those who do not understand, the danger of so jeopardizing the existence of our representative institutions.

At first the people may take no particular interest in the matter, but to-morrow they will grumble; then unrest sets in and in the course of events which are shaping themselves you will reap what you are sowing to-day.

Whatever the Government may say or do, nobody believes that they represent the people or that they were elected through a franchise which represented public opinion. Nobody believes it. They may say: We have a sound and well balanced Government. But they are alone to say so and I think they do not even believe what they say. How could the taxpayers and those who have made sacrifices, who have contributed money and the blood of their children towards ensuring victory to the Allies, how could these people, I ask, believe it?

But the people of this country are going to call these men to a strict account for their administration of public affairs.

Besides, Sir, one need not be a great scholar to know that no administration that has come into office in war time succeeds in remaining in power after peace has come in. Why, Sir? A state of war means the destroying of all that has been painfully built up in the piping times of peace; a state of war spells the suspension of fundamental laws; a state of war involves for the citizens of a country the obligation of giving up their interests, of renouncing their egotism, of sacrificing everything to the public weal. Do you believe that such sacrifices may be imposed on a whole people without a reaction being bound to arise at a given moment? Moreover, every body knows than when war is let loose, public expenditure cannot be controlled as it should be. There are uncontrollable expenditures, which go on increasing by leaps and bounds; appetites get sharpened, passions spring into flame, love of money increases and to satisfy the rank and file of the party, to gratify friends, inroads are made deeper and deeper into the public treasury, and meanwhile, public anger keeps roaring and gathering. And prior to its being let loose, torrent-like, over the country, jeopardizing those institutions for which our ancestors so long struggled, for which, I say, men of the generation of the acting Prime Minister have so often done battle and for which institutions those who will come after us are willing to live, struggle and contend, so as to improve and enlarge them, were it not high time we told the Government: In the public interest, gentlemen, do not hesitate to sink your personal ambitions, to make up your mind to renounce the sweets of office, go to the country, appeal to the people, and should the people, through means I do not wish to qualify here, wish to give you another lease of power, you shall at least have public confidence behind you, you shall at least have the support of public opinion. Beware you do not tarry and wait till class feeling has reached such a pitch that you can no longer stem the tide. The farming community, in this country, should it syndicate, would prove to be the power par excellence, and you should have class legislation, an administration prejudicial to public development. And this, because of your refusing, at a given moment, to take up a position which your duty to the public demanded, and because of your lack of confidence in the people, who put their trust in those who have served them well.

And that is why I cannot understand the position taken by the Government in refusing to accept the amendment moved by my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition.

The hon. member for London (Mr. H. Cronyn)—and this will be my concluding remark—said in his speech in moving the Address in answer to the speech from the Throne that the state of war had brought about the overturn of the old order of things political. I am going to lay down

here a principle, at the risk of shocking those who hear me. I make no bones about saying that I am a party man; I am not ashamed of stating that I am a believer in political parties and I shall tell you why I believe in political parties. Without any political parties in which men of all classes and conditions may meet and give personal bickerings their quietus, so as to work harmoniously and hand in hand in the common interest, you shall have a Government made up of factions, you shall have an administration carried out by coteries or groups. Of the two governments, that which has been most subservient to the interests of humanity, is party government. Because the government of countries carried out by political parties has proved the greatest agency for good in the world, I am still in favour of that government. I am still a party politician and I believe—any contrary opinion notwithstanding—that there is magnanimity in the fact of a man who, holding strong views, tries to have them prevail, but yielding to his colleagues whose opinion runs counter to his own, is broad-minded enough to pocket his personal grievances, so that the opinions of the majority of his party friends may prevail. It strikes me that there is magnanimity in such an attitude. Do not call it servilism, do not call it slavery. Every one is entitled to hold his own opinion, until the majority has spoken, and in such a case it is the opinion of a whole party which is voiced by the majority, and everybody must subscribe to it.

I wish to make an appeal to my right hon. friend, the acting Prime Minister, because, I believe, he is a party man, and because I invoke the statements of the supporters of this Government, that for the winning of the war, all political parties had to sink their differences, in order to form a coalition government, and now that the war is over, I appeal to him,—not as a political opponent,—but I am entitled to make that appeal because he is the oldest representative of the people in this House, the most experienced man, and he is considered as the strongest man in his party: let him do his best so that we may go back to the administration of public affairs in this country on the lines of well defined political parties, leaving to each group the care of urging its claims, but without giving rise to the creation of clans or classes which would bring about class and faction legislation, which would result in the overthrow of every thing we hold dear, for which we have fought so long, and which we have inherited from our ancestors.

Before taking my seat, let me thank this House for having so long listened to my remarks, which may have proved devoid of interest to the majority of my colleagues; but I thought that under the circumstances, I was entitled to the use of my mother tongue, as the assertion of a right, and in speaking in my own name as well as on behalf of those I represent here, I wanted the claims, demands and grievances of my constituents to be heard on the floor of this House in their own mother tongue.

Mr. J. H. BURNHAM (West Peterborough): I should like to join Mr. Speaker, in the praise extended to the mover and seconder of the Address, for I am sure their speeches are worthy of every enconium that has been bestowed on them.

This noble building one might expect to inspire noble thoughts, but I have been somewhat disturbed by the speech of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. Gauthier). He began by repudiating the conciliatory remarks of the member for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat), and ended, as I understood him, by saying—and he asserted that he spoke for himself and his Province—that Quebec would not confer until her hour had come, and then she would be prepared to confer. If that is what the hon. gentleman said and if that is what he meant, I would ask him if he intended that as a threat.

Mr. GAUTHIER: It is not a threat; it is a declaration.

Mr. BURNHAM: The difference between a threat and a declaration, especially a declaration of that kind, is that the man who makes the declaration is afraid to back it up.

Mr. GAUTHIER: The hon. gentleman has no right to insinuate that I am a coward.

Mr. SPEAKER: It would not be in order for any hon. member to impute cowardice to another. It is a question of construction as to whether that is what the hon. member (Mr. Burnham) meant in the present instance, and I can hardly go so far as to place that interpretation upon his words.

Mr. BURNHAM: Mr. Speaker, I of course bow to your ruling instantly. I might explain that I was not attributing physical cowardice to the hon. gentleman; I was attributing to him moral cowardice, something that he himself—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member has now clearly brought himself within the rule of the order, and his latter remark ought to be withdrawn.

Mr. BURNHAM: I certainly withdraw the remark, Mr. Speaker. Proceeding then upon a declaration which is not a threat, but which is a full, plain and explicit declaration by a man who is speaking for himself and his Province, as he said, I must say that I am unable to distinguish between his remarks and something of a very warlike and threatening character. I do not understand such talk as that. I am an admirer of the French. I like the French—the French of Canada as well as the French of old France. But in these days when we in Ontario have had to stand the Nationalists, when we have had to endure from Quebec every insult under Heaven, why should we be subjected to a statement of the most mysterious character, a statement that they would only confer when their hour had come. That means when their hour has struck. Well, if it means that, I can only say, with most infinite regret, that I do not care a brass farthing whether they threaten or whether they do not, for I am confident that we will be able to hold our own with equanimity.

Mr. GAUTHIER: I may say that we will never confer with the hon. gentleman, for if we did he would not understand.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. BURNHAM: However, this sort of feeling that has been aroused, to my infinite astonishment and very great regret indeed, seems to be in the air. The passion displayed by the gentleman of that portion of the Opposition is no doubt largely aroused through the feeling that they have lost the major portion of themselves. The farmers of this country beyond all doubt, according to my way of thinking, owe to the Liberal party, who held the fort for many a long day, at least a tribute of respect, if not of consideration. But now the farmers have repudiated the Liberal party, and surely if the farmers repudiate their associates, the least we on this side can do is to agree with them. They know the Liberals better than we do, and they have cast them aside like a brand into the burning. I regret this parting from old associates, from those who remain of a great historic party, now about to disappear because it is to be swallowed up in that far greater movement known as the Agrarian or Farmers' Movement.

This is one of those incidents arising from furious feeling which has been developed by the war. We have other exemplifications of force; we have the women of this country (whose forte is practical but not philosophical idealism), advocating force. Strange to say in this general convulsion after the war, when peace should have supervened, we have the doctrine of force being preached from one end of the country to the other, by ministers in the pulpit and by women out of it. The religion and the morals of the people, as well as their peace and content, depend upon individual liberty, and if we are to understand, as the Rev. Doctor Bland said recently in his pulpit—a prominent pulpit in Toronto—that individual liberty has disappeared, and that we must henceforth have only community liberty, then we must bow to force. Well, we will bow to force only when we have to. And we will not submit to the force of the majority, because I have known a minority that, when it came to force, could overcome a majority; and if our women and the pulpiteers have so far forgotten their respect to God, and preserve their desire to spread infidelity throughout this country, as they are most certainly doing, let them remember that the remnant who hold dear all the old basic elements of the moral law, the basis of religion, will adhere to these elements when these people proclaim, as they are proclaiming, that the death of Christ himself was unnecessary if the Almighty had had brains enought to prohibit the source of evil. It is one of the most extraordinary and deplorable conditions imaginable. I am well aware that those who say that do not mean it, but they do not know. Those people who pooh-pooh philosophy; who sneer at the fundamental reasons of things and set up something that they adore and that they are determined to back up by force, have intensified the spleen and excitement which we now see throughout the country and which will result in the country's downfall if something is not done to prevent it. I am not now referring to any particular brand of prohibition. It is not necessary to stop at alcohol; that form of prohibition is a very minor affair. We need only follow that idea up to rveive at once the conditions of the inquisition. It it is wrong to misuse alcohol, it is wrong to misuse religion—and we have all the horror of the days when women were executed as witches and when people were burned at the stake the persecutors maintaining the while a remarkable self complacency. The descendants of these very

people are to-day delighted to see a repetition of what has happened before. One cannot look back on those days without wondering how these things could have been done; but when people are wedded to force they can do anything. I can only say that I do not come of a race that submits to force. If force has to be exercised, then let us "cry havoc and let loose the dogs of war." We can all join in that, and possibly out of this extraordinary condition of things there may come that spirit of re-union which the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier) a few moments ago seemed to repudiate. We cannot and we will not put up with this dogmatism which has been engendered by a false system of ethics, this force which has been substituted for the old religion and which sooner or later will destroy the very foundations of society.

One of the disturbing elements of the present day is, beyond all doubt, the condition of the mind of the soldier. He is not satisfied. Why? Because broadly before him is placed this simple fact: That the people who stayed at home have profited and that the people who went to war have lost. They simply say to themselves: Upon us has fallen not only the burden of the war at the front, but the burden of the war at home; we are ignored; we must struggle. The consequence is that there has been engendered and aroused a feeling which is regrettable in the extreme because it is caused by ingratitude—above all things the basest and the meanest flaw in the human character.

I confess that the people who have been engaged in looking after the returned soldier have thought that they were doing well. To some extent they have been doing well. But he gives twice who gives quickly, and they did not give quickly, nor did they follow up what they intended to do with that instantaneous and practical carrying out of the intention which would have taken away so much from the sting of the loss which these men had suffered. Delay followed delay. Impracticable things were suggested. It was suggested that returned soldiers should go upon the farm who did not know a farm when they saw it. Men were offered inducements to go upon the farm but no inducements to go into business. Afterwards the loan principle was extended in some degree to business but there has been throughout a lack of promptitude on the part of our people—on the part of all of us—with regard to the soldier. And the soldier feels it. He does not want to be paid for what he did. He cannot be paid; no country could pay him. But after four or five years of war he finds that he is in an extremely bad condition in many cases—a poor, unfortunate condition— and he thinks that if he had some decent help in time of need; if the people of this country had been a "very present help in time of trouble," this post-war period would have been tided over, with possibly few exceptions. But the condition has been so widespread and so general that it has occasioned at last a suspicion in the minds of the people themselves that all is not right. In England they have said that war fortunes must not only be regretted; they must be given up. How frequently do we say that people in this country made a good thing out of the war; but we let them keep it. Let them in all honesty and ourselves in all honour remember that while they are entitled to a fair reward and fair remuneration, they are most decidedly not entitled to keep the fortunes they made during the absence in the field of strife of our glorious soldiers. There can be and will be no satisfaction so long as these evidences of luxury are paraded before the men who made the sacrifice which made possible the enjoyment of these luxuries. Therefore when we analyze the various causes of discontent we must remember that we have not by any means done all that we could do to allay it.

The high cost of living is founded upon the most awful inflation that ever took place in the history of the world. It is true that the nations' holdings of gold have been enormously increased, but the paper currency in circulation, based upon that gold, has been still more enormously and disproportionately increased. The increase has extended from three times what it was before the war in some cases to ten times what it was before the war in others. There is an immensity of paper money. In some quarters it is worth nothing; in other quarters it is worth little, and we have high prices, based, of course, upon this inflated currency—the Governments of the world, not excluding our own Government, meanwhile standing by and taking no steps or adopting no measures to shrink that inflation and enable prices to get back to where they were. The most extraordinary feature of it all is that we have in exchange a loss to this country which is almost beyond belief and is almost more than we can bear. There are people, the farmers included, who view this condition with equanimity. They may be a little dis-

turbed, but they say: We will not buy in Canada if we can buy more cheaply out of it. Well, if they are determined to follow that system and they are bled year by year many millions of dollars in discount or by way of foreign premium, then, just as a case of Bright's disease will sooner or later destroy and exhaust a human being, so will the payment of that money surely destroy Canada. The nations of this world are not one. We have all our households, national and domestic to look after. Our farmers are the most cultured and, generally speaking, the happiest and most prosperous class in the whole community. For them to consider that they have a right to envy the rest of us because of our superior luxuries or attainments is a serious and sad mistake. I know of nowhere that the farming community enjoys such a high, broad and luxurious life as in Canada. Therefore, it is with the utmost regret that I see that they have formed themselves on a basis of force into a class or group, and to prove that they have formed themselves into an exclusive group, they say that nobody but a farmer can join them. You have nothing left; you cannot follow in behind them because you approve or disapprove their principles, because they repudiate you. And why do they repudiate you? Because their whole new policy is founded on selfishness or self interest. How can they say that they intend to do what is best for Canada when they refuse to let good Canadians join them unless they are actual farmers? They hope, by the power of their number to come to Ottawa to rule the country, and I am stirred to make these remarks by hearing the Premier of Ontario say that he did not care so much for his job as Premier of Ontario, only for one thing, namely, that he regarded it as an outpost in his keeping, and he bade the farmers of Ontario keep their eyes and their minds upon Ottawa. There, he pointed, was the field of their operations, and the province of Ontario will be kept as an outpost while a class or group, defying all the traditions of good Canadianism and all the desire that we have that we should blend our interests, will reject all these and say: We will keep the province as an outpost and make our assault upon our fellow citizens at Ottawa. As for the others—their day will come; labour, the professions, their day will come; the manufacturer, their day will come, their hour will come, in the language of my French friend. But now, just like a great storm blowing across the country, the farmers have announced that they are determined to sweep all before them. Well, that is a magnificent way to proclaim the unity and solidarity of Canadianism. I sympathise with the Liberals that I see before me who are going down in this great storm. I do not suppose that two years hence Liberalism will be more than a name; and if the Conservative party, or that which shall succeed the Conservative party, does not defend the true national policy, which means Canada for the Canadians, a well developed and well balanced country, the Conservative party, or the party which succeeds it, will go down too.

Like the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat), I am wedded to no party, but I am wedded to a Canadian policy. I am wedded to the national policy, not to every feature of it, because there have been mistakes; there have been injustices; but to the principle. Work at home, work together; buy at home; let your country be well balanced; then when time of trouble comes, you will be developed and able to take your part as in the late war, and when difficulties of a financial character arise, they will all be at home and you will not be paying out your gold to redeem yourselves and paying a huge discount to other nations. These things are too serious to trifle with, and I hope, in these crucial days, nobody is approaching these subjects except with the most acute concern.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. J. H. BURNHAM (resuming): When the House rose for dinner I was calling attention to the question of exchange and inflation, and I shall not detain the House further than to make a general summing up. I will begin by congratulating the hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria, the former leader of the Opposition, (Mr. McKenzie) on the courage and fortitude which he displayed in pronouncing unequivocally for Protection, in favour of Canada for the Canadians. It required some courage to do that in view of his surroundings, but I am pleased to see that he thinks more of Canada than of any party; the same spirit should inspire us all.

I just wish to say further with regard to the farmer that if any body asks why it is the farmer has become so aroused he will find the answer in the fact that the farmer dreads high wages, daylight saving, and things of that kind. Especially does he

dread shorter hours, and he cannot be blamed for that in view of his industrious life and its requirements. The question of shorter hours is no reproach to labour, because when we consider how it arose the answer at once presents itself. In the United States, for example, the operators of the coal mines, in order to have as little coal on hand as possible when the demand came for it, shortened the hours of production, so that if the worker in the coal mine was to have any pay at all he must necessarily shorten the hours of his working day so that he could get in more working days, because it frequently happened day after day and week after week that he would have not only many hours but whole days idle. Now when he sees that the operators have made tremendous profits, running all the way from 400 to 2,000 per cent, what can he do but strike? for neither this Government nor any other that I know of has provided him with any means of expressing his feelings in the matter except by striking? People when they read the newspapers hold up their hands in horror at the usurious perc ntage exacted by such operators as I have referred to, but they make no effort to stop it. The reason I refer to the United States is that the Americans have at last taken up this question in their usual strong and vigorous way. We in Canada, although I have nothing but the greatest respect for our Minister of Labour (Hon. Mr. Robertson) who is I think a man of great energy and great ability and certainly of great sincerity, seem to be utterly confounded by these things. We have no solution; we offer no suggestions, and the cruel work goes on. Labour has therefore taken the matter into its own hands, and if we do not get an eight-hour day it will be because we will get a six-hour day, and the farmer will then be worse off than ever. If the manufacturers, for instance, decided to run the country, decided to form a powerful financial group and to concentrate their energies and their wealth, with all the ability that their leading men have, upon their own interests in this House, and with the farmers doing the same, where pray would the rest of Canada be? I would be just as strongly against the manufacturers in any such event as I would be against the farmers. We must be a united and a sane people, or we will cease to exist as a nation. I am confident that one of the difficulties this country labours under is that the people are largely uninformed except as to their own business, and here is a reproach

that lies at the door of our leading men. Our ministers of government and the leading men of the Opposition might well go through the country, not at election times when nobody believes anybody else, but at other times, and explain the broad principles of government and of statesmanship. A statesman, Gladstone said, is a man who ascertains the facts and acts accordingly. In this way our leading men would learn in their peregrinations what the true conditions of the country were; they would know what the country thought and needed, and the country would know also what they thought; but at the present time, until the war drum of elections is sounded, nobody pricks up his ears about the country at all, and it is left to Canadian clubs and similar institutions to educate the country. This is a very serious drawback, and I am quite convinced that the good feeling as well as the intelligence of the country would be very much developed if our leading men were to visit different sections of the country at different times.

I want to touch for a moment upon a source of energy that has come like a flash into view and will afford us more comfort than anything else that I know of. The day of coal has gone by. Even if it could be mined, it is of poor quality or it is not there—I am referring to hard coal particularly, and the highest quality of soft coal. Gasolene has become so tremendously expensive that it is fast disappearing in public estimation and is creating a need which is about to be supplied, industrial chemists tell us, by industrial alcohol. The Americans a few years ago manufactured 6,000,000 gallons of alcohol per annum. Now they manufacture over 100,000,000 per annum. Our industrial alcohol, owing to the nervousness of the temperance people, has to be shipped from the distillers to Ottawa, there be denatured, and sent out to the users throughout the country. The consequence is that the freight alone is so expensive that Canada is put out of business as a consumer of industrial alcohol. That has to be stopped. The National Council of Industrial Research begs the Government to tell the people to grow more corn, and potatoes and everything of that sort from which alcohol can be easily made, and then to take off all sorts of embargoes such as I have referred to, so that this source of energy may be made available to the people.

which means, of course, not only motive power but heat. We are short of electricity, and even if we had all the electricity we

wanted, alcohol has become so cheap as a manufacturing product that one might almost describe it as the product of the wizard's wand. The hope of the world lies in industrial alcohol. Let us be alive to that fact and see to it that the Government duly recognizes it. A few years ago it was discovered that peat could be made into a fertilizer. I wrote to the department then, some five years ago, and begged them not to let some people get hold of all the peat bogs in the country and, after they had been tied up in this manner, find that they were all owned privately. I believe that some steps were taken in the matter. There is a fertilizer which, as the chemist might say, by a single twist of the wrist could be made available to the whole country, and surely it is necessary and desirable that this should be done.

I desire to say in closing—because it is a matter that is very near to my heart—that the basis of religion and morals is individual liberty; and when individual liberty is gone then no religion or morals can exist. The Creator recognized this truth, and He could not establish the moral law or be the fountain of that law and compel one single human being by means of prohibition or any such device. We are to have no freedom, no free will in anything, except by the behest of the prohibitionists. If you want Bolshevism, if you want that frightful explosion of energy which we saw in Russia, which overthrew like a volcanic eruption the tyrannical and autocratic system that was in vogue there, then that is the way to get it. There was no sense in the cruelty practised there by the ruling classes. The country did not belong to the people but to the few. How can we expect a great multitude, disturbed like an immense animal from its long sleep of oppression, to do otherwise than rise up and smash everything to pieces? Believe me, there is far more of that very spirit in this country than many people imagine, and it may show itself in many peculiar ways and not be recognized as the spirit of Bolshevism until it is too late. Why pray when the policeman is at the door? That is the motto of the prohibitionists and the user of force, the man who is substituting force for faith. Hail the policeman! Crush them! Do what no divine plan ever did or could do, and you will show your human presumption, your ignorance and your incapacity. Let me say that no moral system can substitute the "must" for the "ought." In conclusion, let me extend in all sincerity the hand of fellowship from one province to another, if I may be bold enough to do so. Surely the Protestant and the English speaking people have played some part in Quebec. Surely they have shown their faith in Quebec, as well as their high regard for the French people. We are the same as they; our interests are linked up with theirs; our prosperity and our whole future, in Ontario at least is linked up with that of Quebec. If Quebec and Ontario cannot pull together they will both be ruined, and Ontario knows this whether Quebec does or not. Now, we are all men and women, whether we are French or English, Liberals or Conservatives, farmers, manufacturers or mechanics. Let us drop the race cry; drop the party cry. Let us of course be loyal to whatever school of thought we belong to; let us be loyal to our friends within reason. But let us remember that above all things we are human beings and must be loyal to human liberty and human rights.

Mr. PIERRE F. CASGRAIN (Charlevoix-Montmorency): Mr. Speaker, like many others who have preceded me in this debate, I am glad to have the privilege of participating in the deliberations of this Parliament in these new buildings. Throughout the ages among all peoples a custom has prevailed of erecting monuments to commemorate the lives of great men and the occurrence of great and noteworthy events,—monuments designed to give to future generations a proper conception of the glory of their people. These new buildings which we have just entered, when they will have been finally completed, will stand forever as the best monument to the grandeur and magnificence of the Canadian people. Now, Mr. Speaker, although I join with others in pleasure at this fact, I must confess some disappointment with the speech from the Throne. We expected to hear much more from the Government in the way of new legislation intended to solve the problems of the day. In these new buildings to-day we are face to face with many questions of a very grave nature that demand immediate attention from the Government. Yet in the speech from the Throne there is nothing to indicate that the Government proposes very much in the way of progressive legislation. Mention is made of different events that have occurred since the last session, events concerning for the greater part the affairs of the people of Europe. We also have a reference to the International Labour Convention which was held in Washington last fall, but although there were delegates from our Government

at that convention, we do not hear in the speech from the Throne that our Government intends to introduce any new legislation in order to ameliorate the conditions of the labouring classes of this country. It is amusing to read such sentences as this, which appears in the speech from the Throne:

> From every quarter of the world is being impressed, often by severe privation and suffering, the one great lesson that increased production through increased work, combined with thrift and economy in individual and State, is the only sure hope of business improvement and future prosperity.

Now, this is very nice indeed, if only the Government would make some attempt to put this theory into practice. This is a time when there is greater need than ever existed before for Parliament and people to co-operate in the task of working out a solution of the many problems which confront us. It is also pre-eminently a time for the exercise of proper caution when we embark upon untried policies. It is no time for pursuing false doctrines in grappling with political, social or economic problems. It is interesting to read in the speech from the Throne that the affairs of our country are in a very good state, that Canada has maintained a record of social order and industrial and commercial prosperity second to none. If, however, we go to the bottom of the question, as the member for St. Hyacinthe-Rouville (Mr. L. J. Gauthier) stated this afternoon, we shall find that, on the contrary, the affairs of Canada are in an absolutely unsatisfactory condition, due undoubtedly to the imprudence and improvidence of the present Government.

If business was so good in Canada why was the Government obliged, a few days ago, to put an embargo on the selling of foreign securities on the markets of Canada, and to fix the prices of Victory Loan bonds, decreasing the price of those gilt-edged securities for which the Government said we would get par? Many financiers upon being apprised of this action, have expressed the opinion that this is one of the weakest steps that the Government could have taken in order to restore the financial condition of the country. It is bound to be misunderstood by people abroad and to prevent new business from coming to this country. It will also make it much more difficult for the Government to float further loans such as they have been launching in years past. When we contrast the way in which the affairs of the country were run a few years ago with the way in which they are run to-

day, we find that the people of Canada are just as much burdened and taxed as any people ever were. I believe, as a matter of fact, that we are more heavily taxed than the people in any other country. We pay municipal, provincial and federal taxes. The people are absolutely burdened with taxation and yet the Government, notwithstanding the increase in the cost of living, which is being further added to by this taxation, has not seen fit to place in the speech from the Throne any intimation that legislation is contemplated to alleviate the troubles of a suffering people. Either the Government is absolutely deaf to the voice of the people or the people are crying out in vain and their voice cannot reach the Government. When one looks at the treasury benches and contrasts the appearance that it presents to-day, with the appearance that it presented a few years ago, and when we remember the doings of the Government within the last few months, we may be inclined to believe that the spirit of the devil is not dead. We see the Government to-day trying to do things that have never been done before by any Government in any democratic country. Devilish deeds are being done by the Government to keep in power as long as they can and to prevent the people from passing judgment upon them. I say the spirit of the devil is not dead and I believe that the devil himself is not dead.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. CASGRAIN: You are laughing, gentlemen, but we saw not long ago in Montreal the respectable, honourable, venerable Minister of Trade and Commerce, the present leader of the Government, addressing the Canadian Club, and we heard him telling the people of Montreal that the affairs of this country are not so bad after all, and that they should not listen to those people who tell them that we should have a change of government; that it would not do any good and that the only thing to do is to hold on and stick to the Government of the day. The leader of the Government said to the members of the Canadian Club, the leading people in the financial world in Montreal: "The only thing you have to do is to economise, work and produce more." We had heard that slogan before—economise and produce. But has the Government given any fair chance to the people to put this doctrine into practice? How can they economise when, since the beginning of the war and after the war, the Government has done everything it could to help the trusts and the big interests? Last year when there was

apprehension throughout the country as to the high cost of living and the abnormal conditions that had been created in Canada, a measure was introduced into this House and a Board of Commerce was created and given wide and broad powers. Its duty was to inquire into the different conditions of life, to try and set fair prices and to see that the big interests and the people controlling capital should not exact too much from the people. What have we seen and what has been the result of that board? After about five or six months trial I fail to see that any result has been brought about. Has it decreased or helped in any way to decrease, the prices of the commodities most necessary to life? Not at all. I believe that the prices are the same this year as they were last ——

An hon. MEMBER: They are higher.

Mr. CASGRAIN: And in some cases they are higher. We heard a few days ago that three of the big sugar refineries in Montreal had met together and that they had increased the price of sugar from one to three cents per pound. That is a fact that cannot be controverted. I have been told that this has been done under the supervision, and with the quasi consent, of the Board of Commerce that was created last year.

Mr. Speaker, this Board of Commerce has also conducted other inquiries in different parts of the country. We do not know the results of all those inquiries, but as regards the province of Quebec we may say that the inquiries were conducted—I would not say in an indifferent way, but in a manner that was not quite satisfactory. We have seen some companies ignore certain orders of the Board, and yet the Board seemed to be absolutely handicapped in the matter of bringing the recalcitrants to reason and compelling their submission to the orders.

And what do we see to-day, Mr. Speaker? Just before the opening of this session the press announced the resignation of the President of the Board—one of the most capable men that the Government saw fit to appoint to that position. Many rumours have been current regarding his resignation. Some are to the effect that it is on account of a misunderstanding with the Civil Service Commission, which did not want to see the Board working satisfactorily. That may be so; we do not know. Other rumours are to the effect that certain circumstances that the President of the Board did not want to disclose were responsible for the course he took. We are assembled to-day, Mr. Speaker, to discuss national affairs and to try to adjust them in the best interests of all concerned. I put a question on the Order Paper, and so has the member for Quebec West (Mr. Parent), asking that all the correspondence leading up to the resignation be submitted to this House as soon as possible, and that an investigation be undertaken to ascertain the real reasons that brought about Mr. Justice Robson's retirement. I might add that we have also heard that his action might have been influenced by supposed friends of the Government who have differences to adjust with the Board. The people have a right to know every circumstance in connection with the resignation of the President to see whether such resignation was, if I may use the word, forced.

The acting leader of the Government (Sir George Foster) when he visited Montreal and paraded as one of the devils of the Administration told us to produce more. If we are to credit the reports of the different industries and Boards of Agriculture in the several provinces, we must come to the conclusion that we have gone a long way towards increasing production in every line of agriculture and of commerce, and that at the present time our people cannot do very much more unless the Government comes to their rescue and gives them a fighting chance and fair play.

I said, Sir, that our people cannot do very much more to-day unless the Government tells us fairly what it intends to do regarding the fiscal policy of the country. We hear on every side that people are afraid to put capital in any new enterprise because they are not sure what the Government is going to do next. In Montreal people have come to me and asked what was the intention of the Government regarding the Excess Profits War Tax; was it the intention to keep it in force for another year? We have not any explanation from the Government as to their intentions. Last year we were told that a commission for the revision of the Tariff was to be appointed to inquire into conditions prevailing in this country, but up to now, so far as I know, we have not been advised that any such commission has been appointed. We hear that the Government is in possession of certain information, but that information is very vague and incomplete, and is not what was promised by the Prime Minister last year on the floor of this House.

I said at the opening of my remarks that the devil was not dead. One day we

see another devil of the Government represented by the unquestioning faith and optimistic personality of the President of the Privy Council, we see him telling the people of his constituency that everything is all right, and praising the Government for what it has been doing since the war and what it intends to do later. Mr. Speaker, it may be true that the President of the Privy Council is of the opinion that everything is all right with the business of this country, but if he really entertains that opinion it must be based on very imperfect information of the affairs of this country. If that is the information given to him in his constituency, I would advise him to go into some of our big centres, where I am confident he would be informed that conditions are not so satisfactory as he has been led to believe. He hears only one bell—the bell of the Union Government, and it is not the best bell to listen to in my opinion.

Mr. Speaker, it is no use to talk about the affairs of this country being thoroughly satisfactory and the people quite prosperous, and by way of confirmation to quote figures and statements as did the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. McGregor) who seconded the Address yesterday. There is a better way than that, and if I may use the words of a great statesman who is no longer with us, the late Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, when he was leader of His Majesty's loyal Opposition I would say:

> It is no use quoting figures and statements to convince the people that they are happy and prosperous. When I shall have the direction of the affairs of Canada it will be my policy to enact such legislation as will bring happiness and success to everybody; it will not be necessary to quote figures and statements to realize you are happy and prosperous; you will feel it in your pocket.

The only way the people can be satisfied to-day and the trade and commerce of the country placed on a proper basis and so bring back that national prosperity which we enjoyed from the year 1896 down to 1911 is by an immediate readjustment of our fiscal policy.

We have, Mr. Speaker, on the other hand, as I said, another good devil of the Government—this is a real one, and I bow to him—the hon. member, the young and promising Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen). A few months ago he came down as far as our old province of Quebec and addressed a meeting in the city of Quebec itself.

Then he told a big gathering of shoe manufacturers that they would have to be subjected to further taxation; that if they made big profits the Government would try to get some of them. Two or three weeks later the same minister addressed a gathering of farmers in Winnipeg, and on that occasion he said: "Trust us; we will adjust matters so that you will have a moderate tariff, moderate protection; you will get what you want and be happy." That, Mr. Speaker, is not all. In an effort to appease the people, to keep them quiet, as an old schoolmaster would do with his class, the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) announced that an investigation would be made with a view to seeing what could be done with regard to the tariff. That investigation has been promised session after session, but it never seems to materialize. Now that the minister has officially assumed the duties of his office and is in his seat in the House, we hope that the inquiry with regard to the tariff will be instituted, so that we may know what the situation is and advise our constituents accordingly.

Mr. Speaker, among bad angels there sometimes happen to be a few good ones. Among the members of the Cabinet we find that there were three or four good ones. The former Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White); the former Minister of Agriculture (Hon. T. A. Crerar), and the former Minister of all Departments—I mean the member for Halifax (Hon. A. K. Maclean)—as good angels among the devils, separated from their colleagues, saying: "This is no place for us." Some people say that they are defaulters for leaving the Government, but as the member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier) said this afternoon, these men entered the Government with a sincere desire to render service in a good cause, and when they considered that they had finished their work and done their duty, they withdrew. Possibly they were dissatisfied, too, with the manner in which public affairs were being administered. These gentlemen, who are public men of the highest character, having seen fit to resign on the ground that their work was finished, the Government of which they formed a part should immediately do the same—they should resign and appeal to the people. It is recognized in our constitution that a dissolution of Parliament is called for when public interest demands that the country should be consulted upon a question of great importance or when the ministers fail to obtain the support of the majority in the House. Never, I believe, in the history of Canada did public interest so strongly demand the resignation of the

Government and an appeal to the people. I need not go into the details of the formation of Union Government; they are known to every one. The Government was formed to win the war. No other policy was laid down at that time. I do not believe that the hon. gentlemen from this side who entered the Union Government would have done so had the carrying on of the war not been the only purpose of its formation. New problems have now arisen. It is impossible for most of the hon. gentlemen who comprise the Union Government and who are either extreme free-traders or extreme protectionists to agree. The only solution of the difficulty is in appeal to the people.

There is another reason, Sir, why the Government should resign at once, and it must be obvious to every one. I do not wish to be disrespectful in referring to members of the Government, but it is a fact that we have to-day only a remnant of the Administration; and they do not represent the feeling and the sentiment of Canada. Moreover, if we are well informed, the ministers are wrangling among themselves on the question of who shall be Prime Minister or leader of the Government. The office of Prime Minister seems to have lost its usefulness in the affairs of Canada. We are told that the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) is critically ill and that he cannot return to his duties for some time. I want to be fair to the Prime Minister. He deserves credit for his services during the war and for the manner in which he did his duty to this country and to the Empire as well. But if he is as ill as people say he is, it is unfair for the ministers to try to force him to stay at the head of the Administration. It is unfair to Parliament, and it is unfair to the people. In such circumstances as these the Prime Minister should either resign his office or remain in full assumption of his duties, so that we may know where we stand. If he is not as ill as people say he is, he should be here to lead the Government and direct the affairs of the country. The Prime Minister is the pivot of the Government. All the other ministers may withdraw, but if he remains the Government still exists. When the Prime Minister disappears the Government falls. He has more real power than the King himself; only Parliament is above the Prime Minister. Everybody looks to the Prime Minister, not to his assistant or substitute, for the direction of the affairs of the country. I am speaking here to-day as a member of this Parliament, and I am criticising the present attitude of the Government of the day, and the Prime Minister in that capacity, as well as in that of the representative of the county of Charlevoix-Montmorency, which I have the honour to represent in this House. We have the right to have the Prime Minister with us to-day instead of having dummies and substitutes and a bunch of green grocers, if I may be permitted to use that term, to administer the affairs of this country when matters come up that must be settled immediately. When I say that we should have the resignation of the Government and a dissolution of Parliament, I do not ask for something unusual or unprecedented. All other countries that have been at war have changed governments since the war; they have had elections, and nobody seems to have criticised them. If I am not mistaken, there was an election in England immediately after the war. Not a new Government, but practically the same Government was re-elected to conduct the affairs of that country after the war. The former Government had a war mandate and now they have a peace mandate. In France, what was done? An election was held recently and a new Premier was elected. The former great Premier, Mr. Clemenceau, who directed the destinies of France during practically the whole period of the war and who is justly called the "Father of Victory," has been denied the privilege of being President of the French Republic. What is the reason for that? Because the people of France now realize that although this Premier was good for war; that he had all the capacity and energy to conduct the affairs of the country during the period of the war, his usefulness had passed; that new problems had arisen, that conditions had changed and that therefore, the Premier and the Government should also be changed. Why not do the same thing in this country, and then after an election we would know exactly where we stand?

We have been told in this Parliament as well as in the legislatures of the different provinces, that we are a democratic country administered by responsible Governments. If that be so in fact, surely, in order to live up to the traditions of England and also to preserve the rights and privileges that have been granted to us by the constitution, and which were acquired by our forefathers from the mother land, we should immediately go to the people of this country and obtain a new mandate, and a new Parliament ought to be chosen that would come to this House and be truly representative of the country at this time.

I said that public opinion must be at the back of the Government, but what do we find is the trend of public opinion to-day? If we look not only in the Chambers of the ministers at Ottawa and in certain of the provinces that are still backing the Government but throughout the country generally, we find that the public opinion of Canada is going against the Government. What is needed to settle the affairs of Canada at the present time?

The peace problem can be settled by peace and work only. The 9 p.m. peace which has been acquired with great sacrifices on the other side, the blood of our sons mingling with the blood of the sons of other nations, must give us life. To live we must work, and in order to work we must be willing and active. It is all very well for the Government to say to the people of Canada: Work; but the people can turn to the Government and say to them: Govern and administer and look after us. We must, in other words, have a government that will not have the weakness and the laissez faire and the laissez aller of the present Government, a government which, instead of conducting the affairs of this country, has rather been led by events and a desire to cling to the treasury benches and who believes that it can continue to hold on to them by its own will and its own consent.

Before resuming my seat, I should like to make a few observations in reference to the speeches made this afternoon by certain hon. members. The hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat) in the course of his remarks intimated that Union Government was a mixture of the best elements of the Liberal and Conservative parties at the time when it was formed, and that there was no reason why Union Government should not go on. That may be so, but it is no reason why the Liberal party here to-day should not stand as it was in years past and as it is at the present time. The hon. member for Peterborough West (Mr. Burnham) made certain remarks in which I cannot acquiesce. He said that for instance very soon, in a few years, the Liberal party would be a party of the past, and it might be also that the Conservative party would be a party of the past, and he looked at the new agrarian party and said: This is the party of to-day. Listening to the address of the hon. member for Peterborough West, we discover that he is, although I did not want to believe it until to-day, a very bad preacher, a false prophet and a pessimist. The hon. members who sit around me in this House remain Liberals as we were when we entered this House and we stand to fight for the good Liberal cause. I have been a Liberal for over ten years now, ever since I started to mingle in public affairs and politics, and I would not change to-day. A party that has produced such men as Blake, Mackenzie, the late Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the Hon. Mr. Mercier, the hon. leader of the province of Quebec, Fielding, Mackenzie King, is strong enough and good enough for me. Its policy that was advocated in the past and which has given to this country such years of great prosperity as we have seen from 1896 to 1911, a party which has given to this country fair representation and fair franchise and elections in years past, is a party of which every one ought to be proud, and as long as there remains a little bit of the flag of the old Liberal party flying anywhere in Canada, I shall be with it and I will stand and if needs be, fall to support it and I will call every one of the supporters of His Majesty's loyal Opposition, whether they are real Liberals or new members of the Agrarian party, our separated brothers of to-day, to join with us and support unanimously the amendment that was presented yesterday to the Address by the leader of the Opposition in order that it may be carried.

Mr. ALFRED THOMPSON (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, I shall not detain the House very long at this Hour, but I have a few observations which I should like to make as a contribution to this discussion. In the first place permit me to refer to the noble edifice in which we find ourselves to-day, and from which I hope will flow the blessings of sound and sane government for a free people for all time. I find that the dignified lines of this Chamber grow upon me. Its dimensions are spacious, the colour tones are pleasing, and the acoustics are good. The Chamber is well-ventilated and well-lighted. Altogether I think it is a fitting place for the political home of a great people. If one cared to trace the history of our race from its beginning to the present time he would find running through its web and woof a silver thread, which might be interpreted as the principle of a free government for a free people. Wherever this race is found, whether it be on the banks of the Thames or the Ottawa, you will find this same principle underlying their system of government. As to this building and the place it will fill in our history, permit me to say that I have a profound confidence in the future of this country, peopled as it is with a virile race

comprising the various factors which go to make a people great. I am satisfied that one of the things, and perhaps it is the chief factor, that has made the British race what it is, is that they draw their power from four of the most virile races of the world—the ancient Briton, the Roman, the Scandinavian and the Norman-French. We have all these elements in this country, as well as another equally important, and that is the French-Canadian. With these various factors I have not the slightest doubt that we shall develop a type of the genus homo on this continent that will be among the very best, and I am glad to think that that type of this great people will have in this building its political home.

Just a word with regard to the mover (Mr. Cronyn) and the seconder (Mr. McGregor) of the address. A fellow feeling makes one kin; I have had the experience of moving the address, and I know exactly how it feels to get up and face an audience as my hon. friends did yesterday. As someone who preceded me yesterday said, the two speeches were different in type, but equally distinguished. One was of the literary type, and the other of the business type. Movers and seconders of an address in this House in later years will no doubt search through Hansard, as I did, and as I presume my hon. friends did, and when they arrive at those two speeches which were delivered in this Chamber yesterday they will find a model for each style.

My hon. friend from Charlevoix-Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) has made a rather interesting discovery in the House of Commons. He has discovered that this Chamber is inhabited by devils—devils good and devils bad. By a rather logical process of thought he developed first the idea that the Government was in league with the devil, then that the leader of the Government went through this country preaching the devil, and finally he arrived at the point where he found that the Administration was a whole government of devils, some good, but most of them bad. My hon. friend's idea of devils reminds me of the old couplet:

> When the devil was sick, the devil a monk would be;
> When the devil got well, the devil a monk was he.

I think the words are applicable to my hon. friend and his friends on the other side of the House at the present time.

I am sorry the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) is not in his seat this evening. He directed his attention chiefly to the speech from the Throne and criticized the Government's policies, home and foreign. He referred particularly to Orders in Council and condemned that method of Government. So do we all. Every one who knows anything about the constitution of this country knows that Orders in Council are not involved except on special occasions, but in the history of the British Empire Orders in Council have played rather an important part. Orders in Council were invoked and used by the British Government with great effect against Napoleon and his armies. They were also used by the British Government in the present war, and by our Government. One would think to hear hon. gentlemen opposite talk that Orders in Council had never existed in this country before the war. I would remind them that they and their predecessors are not at all strangers to Orders in Council. The Territory which I have the honour to represent was governed for years by Orders in Council. Our whole mining system was regulated by Orders in Council. It was not until several years after the Yukon Territory had an established Government, that we had anything else but Orders in Council. In those days it was quite a common thing for speculators in that territory and friends of the Government of that day to come down here and have the Government change an Order in Council over-night, and they would then go back with a good big slice of that gold-producing territory in their pockets. That is just a little history to show that Orders in Council have been used by my hon. friends opposite as well as by this Government. The one important thing about Orders in Council is that they should not be invoked too frequently nor be used to the detriment of the country. The Orders in Council passed by this Government were properly founded and well carried out.

My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition also referred to the instability of the Government. Now what constitutes Government stability? What is the test? Is it fair to say that a majority vote of the Government supporters on all important questions represents stability in the Government? I think that is a fair test, and Hansard of last session will show that by that test the Government is stable. If my hon. friends are anxious for a further test of the stability of the Government, let them wait until a vote is taken on the question now before the House.

The hon. leader of the Opposition finds that there is disagreement among the min-

isters. Where does he get that information? It was not known to us. Did he get it from his friends of the Opposition? An excellent source, truly! Have there been any defections from the ministry because of disagreement? Only one, so far as I know, and that was when my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar) resigned from the ministry over the Budget of last session. Has any other minister who has resigned said he disagreed with the Cabinet on their policies? I think not. If this were a discredited ministry would it be likely that the people of this country would advance to the Government such huge sums of money as they have done in the past few years? It is absolute poppycock to talk of the irresponsibility of the Government and of a want of continuity of thought and action on the part of the ministers. It is very easy to talk like that, but facts are facts, and truth will prevail. What are the facts? My hon. friend accused the Government of instability and non-continuity of thought and action. What are good tests whether a country is prospering or not? Prices are a fairly good test. Prices for practically every commodity are high. Money by common consent is said to be plentiful. Times are good.

There is very little idleness. Our factories are busy and our manufacturers, that from one end of the country to the other, tell us they cannot find enough of commodities to fill the orders they have. Consequently the workmen are employed. Our bank deposits are increasing month by month, and that fact can be taken as fairly good evidence as to the conditions which exist in the country at the present time. I admit that there is unrest; everyone knows that there is. But let us be fair with the people and with ourselves. Have hon. gentlemen opposite mentioned any single thing that can be said to be a cause of the unrest? If there is a cause let us know what it is that we may endeavour to remove it. But do not let hon. gentlemen simply get up and with carping criticism condemn the Government wholesale because the Government cannot do the impossible.

I am firmly convinced that there are more causes than one for the present unrest, which is by no means confined to Canada. The cause is partly an economic one, but it is psychological as well. The whole world is abnormal to-day, and Canada has unfortunately not escaped the common fate. Any one who is tolerably acquainted with history knows, and it can be proven, that after every convulsion such as we have just experienced there have prevailed conditions similar to those which exist at the present time. One hundred years ago, after the Napoleonic Wars, the exchanges of the world were against Great Britain just as they are to-day; not ten per cent or twenty per cent, but forty per cent, and for the identical causes to which are to be attributed the state of exchange at the present time. Following the American Civil War the same conditions prevailed in the United States as prevail there to-day. And so it is throughout history. As our civilization becomes more complex, and as we harness the forces of nature in order to help us develop that complex civilization, the more difficult will be our problems. No government can obviate these conditions, and it is well to realize the fact and face the situation as best we can. We must understand that the high cost of living is not peculiar to Montreal or Toronto, to the province of Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, or to the Dominion of Canada as a single country. It is not even confined to the belligerent nations, for if you turn to the neutral countries you will find that the cost of living is greater in those places than it is in the countries that were at war. Now, these are not idle statements. The press of the world will convince you of their truth. For instance, in Spain, a country which never drew the sword at all, the cost of living is higher than in Great Britain; and in the Scandinavian countries, which sold their goods by the million to belligerent nations, you will find that the cost of living is higher than in the United States. I do not make these statements merely for the sake of having something to say, because they can be substantiated. In South America, where there are countries that never sent a man to the war, the very same conditions prevail. The unrest is universal. That being so, what justification can there be for any censure of our Government? Let us be fair, however much we may be critical. I do not say that the Government is infallible. I quite realize that the Government is human like the rest of us and has made mistakes, as it will probably make mistakes in the future. But I reiterate, let us be fair; let us give them a chance to carry on the affairs of the country until times improve. There is only one remedy for the condition that is disturbing the world to-day—I care not whether it is in the Argentine, in Stockholm, London, Paris or Ottawa—and that remedy is the one suggested in the speech from the Throne, a remedy that existed since the moral law was first established

amongst men. That remedy consists in thrift and economy and home purchase, and unless we apply it, the same conditions will exist a year hence as exist to-day.

But the leader of the Opposition, whom I am glad now to see in his seat, did not confine himself in his criticism to home affairs. He went abroad and criticised this Government in regard to its foreign policy. Now, Mr. Speaker, Canada has passed the stage of her swaddling clothes and become a nation, and the Canadian people and Parliament must cease from thinking provincially. We must think in a national and an international way; the day has passed when purely provincial problems shall engage our attention. We won by right a place in the greatest Peace Conference that mankind has ever held. We won recognition by the shedding of the good red blood of our men, and by their magnificent bravery in the field, and we therefore have the right to stand side by side with the greatest nations on earth. I therefore deprecate any attempt on the part of hon. gentlemen to belittle Canada and speak disparagingly of its foreign affairs. When they lo so they show a lack of appreciation of the part which the people of this country played in the great war, and such derogatory criticism of Canada's status is little-Canadianism. What have we accomplished? In fifty years we have created a great nation, connected East and West; established a vast system of transportation; dredged our harbours; opened up a great system of lake and river transportation; created great manufacturing industries; and developed in this country the most highly skilled artisans that are to be found anywhere, a fact which was amply demonstrated in the war. From a peace basis we suddenly entered on war conditions and engaged in the manufacture of shells by the same concerns that had formerly made farming implements. We have placed Canada upon the map of the world. Our banking institutions are going abroad for business and expect our manufacturers to follow. And they will follow. We took our place at the Peace Conference and the Labour Conference, anl before this session of Parliament is over, I understand, legislation will be brought forward to give us a status at Washington with a representative there. This is as it should be, Mr. Speaker, and for my part I shall not be satisfied until we have a representative of Canada in every port of the world where we can secure a dollar's worth of trade. If we are to take our place properly amongst the nations of the world we must think in terms of diplomacy and realize that we need representatives in foreign countries; and instead of criticising the Government in regard to its foreign policy it would be well for the Opposition to lend some aid in carrying it out.

My hon. friend wants an amendment to the Election Act. Why does he desire this? Because Quebec is not represented in the Cabinet; that is the one reason. Now, why is Quebec not represented in the Cabinet? How many members from the province of Quebec were returned to support the Government? Three out of sixty-five. How many of these three hold seats in the Cabinet? Two. And where is the other? Representing Canada in Europe. Is this Government to be blamed because Quebec has no greater representation I should think not. But they were not satisfied with that. They went to Quebec and made the Hon. Mr. Blondin Postmaster General with a seat in the Senate. The leader of the Opposition says that Mr. Blondin does not represent the people of Quebec because he was defeated in two constituencies. Mr. Speaker, is Mr. Blondin the only man who was ever defeated in two constituencies and who seeks to advise the House. The hon. gentleman who holds the position of leader of the Opposition was himself defeated in North Waterloo and North York, and he comes and tells us we should have a new election, when he could not obtain a seat at all in his own province nor in Quebec, nor in New Brunswick nor Nova Scotia. Where did he get his seat? In Prince Edward Island. And this is the source from which we get the advice that we should have an election! I do not want to be personal, but I do plead for fairness, and my hon. friend has no more reason to suggest that we should have an election than the man who has not a seat in the House at all. He says that an election should be held because Parliament has outlived its mandate. What does it mean to say that Parliament has outlived its mandate? Is Parliament elected for any particular term other than was provided for in the constitution? The constitution says that Parliament shall be elected for five years. Is there anything in theory or practice that would change that term? I have not heard of it. If there is, I would like to know it, because I am interested in these things.

Is there any other reason he advanced? The Opposition desire it. Did you ever see an Opposition that did not desire an election? The Opposition has no responsibility to the public and it does not need any policy. It devotes itself to lambasting the Government. That is the duty of an Opposition, and that is what it is generally engaged in doing.

Does the press of this country demand an election? Is there any considerable section of the sane press of Canada asking for an election at this time? The press is a very good indication of what the people are thinking. Are the people who direct the policies of the great papers asking for an election? Are the men who write the editorials in our papers asking for an election? No. Why? Because they are sane, straightforward, thinking, Canadians who know that if an election was held it would disorganize this country. What we want is steadiness and to give the people a chance to get down to work again in order that the psychological conditions may become normal.

An hon. MEMBER: And the Opposition.

Mr. A. THOMPSON: The Opposition, I hope, will become normal, although that is perhaps too much to hope for. Do the farmers want an election? No. How do I know? Because a congress of about a thousand farmers was held the other day in Saskatchewan and some one in that body submitted a resolution asking that this Government be called upon to resign. Did they adopt it? No. The farmers do not ask for an election. That is just a sign of the times. Do the people want an election? Is there in this country anywhere a concerted mass of opinion which demands an election? If there is I want to know it, and I fancy the Government want to know it. I defy the leader of the Opposition, or any of the men who follow him, to name any considerable block of public opinion in this country that is at the present time demanding an election.

What about policies? This Government, the leader of the Opposition says has no policy. Has he a policy to put before this country? I have not heard of it. How about the trade policy? I believe that the next campaign in this country will be fought on the question of the tariff, which is a good, clear-cut, straight issue. Where do my hon. friend and his friends stand on that question? Are they a unit on the tariff question? No. How about free trade and direct taxation, amongst the men from the West? How about adequate protection, with my distinguished friend from Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie)? And how about St. James division, Montreal, to-day, where there are two Liberals running, one as a straight Liberal and the other as a Liberal-Protectionist? Whoever heard of a Liberal-Protectionist?

The leader of the Opposition said that this Government is unpopular. One of the things I glory in is that we had a government elected to do unpopular things and that it has done them. Why is it unpopular? Because it took the boys from the home—some of them unwilling homes—and sent them to the front; it told the people what they would eat; it told the people what they would drink—

An hon. MEMBER: What they would not drink.

Mr. A. THOMPSON: Or what they would not drink; it told the newspapers what they would print and what they would not print, and it told the newspaper writers what they would write and what they would not write. Can a government be popular and do these things? Of course it cannot. This Government was not elected to do popular things; it was elected to do unpopular things, and I glory in its consistency. I am sure that the Canadian people who elected this Government to do unpopular things will stand behind these men who have fought the good fight.

The unkindest cut of all from the man who leads the Opposition, and who some day hopes to sit in the seats of the mighty and to lead the Government of this country as Prime Minister, is when he attacks the present Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) because he is away seeking health. Could partisanship go farther?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am sure my hon. friend would not wish consciously to misrepresent my attitude. If my remarks yesterday were in any way capable of the interpretation which he is placing upon them, or if by any turn they would lend themselves to such an interpretation, I am extremely sorry. Nothing was further from my thought than that I should reflect in any way on the Prime Minister. When I spoke of the desirablility of the Prime Minister being in his seat to speak of matters of policy, I had reference to the principles underlying parliamentary government. I was speaking of the desirability if possible of having the leader of the Government in the House to deal with matters of public policy. The reference was followed immediately by a remark in regard to the Prime

Minister's health in which I said that I shared the feeling of regret of everyone in the House that the Prime Minister was not able to take his seat. I was glad to-day to hear that the Prime Minister is so much better that he hopes to be back in this House again before very long. I cannot be too emphatic in saying that any reference that was made to the Prime Minister in that connection was made to the office of the Prime Minister and not to Sir Robert Borden who happens unfortunately to be prevented from being in the House at this time.

Mr. A. THOMPSON: I am not only glad to give my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie King) an opportunity of making that explanation, but I am extremely glad to hear it from his own lips. My hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) in extenuation of the impression that had been made by the leader of the Opposition yesterday took occasion this afternoon to refer to the incident. I do not wish to impugn the motives of any man or to put wrong words in his mouth, but I have looked at the resolution and I am going to read one or two words from it. I accept without reservation the statement of my hon. friend, but in justice to myself I desire to quote this sentence. In the amendment which my hon. friend moved and which my hon. friend from Cape Breton seconded he regretted the "protracted absence of the Prime Minister, the widely accepted belief that it is not his intention to return to the duties of his office." I took it from that that he was not expected to return by my hon. friend and his friends and that they were trying to force him out of public life. I felt indignant, but I am glad to have the explanation from my hon. friend and I accept it. I hope the right hon. the Prime Minister will return soon in the full flush of health. Of the Prime Ministers who led Governments from the beginning of this war in other belligerent and allied countries, in so far as I know, there were only two living and in office at the end of the war and of these two one has since died. I refer to General Botha, the Prime Minister of South Africa. The other man is the Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden, our Prime Minister, who has carried a giant's load all these years, and who now, after four or five years of Herculean effort, is broken in health and has gone away for a brief respite from the onerous duties which bear heavily upon him as Prime Minister of this country. I am sure that I voice the sentiments of hon. members on both sides, Mr. Speaker, when I express the hope that he will return, and return in good health this session. But whether he does or not, I am satisfied that the great majority of our people hope that he will stay away until his health is completely restored.

Now, Mr. Speaker, whether this Government wins or loses in the next campaign is in the lap of the gods, but whatever happens I am satisfied, as one of the members of this House and as a supporter of this Government, that Union Government has justified its existence. And, furthermore, I believe that when the work of this Government has been properly placed before the people it will stand a better chance of securing a majority of the seats in this House than any group existing at the present time, including that which is presided over by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. J. E. S. E. d'ANJOU (Rimouski) (translation): Mr. Speaker, I shall first take up some remarks which the hon. member from the Yukon (Mr. A. Thompson) just made. The hon. gentleman fervidly upheld the Government, and it is no wonder because it is owing to this fatherly Government for which he pleaded with so much force that he is privileged to hold a seat in this Parliament. So the people can understand why the hon. member who just resumed his seat was upholding with so much assurance, if not with great conviction, the moribond Government that are still the arbiters of the future of this country.

The hon. member from the Yukon found fault with the hon. leader of the Opposition for not having in his remarks touched upon the tariff question. My experience in public life has been short, still it seems to me that the Government, not the opposition, is called upon to draw up a political program. Last session, the Government named a commission which was to investigate tariff matters. The commission was to report so that the question could be settled during this session. In the Speech from the Throne there is nothing to show that the commission has done anything. Like every commission created by this Government, that commission did nothing and nothing has been put before the cabinet. As I said, it is the duty of the Government to outline a policy, and the leader of the Opposition is not bound to show his hand. While touring the country and specially the Maritime provinces, the leader of the Opposition had occasion to state his policy in

that connection, and that policy is known not only to the members of this House, but to the whole country. When the Government sees fit to raise that question, the leader of the Opposition and all those who are proud to follow his lead will be here to uphold the Liberal programme which always was that of the people and opposed to the program of trusts and combines which is that of the Government now swaying the destinies of Canada.

The hon. member from the Yukon said that the leader of the Opposition regretted that the province of Quebec was unrepresented in the Canadian ministry. Sir, that province is not represented, and somuch the better. For my part, I venture to state that I do not wish that the province of Quebec should have representatives in such an administration. It will be represented when the people is called upon to bring the Government to trial and when a Liberal administration rules this country. At that time, when the people has faith in the Government, when the country is led by honest and enlightened men who do not wage their political battles against the province of Quebec, who do not make the most of racial and religious prejudices in order to remain in power, we shall be proud of seeing representatives of that province in such a Government.

From 1896 until 1911, the province of Quebec was represented, and legally represented, in the Canadian administration, for we had as leader of this country the greatest man who ever lived in Canada, the one who has departed and whose memory shall live forever, the one who inspires the present leader of the Liberal party and his followers. When we have a Government of that stamp to head us, a Government composed, I shall not say of men as worthy as Laurier, but of men who strictly adhere to his political principles, his respect for every race and every creed, of men who will avoid offending not only the one province, but any province in the Dominion of Canada; then, gentlemen, we shall be proud of being represented in such a cabinet.

Some contend that the hon. Mr. Blondin represents the province of Quebec, as a member of the Government. Some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have stated that the hon. Mr. Blondin had been defeated in the province of Quebec, only because of his having supported the Government enforcing the Conscription Act. That is not the only reason. He was

defeated, because, along with many others, in 1911 he had outrageously misled and deceived the people of that province.

The hon. member for the Yukon, who is always at the fore to defend the cause of the administration, sang the deeds of the boys at the front. Now that the war is over, and that peace has come in, it were high time that a stop were put to that music which grates on our ears. The winning of the war was the Government cry to remain in office or to get a new lease of power; they should like to keep up that war cry and that the war were still going on. It served so useful a purpose for the hon. gentlemen that the war should go on. Unfortunately for them and happily for the people the war is concluded and I hope that a majority of votes will be cast in favour of the amendment so that the Government may be forced to the country. On the Opposition side, we want the people appealed to, without the least fear as to result; we want the people freely to choose their representatives; we want the country to come back to British institutions, to responsible Government; we want the liberties that have been secured to us to be respected.

During the war, all laws and rights were suspended and crying abuses crept in. The present Government was the first to infringe the law, and not so long ago, our prisons were crowded with young men who had not reported for duty, and they were thrown into prison, because it was contended that they had violated the law. The guilty parties are the hon. gentlemen opposite. Those are the men who should be packed like sardines in jail, and not these young men who often acted through ignorance or because they considered that it was better for the country that they should stay behind and remain steadily at work on their farms, to increase the production of foodstuffs, for our own people and our soldiers overseas.

Although the debate is nearing its conclusion, think it my duty to congratutate the mover and seconder of the Address who have so well discharged the task entrusted to them. But I cannot extend my congratulations to the Government itself, the Government has once more ignored the rights of the French language, a fault which has grown into a habit. At the opening sitting of the session, it is true, the Acting Prime Minister was kind enough to say a few words in French; but neither the mover nor the seconder of the Address have said a single word in French. The right hon.

the Acting Prime Minister in referring to the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition queried whether it was not a fine bit of strategical camouflage. Let me tell him that it was his remarks in the French language, at the opening of the session, that could be styled a fine bit of camouflage; for, had he been honest, he wields enough influence over the Cabinet, as he is the substitute of the Prime Minister, to make his followers realize that the rights of the French language should be respected in this Parliament and that the mover or seconder of the Address should at least be able to express themselves in French. This is the third occasion on which I register my protest in this House in the name of my constituents. It is not enough to make speeches in French, but the constitution must also be respected. The two languages are official and the rights of the French should be upheld. The mover or seconder of the Address, under the tradition, has always been a French Canadian or at least a Canadian conversant with the French language. Moreover, during the preceding sessions, I availed myself of the opportunity of saying that there is an hon. gentleman on the Government side who is fully qualified to move or second the Address in French. The hon. member from Edmonton (Mr. Mackie) is quite competent perfectly to perform that task. He has shown himself proficient in Parliamentary oratory, and is eminently gifted in the art of expression in the French language. Were the Government anxious to respect the rights of the French language, they could have, this year, entrusted him with the task of moving or seconding the Address.

From the very opening of the session, all the talk is about national unity and a better understanding; about making love and offering incense to Quebec.

In 1917, Quebec was not coaxed. The main thing was to win an election. The Unionist government saw fit to enforce conscription in order to discredit that province in the eyes of the other provinces, to get them at loggerheads with her and so to win the election and remain in power. It is two late now to cajole Quebec. They see to-day that they cannot be elected without the help of our province, and after vilifying her and treating her in the most outrageous manner, they are intent in making peace with her for political purposes. Well, Sir, Quebec is beautiful, great, noble in her loneliness. There is peace in that province; her government has assured prosperity to her people who live happy. The fault is not ours if the other provinces do not enjoy the same conditions.

It is rather late to flatter Quebec for, I repeat it, during the political campaign of 1917, that province has been used as a scape-goat; everywhere they have fanned the racial and religious prejudices and roused the other electors against her. It has been said: Quebec will not do her duty; the French Canadians refuse to enlist; conscription must be imposed upon them.

Sir, the French Canadians have too chivalrous an ancestry to warrant such aspersions, and the 22nd regiment have distinguished themselves overseas. For the third time I shall say that in Rimouski county we have two Victoria crosses, lieutenants Brillant and Raeble who were killed in action. We are not the descendants of cowards but of a chivalrous race. We wanted to fight, but freely, as men. Sir Wilfrid Laurier said in the electoral campaign that if the Government had been sincere, if they had used the necessary means to boost voluntary enlistment, conscription could have been dispensed with. Moreover, in other British Colonies, in Australia, for example, one of the most important colonies after Canada, conscription has been poohpoohed. Consequently, it is neither more nor less than a political game against the Liberal party, in order to rouse the other provinces against Quebec with a view to remaining in power.

The address is particularly interesting for what it omits mentioning. The only important thing found in it is the plan of a new Franchise Act. It is obvious that the Government are not at all anxious to go to the people, but they are cautiously feeling their way. Why should we not keep the old Franchise Act, the one we had before the war? Owing to the war-time Elections Act, the country is spending monstrous amounts and, if I am not mistaken, the government have decided to maintain the system of enumerators in the making of the electoral lists which were previously the work of the municipal councils, the said lists being used for the federal as well as the provincial elections. They were fair and just to everybody and the country had nothing to pay. But, with the present system of enumerators, those lists cost enormous sums of money, and besides they favour all kinds of frauds which profit to government candidates. I hope therefore that the Government will not exceed the bounds of decency and that if they introduce in the House a Franchise Bill its

principle will be more acceptable than that embodied in the War-time Elections Act and that all those entitled to vote shall have their names on the lists.

In the elections of 1917, a great number of citizens who for twenty years past had exercised the franchise, were denied their rights under the War-time Elections Act, because they were suspected of being opposed to the Government of the day. If the Government earnestly wish to put an end to the unrest in the country, they are bound to enact a Franchise Bill which is fair to everybody; they are bound to go to the people at once in order that the electors of Canada may choose their own representatives.

I am satisfied that when the people pass sentence on the present Government they will be anxious to appoint another one which better safeguards the country's interests, that is a Liberal government, worthy of the Canadian nation and the Liberal party, as the one we have had from 1896 to 1911, for the happiness and prosperity of the people.

Besides, the present Government have never represented public opinion. It is no use to say that the Unionist Government were elected to win the war—such was and is still their claim—but these gentlemen have no right to say that they have a mandate from the people, for this mandate was juggled away from them by means of the law of Elections in War time and of the manipulation of the soldiers' vote overseas. I therefore say that the Government have no right to say to the country and to the House that they have the support of the people, that they were elected to win the war and to save the Empire. If the Government are so confident in the success of their administration, if they are so sure that the people are behind them, why do they not appeal to the people, why do they not go and ask them for a renewal of their mandate, not by means of an election that may be juggled away as in 1917, but in an election carried on as they were in 1896 and 1911, when the people were free to express their opinion on the choice of their representatives? When the Government decide to go before the people I am sure of the verdict that they will obtain, and the Government themselves, well aware of what that verdict would be, will do every thing to defeat the amendment proposed by the leader of the Opposition.

I said a moment ago that there is unrest in the country, an unrest largely due to the present Administration, but also to the high cost of living. During last session, it seems to me, a commission was appointed to inquire into the high cost of living, to examine how to remedy the situation; but unfortunately nothing has been done by this commission. The most efficient remedy with which the Government might meet the high cost of living would be overproduction and the lowering of the duty on agricultural machines and on all the articles needed by the farmer. Overproduction is being all the time preached to the farmer; he is everywhere begged to produce and produce always but he is not given the means to produce any more than he does. Were the Government sincere, they would amend the tariff, they would modify it so as to relieve from duty all agricultural implements and all articles of first necessity to the farmer. In this way the farmer could produce more and at much less expenditure, and the consumer would benefit thereby. It seems to me quite important that the Government should, during the present session, take measures to change the situation, to lower the cost of living; and this could be done by an intensive production, fostered, I repeat it, by a lowering of the duties on the agricultural implements and on the articles of first necessity to the farmer.

I would like, by the way, to say a word about the dismissals which are at present taking place in the Printing Bureau. As you know, employees are being dismissed by fifties at least in the Printing Bureau. The reason given is that their services are not required and after these men are gone, longer hours are in certain offices imposed upon those that remain. If it is necessary to increase the working hours it must mean that these men were not useless. I have been told that these men were French Canadians, were old men, and that they were thrown on the street without pension, without any compensation. This surely cannot be called measures of patriotism. As every one knows, the Government hardly practise economy; they spend lavishly, too lavishly even. Why not keep these men in the Printing Bureau? The Government pretend that these employees were dismissed for reasons of economy. If they were sincere let them begin by practising economy themselves. I protest with energy against these dismissals.

Now, why have Americans been called here to effect a reclassification of the Civil Service? You remember that in 1911, the slogan of the opponents of the Liberal party, the slogan of the Tories, was, "No truck,

no trade with the Yankees". And yet, to-day, when anything or anybody is needed, the Government apply to the United States, when we can have here what is needed, when we have Canadians who can do the work with as much intelligence and at less cost to the country. When this reclassification was to be made, why were not the chiefs of the departments taken to do it; they knew the situation much better than the Americans called to do the work and to whom fabulous sums were paid for the insignificant labour they have performed. I protest against this abuse.

I again protest against the dismissals I have referred to, and I hope that the Government will at least see to it that the men thus turned out be treated with justice. Old men of sixty, of seventy, were discharged; I hope that the Government will come to their help and will grant them such pensions as they deserve.

Before concluding, I would like to answer some of the remarks made by the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) and by the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat), concerning the Liberal party. The hon. member for Parkdale used to be a Liberal, he bears a great name, that of a great Liberal, but I see that he has degenerated and he does not honour that name to-day. He stated that the Liberal party existed no more, that is was extinct in this country and that true Liberals could be found, not on your left, Mr. Speaker, but among those who crossed over to the other side and who are supporting the Government to-day.

The Liberal party is just as alive here as it is in Great Britain and the hon. member for Parkdale must have heard, a few days ago, of the splendid victory won by the leader of that party in England, Mr. Asquith, in the constituency in which he was nominated for election. He too had been cast aside because he had refused to compromise on the question of Liberal principles and because he would not follow Lloyd George and enter the coalition. He stayed away, but, to-day, the English Liberals who are just as true to their principles as we are to ours here, rejoice over his return to the British Parliament. I hope he will make it as hot for the coalition Government as the hon. leader of the Opposition has started to do as regard this Government.

In closing, I must say that I support entirely the amendment introduced by the hon. leader of the Opposition. If the Government feel that they have a record worth submitting to the people, if they are so sure of their re-election, why do they not go and face courageously the electors? Why do they not ask the Governor General for the dissolution of Parliament, in order to submit immediately their political record to the people? Personally, I am anxious for it, because we would be able to again demonstrate to the people of Canada that the hope and future welfare of this country are still with the Liberal party and the leader it selected in the great convention, held in August 1919. That convention at which the hon. member for Prince was elected as leader, was really democratic, because all the different parts of the country were represented thereat.

With so distinguished a leader, a loyal disciple of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the bearer of a great name, and a descendant of a proud and noble stock, I am convinced that when we shall go before the people, they will recognize their true friends once more and place at the head of the country the eminent leader of the Liberal party, who, I am sure, will do justice to the Province of Quebec and restore in our country the happiness and prosperity which we emjoyed from 1896 to 1911.

On motion of Mr. L. J. Papineau (Beauharnois), the debate was adjourned.

BOARD OF COMMERCE—RESIGNATION OF JUDGE ROBSON.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the House, I desire to lay certain documents on the Table.

Mr. SPEAKER: Sir George Foster desires, with the unanimous consent of the House, to lay certain documents on the Table.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I lay on the Table copies of communications that passed between myself and the Chairman of the Board of Commerce in connection with the resignation of the chairman. The correspondence is as follows:

Board of Commerce of Canada.

Ottawa, 23rd February, 1920.

My Dear Sir George,

It is impossible for me to continue further in the office of Chief Commissioner of the Board of Commerce. I trust the Government will select a successor at an early date. This may be treated as a formal resignation if you so wish or I will send a more formal document.

As I previously informed you I could not see my way to removing my home to Ottawa and I am under the necessity of returning to

Winnipeg at once. Under these circumstances I should make way for another appointment.

Sincerely yours,
H. A. Robson.

The Right Hon.
Sir George E. Foster, P.C., G.C.M.G.

Board of Commerce of Canada.
Ottawa, February 23, 1920.

The Rt. Honourable
Sir George E. Foster, P.C., G.C.M.G.,
Ottawa.

My dear Sir George,

My short experience on the Board of Commerce in the administration of The Combines and Fair Prices Act, has led me to views which make it improper for me to hold a position on that Board. The fact is that I am out of sympathy with the Act, and it is my duty to inform you thereof.

The general idea was that the Act was calculated to reduce the cost of living. That impression was largely erroneous. The primary idea of the Act was control of profits on sale of necessaries. To some extent that might affect the cost of living, but high prices and small profits may and in fact do very often coincide.

It is only the thoughtless that imagine that prices should have been brought down and that such was the function of the Board.

The economic policy of the country should be towards high prices and against low prices. Numerous governmental agencies, at the expense of the people of Canada, are doing their best to get the highest world prices for Canadian produce. In view of this, any machinery to reduce prices of this produce is simply abortive.

But taking the Act as merely profit regulating, in my view it is largely fruitless, also because of the fact recited above, that the producer will find the highest market and the highest profit, and if these are abroad he will send his goods there. Once again I remark that the governments encourage him to do so.

It is futile to think of trying to bring down prices or profits on necessaries in view of above facts.

Dealing with it as a measure to repress profiteering, I have further objection to the Fair Prices part of The Combines and Fair Prices Act (which is the important part of that Act) in that it picks out for profit regulation those classes of producers and traders who deal in the necessaries of life. This regulation does not apply to the great number of other branches of business and occupation. We restrain and discourage the citizen who supplies food and clothing but leave free to profiteer as he pleases the man who deals in non-essentials, or luxuries. We do not touch any excessive charging for service involving mechanical or professional experience. There can only be one effect, i.e., to discourage persons from entering into the production and distribution of the necessaries of life.

There is, to my mind, further objectionable discrimination in that the measures for controlling the selling prices of the retailer are in terms fairly effective, while those for reaching the manufacurer are not so.

A profiteering measure to reach the distributing class should, in my opinion, be local in its character and be administered locally. Federal machinery cannot reach the grievance effectually throughout all Canada.

[Sir George Foster.]

It seems to me further that the Act actually contains a provision which removes the last chance the consumer had to do anything for himself in reducing the cost of living. There never was before the Act anything to prevent a group of consumers from co-operating in the purchase of necessaries. They took their chance of being able to buy. But a declaration of parliamentary policy crept into the Act, and a manufacturer or wholesaler is not bound to sell to classes who were not accustomed to purchase from such manufacturers and wholesalers. This was designed to head off co-operative movements, which were likely to make progress for the benefit of consumer members and, as I say, restricted a remedy which elsewhere has been of some effect in price control.

I might also add that I think the provincial authorities should have been left with power to prosecute combines in any case where they might see fit, without being bound to first apply for a finding of the Board. The inquisitorial provisions of the Act, while of a nature useful in war time for ascertainment and control of food supplies and other necessaries, do not, in my opinion, fit ordinary conditions and only harrass and discourage business men.

I do not wish to be understood as saying that I do not think there is a legitimate and useful field for the Board of Commerce. Great good can be accomplished by the spread of information and by careful administration of investigating machinery. Publicity itself as to the reasonableness of cost and profit will to a substantial extent benefit the consumer. He may thereby know at least whether or not he is being imposed on. My idea is that a Federal body of general character working in with provincial authorities who would enforce anti-profiteering laws would be beneficial. But that is a matter which requires discussion and some re-casting of the Acts. My opinion of them as they now stand is stated above.

I am, yours sincerely,
H. A. Robson.

Prime Minister's Office, Canada.

Ottawa, Ont., Feb. 25, 1920.

My dear Judge Robson,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 23rd February, in which you say it is impossible for you to continue further in the office of Chief Commissioner of the Board of Commerce and ask that your resignation may be accepted at once. I have brought the matter before Council and an Order was passed to-day, accepting your resignation. Let me express personally my regret that you have found it, for reasons expressed in your letter, impossible to remain any longer in the position of Chief Commissioner or member of the Board.

Yours faithfully,
George E. Foster,
Acting Prime Minister.

Hon. H. A. Robson, K.C.,
Board of Commerce,
Ottawa.

Ottawa, Ontario,

February 26, 1920.

Dear Judge Robson,—I beg to acknowledge your letter of the 23rd February, in which you give yeur views as drawn from your experience in the operation of the Board of Commerce ad-

ministration and your suggestions as to what might be done in the way of amendments to make the machinery more workable and to better effect the purposes had in view when the Board of Commerce Act was passed by Parliament. I thank you for the suggestions, which will be carefully considered by the Government.

Yours faithfully,
George E. Foster,
Acting Prime Minister.

Hon. H. A. Robson, K.C.,
Board of Commerce,
Ottawa.

REPORTS AND PAPERS TABLED.

Governor General's Warrants; Statement of Expenditure on Account of Miscellaneous Unforeseen Expenses; Statement of Temporary Loans Issued and Outstanding Since the Last Session of Parliament; Annual Report of National Battlefields Commission; Annual Report of Ottawa Improvement Commission; Statement of Receipts and Expenditure, Royal Society of Canada; Financial Statement of Montreal Turnpike Trust; Report of Superintendent of Insurance, Business of 1918—Life, Fire and Miscellaneous Insurance Companies; Statement of Civil Service Insurance Account; Statement of Superannuation and Retiring Allowances; Public Accounts.—Sir Henry Drayton.

On motion of Sir George Foster, the House adjourned at 10.07 p.m.

Wednesday, March 3, 1920.

The House met at Two o'clock.

REPORT TABLED.

Annual Report of Department of Immigration and Colonization.—Hon. Mr. Calder.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Consideration of the motion of Mr. Hume Cronyn for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the proposed amendment of the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie King thereto, resumed from Tuesday, March 2.

Mr. ARTHUR TRAHAN (Nicolet), (translation): Mr. Speaker, being called upon, for the first time, to say a few words within these new parliamentary precincts, I feel it an urgent duty and a pleasant obligation to express myself in that beautiful French language which radiates among all nations for its limpidity and which owes it to its clearness to have been chosen as the universal language of diplomacy. If, in the course of our deliberations, we happen to use the English language now and then, I pray our friends who represent the majority to believe that we do so only out of courtesy towards them and because we want our remarks to be understood by everybody. But, for the present circumstance, since we are officially inaugurating this new temple of legislation, it is proper, nay, it is necessary that every member from the Province of Quebec should express himself in his own native tongue, showing clearly, thereby, that the most efficient means of turning a right to account is to exercise the same, especially under such solemn and serious circumstances as these. That being understood, I shall now enter upon the discussion of those matters which were laid before us.

The other night, the hon. Acting Prime Minister thought it his duty to review the policy of the "tory", unionist, imperialist government since the beginning of the war. That entitles me, it seems, to take a leaf from the book of the Acting Prime Minister and to review before this national assembly, as briefly as possible, the policy followed during the same time by the Liberal party to which it is my privilege to belong.

In one of his works, Abbé Barthélemy states that "to love one's country is to see to it that it is formidable abroad and peaceful at home". From that quotation, that statement, it might be inferred that there are two kinds of patriotism, that the inhabitants of a country are called upon to give various tokens of their patriotic spirit according to varying circumstances, and that a distinction might be drawn between patriotism in times of peace and patriotism in times of war.

During the last great war there were displayed in this country two different views of the duties imposed on us by wartime patriotism. When war broke out, we were certainly all of one mind in saying that this country was bound to help England and the Allies to ensure the triumph of their just cause. Differences of opinion arose as to whether we were legally, morally or in honour bound to do it; nevertheless, the capital fact remains that we were all agreed there was an obligation on our part, by whatever name it might be called. Starting from that principle, the rulers at that time, headed by Sir Robert Borden, thought that Canada should take

part in the world-wide war from entirely imperialistic or solely military considerations, which the opposition forces based their claim upon a truly liberal notion, upon an idea which was Canadian rather than imperialistic.

These were the principles underlying the first view, that is the exclusively militarist view: The interests of the empire were to supersede those of Canada; we had to give up our last man and our last dollar and, if necessary, to lay aside our constitutional law, to rule the country through unusual Orders in Council and even to so break the Constitution as to put upon our statute books a law called the compulsory military service Act, which is unfair, nefarious and unconstitutional. We opposed the passing of that legislation because we thought — and we still think so—the fundamental laws of this country did not allow the Government to sanction such a principle. We opposed it because we hold — and we still hold — that Canada should only take past in the war according to her resources, and that an exclusively militarist patriotism was a dangerous error, that is should be subjected to and guided by the purest economic patriotism.

We begged the Government to protect our economic interests, to spend cautiously, to increase production, to do all those things in order to avoid a financial cataclysm, to prevent the Allies from starving to death. Aud we thought that by the most energetic use of our resources so as to procure food and munitions to the Allies, we would be discharging a large part of our obligations as a self-governing colony of the British empire.

Blinded by their extreme imperialism, their wild militarism, the Government replied to every remark we made to them when there was a question of rebuilding our economic framework, of reducing the expenditure, of taking measures in order to prevent a rise in the cost of living, of obeying the Constitution and respecting the franchise and the constitutional rights of every citizen of this country — to every one of those remarks the Government replied: " The war must be won ", and they would not take the preventive measures we suggested so as to avoid the financial, economic, moral and political cataclysm which now overwhelms our country.

They not only turned a deaf ear to our representation, but they thought fit to insult, to despise and to slander us. During the elections of 1917, which were won through numerous fraudulent practices made possible by the Military Voters Act, through the disfranchisement of a large number of British citizens by that unfair, or rather infernal law named the War-time Elections Act, a campaign of prejudices was especially directed against the inhabitants of the province of Quebec. We were being branded as deserters, cowards, slackers, because we advocated as a minimum of satisfaction, a referendum on conscription.

The present situation through which Canada is passing, the financial unrest with which the country is seething, the labour disturbances we witness with tearful eyes, the radical change which has taken place in the feelings of our population, as a result of the anti-Canadian policy carried out by the tory-imperialist-unionist Parliament, warrant, to my mind, the decided stand we have taken from the very outbreak of the war, and which we have maintained during the prosecution of the war.

How the times have changed? In 1917, we were cowards and traitors. To-day, the Province of Quebec is the best balanced of the provinces of Canada; it is the pivotal province from different viewpoints, such as the maintenant of social order and peace, labour and production. We are being flattered, complimented; in short we are the best fellows in the world. In this connection, let me quote an extract from an editorial that appeared in the columns of The Farmers' Sun on February 11, 1920. This is the headline of this article:

Quebec then and now.

It is funny to hear the big interests making love to Quebec. No Bolshevism there. No Demagogues preaching sedition. No labour agitation. A contented, hardworking, thrifty people. A safe and sane province, where you may invest your money at seven per cent, in privately owned concerns, unmolested by Government ownership. The finest province of Canada, and a glorious example to the turbulent West, with its organized farmers and labour men.

It is for the French Canadian to laugh, perhaps rather bitterly. Only two years ago they were being denounced as slackers and traitors. The whole province was boiling with sedition. The sturdy men of Ontario ought to go down to Quebec and clear the French Canadians out. They were priest-ridden. They were anti-British. "Shall Quebec rule?" was the war cry.

And now these fire-eaters are down on their marrow-bones, offering incense to Quebec. Why? Have the French Canadians changed their character? We have seen no evidence of it. The secret is that their votes are wanted for high protection and the big interests. "Come back" cries the agonized father. "and all will be forgiven." No; even that does not quite describe it. "Come back and we will beg

your forgiveness for all the hard things we said in 1917. Instead of abuse we will give you flattery. Instead of charging you with sedition we will give you a certificate of character as bulwarks of defence against Bolshevism. Only stand by the sacred tariff and the big interests and the big profits, and we will exalt Quebec above Ontario as the premier province of Canada."

As we say, it is for Quebec to laugh. But what opinion must French Canadians hold of those who have passed from violent abuse to flattery based upon selfishness?

In this editorial, sir, there is to be found a certain amount of truth, but not the whole truth. Allow me to supply the deficiencies. The French-Canadians were not the only ones who were insulted, branded as disloyal men, traitors, deserters, during the prosecution of the great war. I remember that the farmers of the English-speaking provinces who were opposed to conscription, or at least to its being enforced in their midst, as energetically as we Liberals of Quebec, were opposed to it, were also branded by these gentlemen of the Unionist party as a band of traitors, disloyal citizens, slackers and deserters. It is no doubt within your recollection, Sir, that, during the elections of 1917, as stated by the "Farmers' Sun" that the elections in the English-speaking provinces were carried on and fought on the back of the province of Quebec and of the French-Canadians. As the farmers of the English-speaking provinces felt reluctant to conscription and were by no means favourable to it, an election dodge was resorted to and that famous order in council was passed, supplemented by the decision of Judge Duff in the case of Rowntree, to the effect that farmers should not be called to the colours, but on the contrary, should be exempted; because, as they said, national interest, the interest of the empire required an increase of production and farmers only could produce food for the Allies. Then, after dispelling the fear experienced by the farmers of the English-speaking provinces of being conscripted, they were told: "No popery! no French domination! no Quebec rule! and the election was carried. Six months later, the same national interest under which the farmers in general were exempted, required of the Government, as stated by the Prime Minister, Mr. Borden, that the exemptions be cancelled in the case of young men from twenty to twenty-three years old and that the sons of farmers be conscripted.

This was the occasion of a general protest voiced by the farmers of the English provinces, and we witnessed in Ottawa that monstrous delegation of Ontario farmers at the head of which was the new member from North Ontario (Robert H. Halbert) as chairman of the Ontario United Farmers, and the new Minister of Agriculture in the Ontario government, Mr. Manning Doherty. They came here to ask the government to fulfil their promise, to exempt the farmers' sons. You know how they were received. They were politely turned away by the Unionist government of the day under the leadership of Mr. Borden, with among its members the honourable member for Marquette (Mr. T. A. Crerar), then Minister of Agriculture.

Moreover, the order in council contained a proviso by which it was to be submitted to the House of Commons for its ratification. Three votes were taken on that question at the session of 1918. A motion was made by my honourable friend for Provencher (Mr. J. P. Molloy) to the effect that the said order in council cancelling the exemptions should not apply to the farmers. What was the result? All the Tory-Unionist-Imperialist members voted against that motion, and among the Tory-Unionist representatives was the hon. member for Marquette, the then Minister of Agriculture (Mr. T. A. Crerar), the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark), the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. T. MacNutt), the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Levi Thomson), and all the so called upholders of the interests of the agricultural class in this House and in the country at large.

I am, Sir, a steady reader of the "Farmers' Sun" since its foundation and, previously, I used to read the "Weekly Sun" which has been succeeded by the "Farmers' Sun". Following that rebuff, the new member for North Ontario, accompanied by Mr. Burnaby and Mr. Manning Doherty, travelled all over the province of Ontario, saying that the Unionist government who had among their members the honourable member for Marquette, who had among their supporters the honourable members for Red Deer, Saltcoats and Qu'Appelle and all the other unionists who are to-day the so called farmers, were treacherous to the farmers, etc., because they had cancelled the exemptions for the young men of 20 to 23 years old and had refused to exempt the farmers.

Either the honourable member for North Ontario was a humbug when he came here at the head of the farmers' delegation and was holding meetings to protest; either he is a humbug to-day in accepting as his leader the honourable member for Marquette who was the then Minister of Agri-

culture, and in accepting also to sit as a member of the same party with all those old unionist members who do not agree with him upon such a vital matter as the Military Service Act.

It can be asserted that if there ever were oppressors of the agricultural class, the Unionist government should be mentioned, as also the honourable member for Marquette, then Minister of Agriculture, as also the honourable members for Red Deer, Saltcoats and Qu'Appelle.

But, Sir, all of those Unionist members, now farmers, including the honourable member for Marquette, have insulted us in 1917 the same as the others; they have insulted Quebec in 1917, just as the others did and to-day they are also dancing attendance on us. The big interests mentioned by the "Farmers' Sun" are not the only ones doing so. Those so-called defenders of the agricultural class of the Western provinces who joined the big interests in 1917 to heap insults on us are now paying their court to us, and why? Because they are anxious that we, belonging of the Liberal party should join hands with them on a question of economies, on a question of free trade. The insults of 1917 did not move us; neither are we moved by the present time fawning, wherever it comes from.

Yesterday afternoon the honourable member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier) answering the honourable member for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat) who had suggested a provincial conference in order to try the settlement of the racial difficulties, said: "Quebec is not ready to discuss just now; it is biding its time." Then the honourable member for Peterborough (Mr. Burnham), in his peculiar bombastic manner, asked the representative for St. Hyacinthe if his statement was a threat, and the honourable member for St. Hyacinthe answered, very truly indeed, that it was nothing but a declaration of principle.

We do not see our way, Sir, to discuss with people who want conference without stating the why and the wherefore of such conference.

Is the honourable member for Parkdale going to come, as suggested by the "Farmers' Sun," and beg the pardon of the member for St. Hyacinthe for having called his countrymen traitors and disloyal? Is the honourable member for Peterborough going to beg the pardon of the electors and the members of the province of Quebec, in that conference, for having said that the citizens of the province of Quebec were slackers? Would perchance the honourable member for Red Deer, if he were at this conference, come and beg pardon for having voted for the cancelling of the exemption of the young men of twenty to twenty three years of age? Would perchance the honourable member for Marquette, a minister in the Unionist government, come to this conference and beg our pardon, of us of the province of Quebec, and also perhaps that of the Ontario farmers for having as a minister, refused to exempt the farmers' sons, when six months before, as a member of the Government, he had passed an order in council exempting them? This proposal of a conference has no ground to stand on.

There is no need for discussion at this time. The position we have taken, we took before the country and we will continue to hold it until the Government, who cling to power like grim death, shall give us an opportunity of going back to the electors, as is asked by the leader of the Opposition in his motion of amendement.

The honourable member for St. Hyacinthe did not make an appeal for retalliation. He expressed our feelings, the unanimous sentiment of the whole province of Quebec. For our high-mindedness, our self respect revolt at the sight of such fawning from people of the West and Ontario. Such interested flattery is indulged in with the object of dividing us in order that they may better control and persecute us.

We have always been tolerant. In the province of Quebec, justice is done to whom justice is due; we do not do to others what we do not want others to do to us. Our tolerance is not one of opportunism, as that of the jingoes, the tories, unionists and imperialists of Ontario, nor that of the so-called defenders of the agricultural class in the country. Our tolerance is not a matter of opportunism, it is immutable. It has its roots in our liberalism; it has been taught to us by that great patriot Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who, as every one acknowledges today, spent his life preaching the union of the races, concord and harmony between them; and not preaching the amalgamation or assimilation of them.

If his appeals have not been heard; if today we are threatened with social warfare, with a war of races, with a war of religions, a war of classes, the responsibility is on the heads not only of the Unionist government, but of the members for Marquette, for Red Deer, for Saltcoats, for Qu'Appelle, on all the Unionist members and on all the self-called defenders of the agricultural class,—excepting the four newly elected of this year—who have united to break the given word, to forswear their most solemn engage-

ments towards the farmers of the country, to kindle the fire of passions and prejudices against a race, against a province which has always done its duty towards the Dominion, and which gives to-day to the other provinces of Canada the example of work, of moderation, of tolerance, as is admitted by all the newspapers supporting the Unionist government and the so-called Farmers' party.

In 1918, in the month of November, the armistice was signed, and in the course of the first session of 1919 was brought down the Covenant of the League of Nations. In this document It is said that the principal object in view in the formation of the League of Nations was to prevent future wars, and to that effect to reduce armaments. It was, no doubt, in order to reduce armaments and decrease military expenditure, that the Government caused to be presented during the same session, a Bill the object of which was to double the peace time military force of Canada and to raise it from 5,000 to 10,000 men. It meant a considerable increase of the military effectives, and of the military expenditure. The Opposition fought that Bill. We claimed that the war had been a war against war, and that if the Allies in their triumph had adopted the principle of the League of Nations, it was to the end of reducing armaments and military expenditures. A vote was taken. The whole Opposition voted against the increase of our forces and of our military expenditures; but again, the member for Marquette, the member for Red Deer and the other so-called defenders of the interests of the agricultural class in the country, either voted for such increase or abstained from voting.

The Peace Treaty was signed in June 1919 and the Government, probably in their desire to maintain their majority, called a special session of Parliament for the purpose of ratifying the Treaty. Then what happened? There were differences of opinion upon the future obligations of this country, as regards the interpretation of article X of the Covenant of the League of Nations. The hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. W. S. Fielding) in accord with the Liberal views, introduced an amendment providing for a reservation—an essential one, in my opinion — to the motion for which we were asked to vote in connection with the ratification of the Treaty. The reservation was asking that the Canadian Parliament be the only one to determine what should be our future obligations and whether we should take part in any future war and to what extent. The Liberal Opposition gave a solid vote in favour of that reservation which was essential, and again on that occasion the so-called friends of the farmers, the hon. member for Marquette and others, voted to have Canada tied hand and foot through the obligations imposed by Article X of the Covenant of the League of Nations, without Parliament being consulted or the people having the privilege and the right to voice their opinion through their representatives.

I remember very well that during the session of 1919, we noticed the extended absence of the hon. member for Red Deer, who, a few days later, came to the House to teach the Opposition a lesson of diligence. It shows the interest hon. gentlemen were taking in the affairs of the country and in the welfare of the great agricultural community.

As regards the question of autonomy, I wish to put on Hansard the following resolution, dealing with the subject, which was adopted at the Liberal convention, held in August 1919.

> Resolved that we strongly oppose any centralization of imperial control and that no organic change in the Canadian constitution as regards the relations of Canada to the Empire, be carried out, after its adoption by Parliament, without being ratified by the people by means of a referendum.

That is true democracy and the best means to assure peace in this country. There is talk of a future imperial Conference to be held in the course of this year or next year. The policy of the Liberal party is that none of the decisions which may be made by the Conference shall be carried out unless they are approved by Parliament and afterwards ratified by the people by means of a plebiscite. This policy which we are supporting, calls for the fullest measure of autonomy and we shall support it to the end.

The speech from the Throne has much more to say about external affairs than of home or Canada issues. Why? Because the Government who are conducting the affairs of this country are still imbued with the same imperialistic ideas as before the war. As I reminded the House a moment ago, they doubled the military forces. We opposed the measure. General Arthur Currie, in addressing the Canadian Mining Institute in Vancouver, claimed that if we wanted to remain within the British Empire, we must be ready to do our share, and should the occasion arise, to send at least 6 or 7 divisions to take part in future wars,

failing which we would have to leave the Empire. That is what you would call military imperialism on land. It is an express denial of the provisions of the Covenant of the League of Nations to which our representatives contributed in London and which provides for the reduction of armaments and the annihilation of militarism. As far as we are concerned we are against the plan suggested by General Currie.

Then there is the amazing member for Parkdale, who, in his speeches in Toronto and elsewhere, advocates compulsory military training. That was rejected in United States and we are opposed to it, because we believe it would have no good effect in Canada. This does not mean the elimination of physical training in our schools, but we do not want any military training. There is a big difference between the two.

We are also threatened with imperialism on the seas, namely with a new naval policy.

Admiral Lord Jellicoe came to visit this country and malicious persons say that he took our sickly Prime Minister away with him for the purpose of persuading the people of South Africa to adopt a new naval policy. However the trip was cancelled, because the people of South Africa, who are possessed of a keen sense of national pride, would not be governed either by a foreign Prime Minister—even from Canada—or by an admiral of the British Fleet.

That naval policy is imperialistic in its nature; it means military imperialism both on land and on the seas, and its plans involve considerable expenditure. We oppose them for a good many reasons. It is not absurd to suggest an increase in the public expenditure at a time when the country is on the verge of bankruptcy and social revolution, and when we are not in a position to meet our obligations, compelled as we are to carry on by means of loans which are renewed from year to year. This reason is sufficient in itself. Again I submit that this naval policy is an absurdity under the present circumstances and the Government would do well to abandon their project rather than playing into the hands of the English imperialists and of the profiteers who are interested in the shipbuilding industry.

As to the question of economic imperialism, the House will allow me to defer my observations on that subject until the discussion of the Budget.

Canada fought four years to secure peace. Do we enjoy that peace which we were long-

ing for? What is the policy adopted by the Government to secure and preserve a real peace which is so essential to the progress and to the mental, moral and material prosperity of our dear country? Was it based upon the eternal principles of liberty, justice and charity like any social policy ought to be? Not at all. The Governmeent, in framing their policy, were the slaves of "plutocratic barbarism" and "socialistic barbarism," which are friends and foes at the same time and, though they seem to fight against one another, agree very well to exploit the consumers and to increase the cost of living. The Government have been constantly and faithfully feeding these two kinds of barbarism. They kept in the wake of the "Profiteers" and the "rioters," to use the forceful expression of Maurras of the Action Française.

In the first place, let us take the tax exemption on Victory bonds which was taken off only last year. That exemption was intended to benefit the big capitalists at the expense of the great labouring and agricultural masses, of those who toil and suffer. The same capitalists who exacted from the workers and farmers the sacrifice of their lives were the first to fail in their duty, as far as financial aid to the country was concerned. They were the first to beg the Government to exempt them from paying their share of the war expenses. The result of that nefarious policy is that every year there is about fifteen hundred million dollars' worth of incomes which escape taxation. The Liberal party had to fight for two years before we succeeded in having that crying injustice removed. Therefore, I was right in stating, at least as far as that is concerned, that the Government were the slaves of the profiteers of this country.

At the last session, which was supposed to have been called for the sole purpose of ratifying the Peace Treaty—as intimated in the speech from the Throne—the Government introduced in the dying days of that session and quite unexpectedly, a considerable Bill for the purchase of the Grand Trunk railway. We opposed that Bill very strongly, for the following reasons which we gave out at the time: The Bill is to benefit the English investors, i.e., the capitalists, at the expense of the Canadian ratepayers, and will cost this country hundreds of millions. According to the statement made by the hon. the Minister of the Interior, we are assuming obligations which amounted to $707,929,817 in 1918, besides what we shall have to pay for the common and preferential stock of the company. It increases our debt

which is already well above our means, specially if the present Government continues to support the profiteers, regardless of our national resources, which, I am glad to say, are inexhaustible.

That policy will also result in the increasing of our annual deficits, notwithstanding the fact that every year, when the time comes to discuss the Budget, we hear hon. members on the opposite side of the House and the members of the Government say: "Where shall we take the money, where will it come from?"

And these hon. gentlemen, who are always at a loss how to make both ends meet, that expenses and income may balance each other, are in a great hurry to saddle the country with a new undertaking which is bound, from the Government's own admission, to pile up yearly deficits.

Another ground on which we opposed that policy is that it was a further step towards nationalization of public services or State ownership, a socialist principle of German origin which has resulted in destroying competency, responsibilities and any sense of personal interest in administration and in encouraging extravagance.

To quote Sir Herbert Samuel, in any public undertaking socialized or nationalized, either the charges are fixed at a rate exceeding the cost price, and then it is an invisible tax, which is levied on every consumer, and at the same time the most burdensome tax, inasmuch as it is borne by ways of communication, by systems of freight and passenger transportation, or else they fall below the cost price, and in that case they are an invisible subsidy. This outright nationalization of public services has proved a dismal failure in the United States, and no later than March 1 last, after a Bill had been passed by Congress and Senate, the railway companies were handed over to their private owners, while all State control came to an end. The State ownership principle is strongly opposed by the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Lloyd George, at least as far as the nationalization of mines is concerned, and that great patriot, Mr. Asquith, at his recent election at Paisley, the issue of which contest was a signal victory for him, emphatically condemned State ownership and more particularly the nationalization of coal mines.

Even in France, where are to be found State-operated railway companies and other railways operated by private companies, a recent experience shows that the ratio of losses on operating expenditures as compared with earnings, was higher with State-owned companies than with those under private ownership. This goes to show that when a public interest railway is operated by the State, there is waste and extravagance and inefficiency. Nowadays in France, Socialists, who are the outstanding exponents of State ownership, are becoming somewhat lukewarm in advocating this system, and Mr. Millerand, the new Prime Minister of France, who is a Socialist leader, made, on January 22, 1920, before the House of Representatives, the following statement:

> The condition of its budgets now forbids the State, regardless of our doctrinal predilictions, exclusively to assume outlay on larger public works indispensable to the development of national wealth.
>
> The development of such works is to be secured through a formula which renders the State, controller and part benefit-sharer, a partner with the interested collectivities and private initiative, which to larger extent than ever must be fostered and encouraged.

What follows from such a statement, Sir? That even in countries with an advanced school of thought, the conclusion reached, from experience, is that it is better to encourage private initiative than to nationalize public services, the more so at a time when currency is depreciated and public finances are so crippled and strained almost to the breaking point.

Were I allowed to put on record my own views in this connection, I should suggest that the Government accept as a basis of its policy in railway matters the principles set forth in a work entitled: "L'Avenir de la France"—The Future of France:

> Legislators, says the author, should not aim at framing a programme squaring with political formulas, but should endeavour to obtain maximum yields; the State should visualize commercial results. The operating earnings and their consequences so far as the increase of collective well-being and national wealth is concerned, ought to warrant the State in controlling private initiative. Therefore, we do not coincide in the views held by certain political men who want the State forcibly to proceed to the repurchase of railway companies. Quite the contrary, an extension of charters is the system which seems to be required, against a rental paid by the companies to the State, under the obligation for the former to improve their systems, their operating methods, and possibly by imposing benefit-sharing for the future.

Such is the principle which, in my opinion, should be adopted.

Another fact which shows the trend of opinion among members of Union Government towards socialism is the principle acted on in the classification of the Civil Service: same work, same salary. It is a socialist doctrine which ignores the fact that

qualification for work and co-ordination being quite different in men, the earning power is of necessity different in each individual. Moreover, that method tends to abolish initiative, to encourage routine work and to create an injustice toward those who are better qualified and who, on account of their ability, are producing the most. In fact, the work becomes purely material instead of intellectual. Instead of following the principles as set out in the labour clauses of the Peace Treaty, instead of treating men as human beings and of proportioning their reward to the efforts produced by their intelligence, which is the first and main factor of all our actions, they regard them as mere machines by giving them a uniform status. They say: "For the same kind of work you shall receive the same amount of remuneration, regardless of your qualifications, technical knowledge or special studies." That is the socialist principle which has been introduced in the legislation of this country by the present Government.

We are complaining of the people deserting the land. They say the farms are idle, that agriculture has divorced from modern life and that the young people are leaving the country to go and live in the cities where they become intoxicated with various poisons. There undoubtedly exists a social plague, a moral disease which nobody can deny; it is evidenced by the census figures. What did the Government do to remedy that situation? All they did during the war was to enlist the farmers and their sons, with the support of the hon. members for Marquette and Red Deer, and to let the munition workers earn large wages in their manufactures. That is what happened. The Government saw to it that the farmers sacrificed their lives, being supported in that policy by the members for Marquette and Red Deer and all the so-called defenders of the agricultural class, but they did not exact the same sacrifice from the workingmen. They said to the farmers: "You shall go to the trenches and earn $1.10 a day," and to the workingmen: "Go to the cities, enjoy all the advantages and earn remarkably big wages, much bigger than you ever earned before." That is one of the principal causes of the desertion of the land, namely the adoption by the Government of a shameful and unjust policy for two different classes of the community.

They made city life one of comfort, and they intend to make it still more comfortable. How will they do it? The hon.

President of the Privy Council went to Washington, where he fought with indomitable energy in favour of the adoption of the principle of the eight-hour day. Has the hon. gentleman forgotten that there is a universal law which is as old as the world itself and which provides for the increasing of national wealth, the intensification of production and the reduction of the burden of national indebtedness. We shall have the very opposite result if we adopt the principle of the eight-hour day, and there will be a much greater discrimination against the agricultural workers. No wonder the latter are going to the cities.

Mr. Speaker, if, as unanimously proclaimed, we are enjoying in the province of Quebec to-day greater prosperity than the other provinces, if we have peace, order and harmony, it is because our people have been used by the teachings of the school and the church, to practise the great and eternal laws of work and sacrifice. It is because the people on our farms are not afraid to work effectively to reap from the fertile soil of the province of Quebec its maximum of production. It is because the workers in our cities do not hesitate to follow the teachings of the most competent religious authorities which command them to respect the rights of their fellow-citizens and to fulfil their civic duties properly.

That may be considered as a somewhat doctrinal and religious argument; but, no matter, I agree with those who assert that you must not worship God at home and then forswear Him in public. I contend that a man in public life who is thoughtful of his responsibilities, must adopt the same course in Parliament, on the hustings and in private life, always and everywhere.

We are suffering from another social disease: Luxury. To-day, nobody wants to work; they all wish to enjoy the pleasures of life, and they are all anxious to become rich. The president of Queen's University of Kingston, in an address which he delivered recently, said that the people of Canada were sinking into materialism and that you could hear of nothing else but money, and money all the time.

If we want to carry out this work of social and christian regeneration of our country, we must discard that materialism.

There appeared in the columns of a Quebec newspaper, on February 16, of this year a striking article, under this heading:

> There will be improvement all round when . . in these times of stress when the shrewdest minds are despairing of the future of the country, good sense is here to set our minds at

rest, on condition that we do its bidding. And do you know what good sense would tell us, were it questioned as to how the alarming situation of the present times could be remedied? Good sense would tell us that things in general will improve:

When there will be more alarm clocks in our homes than jewellery;

When there will be more flannel petticoats than silken skirts;

When there will be found at home more slippers than fancy shoes;

When there will be more smock frocks or over-alls than fancy dresses;

When there will be more aprons and fewer decolletes;

When there will be fewer people in shops and more tillers of the soil on the farms;

When less time will be devoted to moving pictures and theatres and a little more to work at home;

When "more cows" will be kept on the farm, and there will be fewer pianos in our homes, as remarked one day by Dr. Grignon, an agricultural lecturer;

When there will be a larger number of producers than of consumers;

When people will learn how to bend their energies toward their task, and will entertain a lesser dread of labour;

When people will devote more attention to making deposits in savings banks, instead of squandering their money on trifles.

When people will be able and willing to make sacrifices and deprive themselves, instead of indulging in extravagant expenditures;

When they will realize that idleness is the mother of poverty, and work the parent of wealth;

When they will pause to ponder that this racing towards the abyss has but one issue, at the end of the trail, that is the abyss itself;

When people will set about acting on the principles of Christianity, and a little less over the principles of paganism.

When classes will have a clearer notion of solidarity and social duty.

Mr. Speaker, were those suggestions lived up to, I am convinced that many difficulties we have to grapple with to-day would be bridged over and settled; I have not the least doubt that this seething unrest would soon be on the wane; that every one would faithfully discharge his every day duties and work not only in his own interest, but also in the general interest of the country.

The hon. member for Parkdale told us yesterday, with his wonted flow of words: "I was astounded, when I joined the Unionist party, to meet there so many radicals; it is remarkable how many men with extreme ideas are to be found in that party." May I be allowed to refer for a moment to the etymological definition given by a French journalist of the word radical. Radical, says he, is derived from the word "radis" (radish) which means red outwardly, white internally and it is always found near the butter plate. The hon. gentleman is an enthusiast, a proud man, easily stirred up, who is flushed with joy to-day at being a member of the Unionist party and at being indebted for his election to the insults and slanderous attacks levelled at a sane and honest population. But it is white in the interior that is to say, a whited sepulchre, when he comes down and hypocritically suggests as he did yesterday, that we enter into conferences, without telling us what we are to confer about. Moreover his supreme ambition is to remain as near the butter plate as possible, to support the Government to prevent elections being held, as he is aware that the Government would be defeated, and that is why he feels himself at home and so comfortable in the Unionist party.

We do not want to have anything to do with that radicalism I have just referred to. We spurn those empyric methods, because we abhor materialism. On this side of the House, we are content with subscribing to and acting upon the principles of that pure liberalism we are wedded to, namely, science, honesty, charity, toleration, elevation of thought, justice and faith in the destinies of Canada. We put into practice those eternal laws, love of work and of sacrifice; we are proud and happy to proclaim that we, members of this House, from the province of Quebec, belong to a religous people, and we are not afraid to affirm that a business policy, willing or unwilling, rests upon a religious principle, and not on the worship of the God-state of ancient Rome or of Germany.

Fault is found with us for submitting this amendment to the House and contending that the time is opportune for an election. "Why, you are not in earnest, you know that you have no chance of being returned, and that you shall be beaten at the polls." Let the right hon. Prime Minister allow me to tell him that this is no answer. The question is not whether the Liberal party will be defeated at the next elections, but whether democratic principles and responsible Government are to be upheld or to win the day.

Clemenceau during the war, used to say, just like this Government: "Je fais la guerre"—"I am waging war."

When a successor to that gentleman was to be elected, the French parliamentarians said:

"This will be a peace government and the man who presided over the course of the war may not be qualified to direct the peace government." And they elected another man, M. Deschanel, as president of

the republic. It is the same as regards our country. We say: We have had a war government, but peace has come, war conditions have ceased to exist for a year. We should have a peace government now and it is for the people to choose the members of the government which will have to administer the public business in time of peace.

They say: "Why, you will be defeated." And what of it. It is not success that matters, but our duty. We do not seek for honour nor profits; we stand up, not for private interests but for public interest and we aim to build in Canada a nation where greatness shall be based on justice and kindness, on work and social peace, on liberty and sacrifice.

Mr. WILLIAM FOSTER COCKSHUTT (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, this new Chamber has already listened to several very excellent speeches. If the doings of our Parliament, the legislation that we pass and the addresses that we make in this Chamber are to be equal to our surroundings, we shall have to go some in order to attain such excellence as our surroundings indicate we are at present in possession of. I desire to congratulate the architect and those who have been associated with him on the spendid result of their work as I think this legislative assembly chamber will compare very favourably with any others in the principal capitals of the world. I have visited quite a number of them, and I have seen very few that are equal in grace and durability to the splendid Chamber in which we are assembled to-day. I trust the future of Canada may justify the expenditure of the present, in legislating in such a wise and wholesome way for our people as will bring the same excellence to bear in all parts of Canada. The mover and the seconder of the Address have given us excellent speeches, and it is not necessary that I should allude to them more than in a passing way. They have already received many encomiums from other hon. members who have spoken.

One of the principal subjects, however, mentioned in the speech from the Throne has not, up to the present, received that consideration and attention that, in my opinion, is justified. The larger part of the speech from the Throne is taken up with allusions to the Peace Treaty, which is supposed to bring to an end the greatest war of all the ages and to proclaim peace and future happiness to the world. The war was a deadly affair; but the Peace Treaty I think is, in many respects, a bigger disaster than the war. It is now about eighteen months since the Armistice was signed, and during that period the Peace Treaty has been before the various parliaments and legislative assemblies of the nations that were concerned. Up to the present time I have seen no proclamation from any of the great nations that would lead us to believe that conditions of peace have yet been reached, while we know, in the neighbouring country to the south, the attitude of the legislators and of those high in authority towards the Peace Treaty is lamentable in the extreme and is causing and will continue to cause unrest until these matters are finally settled between the great combatant nations of the world. I have been watching fairly closely the doings in the United States capitol with regard to the Peace Treaty and the discussions thereon. I have alluded to this matter already on two previous occasions. I know that I am singular in that respect, as I have heard no one else express the same view; but I have said from the start and I say so again that, in my judgment, it was a great mistake to unite the League of Nations and the Peace Treaty in one document. The plenipotentiaries who were sent to the Peace Conference were charged with making peace with the nations with whom we have been at war. That was their first and main duty so far as I can understand it, and to endeavour to wipe away war for all time and to raise idealistic pillars throughout the world was something that could have been taken hold of later on. Whether the League of Nations, which is really an ideal, and is another term for the balance of power, is finally successful or not, there was no good reason why the matter of dealing with the League of Nations should not have been left until the Treaty of Peace had been fully signed, sealed and delivered. I may be, as I say, singular in that respect, but as the unrest in Canada and in all other countries of the world is one of the most serious subjects with which we have to deal, everything that tends to increase this unrest or to continue it should be removed, and by the bringing to an end of these negotiations and the signing of this Peace Treaty letting the world know that the hatchet is buried and buried for all time, or at least until another war is declared, we would wipe away a good deal of the unrest that at present prevails. In order to show that I am not taking an extreme view in speaking of the Peace Treaty as I have done, I will read a few words only from a review published in London which I have read in this House

on more than one occasion. The date of the review from which I am about to read is February, 1920. There is a good deal of this which I shall not read, but I will read this so that hon. members may see a portion of British opinion goes quite as far in that direction as anything that I am able to say:

The Tiger—

Referring to Clemenceau, the former great French Premier, who was one of the greatest and most outstanding figures in the war and in the peace negotiations; and if we have arrived at a sound basis, he has had more to do with it than any other one man not even excepting our own Lloyd George.

The Tiger at large, backed as he would have been by an irresistible public opinion on both sides of the channel, could have achieved much, and even had President Wilson gone home in the "George Washington" and the conference broken up, we cannot see that the world would have been any worse off than it is to-day under the ratification of a Peace Treaty which, in trying to settle everything, failed to settle anything, and in the hope of ending all war has not even made a certainty of ending the only war that concerned it, while it opens up limitless vistas of future and hitherto undreamt of conflicts of which no man can foresee the end. The tragedy of the Peace is worse than any tragedy of the war. As some cynic has observed, the foundations have been laid of many a just and durable war.

Those are the remarks made in a magazine published on the other side. The article goes on to say, and this, I think, is also worthy of notice:

Yet another blunder was made in the drafting of the Franco-British Treaty by the insertion of the unfortunate proviso that it "will only come into force" on the ratification of the Franco-American Treaty.

So that until the United States is pleased to make a treaty with France, the British and the French treaties must be held in abeyance until that is brought to pass, which certainly does not appear likely before another presidential election for which the present treaty is going to furnish great material.

Mr. FIELDING: What is the name of the magazine?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: The National Review.

The final blunder was the omission of Italy, who, now that she gets strategic security on land and at sea, could have no objection to joining in buttressing peace in the West. The policy of "deconsidering" Italy was carried so far in Paris under American auspices that this may have been another manifestation of the same spirit. Now that U.S.A. has withdrawn into her shell, we Europeans may perhaps be allowed to put our own house in order without outside interference. Our first duty is to consolidate the Entente.

I shall not read further; but the article is a long one going on to show that in resting on President Wilson to guide the destinies of the world, we have depended more or less upon a broken reed, and that he, going as the representative of and assuming to represent the whole of the American people, has failed to carry his people with him.

While Britain and France were misled to a considerable extent and believed he could deliver the goods that he claimed to have, they have now awakened to a great disappointment, and the Peace Treaty after eighteen months is more up in the air to-day in many respects than when it was first written. Canada, Great Britain, and all the countries of the world are in a state of great unrest because we are all waiting for our brethren to the south to set their pen to the Treaty, to which it appears they are going to add a very large number of reservations. I shall not criticize any body, but I do think that some of the representatives of Great Britain and the Dominions should have known, and I believe they did know, that the American constitution contained a clause to the effect that all peace treaties and all declarations of war by America are subject to a two-thirds vote of the Senate. Knowing that, and believing that the Senate would stand behind the constitution as it had done for more than a hundred years, was it reasonable to suppose that unless President Wilson had with him some guarantee or some representation from the Senate that would warrant him in speaking for the American people, he would be able to deliver to the European people all that he claimed to be able to deliver? It is clear that he has not delivered the goods, and he is not likely to, and the result is that the Peace Treaty is up in the air, and Canada and all the nations of Europe will remain in a state of chaos until the United States holds another presidential election. That is a lamentable state of affairs, and though our Government can do little to remedy it, I think we have a right to tell our brethren to the south that while they must fight out their own political differences, they should not impose upon the nations of the world a chaos that might be removed to a very large extent if they went ahead and did their duty which they have pledged themselves to the world to

do. The unrest will never be settled until something of this kind is done, and a peace treaty drawn up in which all can unite.

My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) made a speech that was excellent in many respects. I am going to read a few words of his with a degree of approbation, but I reserve to myself the right of criticism which I expect to exercise a little later on for some other things he said which do not quite gibe with the declaration he made in his speech. Continuing for a moment on the subject of the unrest that prevails in Canada to-day, to my mind it is one of the most, if not the most serious question with which this House has to reckon. Thinking men not only in Canada but in all countries of the world have said that the year 1919 was the most dangerous one for civilization through which the world has ever passed. I believe that is true. We were in danger during the war; in fact, we were in danger of losing the war at one time, but never were we in as great a danger as we have been in since the Armistice was signed. What was the cause of that? An unrest, deep-seated, that cannot easily be removed. The words of the leader of the Opposition, to which I alluded a moment ago and which I will now read, are found on page 27 of Hansard:

> The war has also destroyed, as my hon. friend from London has said, much that is sacred and venerable in all our institutions, religious, political, and of every other nature. That indeed has been one of the most serious of all the effects of the war and to a very large extent accounts for the great unrest that exists in the world to-day. Men have faltered in faith where before they stood firm. Their faith in government is shaken, and in religion, and even in themselves. What we speak of to-day as Bolshevism had its growth in a country where they have had not so much in the way of religious and governmental institutions to cling to. Wherever that has been the case, there the world has suffered the most. What is needed to-day to bring about a change in conditions is a restoration to the faith that has been weakened, faith in an overruling Providence, faith in our political institutions, faith on the part of men and women in themselves.

Except for the first few words, which attribute all these disasters to the war, I heartily agree with those sentiments. My hon. friend, however, has laid a burden upon the war which should not be laid upon it, and I shall deal with that phase a little later on. For the moment, I desire to take as a text the foundation that has been given to me by my hon. friend, and I give him credit for giving utterance to one of the finest thoughts that has been expressed during this debate. In my judgment the unrest, the wrongs, and the violence that threatens Canada are so deep-seated that they cannot be reached by any legislation. You may overthrow Governments and destroy constitutions; you may upset civil and religious order and liberty, but have you got anything to take their place, which will give to mankind that for the lack of which they are now suffering? I say not. We have had an election in Ontario and the Government has been changed, but has that settled the unrest? I shall deal with that election a little later on. One of the most encouraging signs that I see to-day is the splendid Forward Movement that has been inaugurated by the Christian churches of Canada for a return to the old paths and for living again the life that we as a Christian nation have said in our churches every Sabbath day we believed in, but which we are not living up to. At the risk of being accused of sermonizing, I say I believe the unrest in Canada to-day is due to the fact that we have slipped from our moorings and have drifted from the old paths. The old foundation stones of civil and religious liberty that were laid by our forefathers in Canada, the exaltation of the Almighty and of His cause and His church, have been responsible to a very large extent for the splendid institutions under which we have lived for the past hundred years. When we enter the church to-day, and see the empty pews, and the old sound doctrine of the Word of God and the teachings of His Book discarded, we know one reason at least why the people are not easy to govern to-day, and why they have drifted away from the old sheet anchor that has stood the test of two thousand years, and will continue to stand the test if we will but recognize our duty, believe in God, and do the right. The Forward Movement has been inaugurated with a view to bringing us back to the old truths and the old paths, and I think my hon. friend had that in his mind when he made the remarks I have read. I have stated what I believe to be one of the most fundamental causes of the unrest in Canada to-day. It is all very well to ask, why does not your Government do this, or why did not your Government do that, or why did it not do the other thing; but no matter what Government is in power, no matter what legislation you enact, or how heaven-born your statesmen may be, they could not touch all the grounds of unrest in the Dominion of Canada to-day. My

hon. friend laid the whole blame upon the war, but there I disagree with him. Many people who never took part in the war are worse agitators to-day than ever they were. The war has caused some difficulties but not all; it undoubtedly is responsible for some of the present unrest and unsettlement, but not all. But people to-day are disposed to attribute every difficulty to the war, and when anything unpleasant transpires to say, "Oh, it is another result of the war." This is all wrong. There are lots of people who are better off to-day than ever they were before, and are in possession of more of this world's goods than they ever dreamed of owning. They have money to spend galore, resources which they never expected to have at their command, and still many of these very people are in the ranks of those who complain of unrest. The trouble is more deep-seated than any government is capable of reaching. As a rule, when we have had unrest in this country it has been the result of bad trade and hard times, and the suppression of the working man. None of these conditions exist to-day. Wages are higher, work is more abundant, and there is more of everything at one's hand than ever was the case in the history of this country. You cannot therefore lay the unrest at the door of the Government, on any charge that they have not endeavoured to bring about good times. My hon. friend opposite brought nearly every charge that could be laid against the Government. Now, Mr. Speaker, any legislator who undertakes to use derogatory adjectives in the way in which our hon. friend did ought to live in a very substantial house of his own, but I am afraid that when I examine the deeds of the hon. gentleman somewhat closely, as I intend to do, we shall find that he will not stand up under the glare he is prepared to put this Government under. He has applied to them pretty nearly every epithet he could think of so far as their failures are concerned, and after telling them that they had no head he stultified himself before he resumed his seat by the discovery that they had three heads. Well, it is not so long ago since the Opposition had three heads. I think they are all sitting in the front benches to-day, but two of them unfortunately have been deposed, and I am not sure whether the best man is in the lead or not. They are three excellent men and were all leading the Opposition last session, and we had from the east a triumvirate of wisdom and sagacity that has never been excelled, I think, by any Opposition in the history of this country. It appears, however, that it was found that a despotic control was better than one representative of the people, even to the number of three, and therefore the Opposition has reduced its leadership from three to one. It is with the utterances of the nominal leader of the party that I am trying to deal at this moment. The hon. gentleman has moved an amendment to the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, in which he seeks an immediate election. Well, I think His Excellency will rather smile when he reads the appendage which my hon. friend seeks to place to the Address. He will probably consult the history of the last two or three elections and see what was done by the hon. gentleman who now asks for an immediate election. I am afraid that if my hon. friend were granted his request to-day he would not be in the clover as he evidently anticipates. No; not by any means. If he is looking for a seat in Ontario, as he did at two previous elections, I am afraid he will fall sadly short of his expectations; for, notwithstanding his severe lambasting of the Government and his indulgence in all the disparaging adjectives which he could marshal against them, he will have to answer a little on his own account, and one of the questions will be this: "Where were you during the war, and what did you do towards the winning of it?" Because there are yet in the communities of Ontario a very respectable portion of people who measure a man's worth by what he did in the war and not by what he said or where he was; and I fear that, measured by that standard, when my hon. friend goes before the people of Canada he will have some very knotty points to clear with regard to himself before he deposes a government which, bad as they may be, and having made as many mistakes as they have made, still gave us a splendid amount of legislation and endeavoured to carry on the war and see that our boys were supported in order that the struggle might finally be won through the assistance of Canada in keeping at the front one of the best fighting units that were seen in Europe during the whole of the war. Some credit is surely due the Government for having thus "carried on." The leader of the Government gave us a list—and it was only a part of it—of what had been done. It was a very magnificent list which he gave to the House only two days ago of the doings of the Government

since they were in power. He might very well, in addition to all the things he enumerated, have told us what we have done in Canada in a trade way in the last year. As he did not do so, I purpose to read just a few words from the Gazette published by Mr. Robert S. White. It is an edition sent out with one of the special numbers giving in concrete form the history of Canada's business for the year 1919. In the light of this article I do not wonder that my friend opposite could not find much reason for criticism:

Business has been excellent in Canada throughout the year 1919. There has been an increased domestic trade, while foreign trade has been singularly well maintained, in view of the cessation of munition shipments. The amount of money in circulation is the largest on record, and probably the most convincing evidence of the prosperity of the people is the large increase in savings deposits in the banks, $198,525,000, or about $25 per head of population, plus a large investment in war bonds. Prices of commodities have remained high, and the cost of living has not been reduced; in fact, some classes of foodstuffs are dearer than ever before. Labour has been unsettled, with numerous strikes in important industries, curtailing production, and usually resulting in higher wages and higher costs of output. The year, however, closed with an improvement in the labour situation, and at the time of writing Canada is comparatively free from strikes. The business mortality was low. Not for many years has the failure list been so light, nor trade so free from losses occasioned by bad debts. The stock market has had unwonted activity, with rising prices for many shares, especially those of paper making companies, who have found a ready sale for their product at profitable prices in the United States and have, in addition, derived a handsome sum from the premium on New York funds.

The crop was a fair one, but by no means bountiful, yet by reason of high prices the money value of the harvest makes a new record, it being placed at $1,452,788,000, against a value of $886,495,000 in 1916. The cost of production has increased in the three years, through higher wages for labour, but there must be a substantial gain in income by farmers who were fortunate enough to reap a good crop. The notable failure was in Southern Alberta and Southern Saskatchewan, due to drought. The number of live stock was slightly increased during the year, except in the case of swine, which show a decrease of about 5%; but as compared with 1914 the official returns show a large addition to have been made to the herds and flocks of farmers. Despite the unexampled high prices, dairy production dwindled, due possibly in part to mid-summer drought. The export of cheese from Montreal was the lowest in twenty years, being 1,172,460 boxes, while in 1906 it had a dimension of 2,227,838 boxes; and of butter only 79,155 packages were shipped from this port, as against 861,400 packages thirteen years before. What was lost in quantity was, indeed, recovered in value, but the decline in this important branch of agricultural industry is not comforting.

[Mr. Cockshutt]

There you have in concrete form the history of the trade of Canada. The banks show a more marvellous development, if such were possible, in spite of Government borrowings which have been close upon $2,000,000,000 and all from our own people. Canada has been in position to finance herself and her war burdens in a way that she never dreamed of and I question if any other country in the world that was involved in the war has a better trade or financial showing than that which Canada has been able to make. Whatever credit may be due to this Government I am not in a position to say, but I think that some credit should be given to them in this regard. Even the leader of the Opposition, in his very crushing speech, was unable to point out anything that was not to the credit of the Government in so far as trade and financial matters are concerned. There is a good deal more that I might read to advantage but I do not want to trespass upon the time of the House to any great extent. This Government, in addition to all those things I have mentioned, and that were recounted by the right hon. acting Prime Minister, particularly in regard to trade development, should also get the credit for the nationalization of our railways. That question has not been mentioned so far in the debate but it has to do with one of the most gigantic projects considering the small number of people in this country that was ever undertaken in the history of the world. It remains to be seen whether the financial results will justify the expenditure. It was a necessity in any case, but whether we can justify that investment by the returns from the railways remains to be seen. I am optimist enough to believe that the railways of Canada, well managed and with proper rates, on both passengers and freight will, in the end, justify their existence and that not only will we be able to pay our way, but that after all costs and charges have been met a substantial revenue will finally come to the treasury as a result of the management which will be given these railways under a commission or other properly constituted board. I think that in the meantime they are doing very well. If anybody questions the kind of service that the National railways are giving, I would ask him to take a ride from Ottawa to Toronto on the new service that has been inaugurated and if he is not satisfied that the Canadian Government is giving a splendid and an expeditious service, he will not have had the same experience as that which I have enjoyed in travelling over the line

two or three times lately between Ottawa and Toronto because I believe the service is of a character unsurpassed on the continent.

The labour situation in Canada has caused a good deal of disturbance during the past year. As my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition is an expert in labour matters, I had thought that he would have propounded something in the nature of an alleviation for the strikes that have existed in Canada and for more or less of the unrest that has been present in the labour market. I believe that labour is more fully employed and better paid to-day than it ever has been in the history of Canada and that there is very little to complain of in point of the hours of work and the remuneration that is given to the working men of Canada for the services rendered. I am not sure but that when normal times come back, as they may come back, we will be able to keep up the high standard of wages that has been set during the past year. Labour, I think, is an important, if not the most important, factor in the population of Canada to-day. There may be those who belong to the U. F. O. who will dispute that statement and say that labour is not equal in numbers, and should not receive the same consideration, as agriculture. I do not exactly remember the relative figures but I believe that there are as many who are called labourers or artizans in one branch of industry or another as there are farmers upon the land, and therefore I view with a good deal of solicitude the course that is being embarked on by certain sections of the people of Canada. At the risk of receiving very severe criticism from some of our agricultural friends, I am going to say, Mr. Speaker, that I believe that the agrarian movement is a destructive movement for the Dominion of Canada. I believe that in my heart, and believe that those who embark upon it to-day will find it out later. Class legislation in Canada, and class legislation must follow, if an agrarian Government is going to be formed in Canada, as it has been formed in the province of Ontario, can only have one result. We have pulled down one Government in Ontario—I thought it was an excellent Government—and we have put in another. It remains to be seen whether or not we have made a shift for the better or for the worse but for my part, I expect that it is for the worse. I trust I may be deceived. In the first place, we have always thought that population should rule in Canada, but that does not seem to be necessary now. Ontario has a government to-day that represents less than one-third of the popular vote cast in the last election. I have the figures here; I do not know that it is necessary to detain the House by reading them, but you are all familiar with them. There were two other parties in the fight that polled more votes than were polled by the agrarian aggregation in Ontario at the last election, and yet, with the addition of labour, they are in power. I want to give them a fair chance and I hope they will make good but in my humble judgment no class legislation of this kind will finally succeed. I believe that to be a united people we must have all classes represented in the Government. But when I look about I see that only one class is eligible. No speaker is welcomed or permitted, in some cases, on the platform unless he can qualify. I am making an attempt to qualify. They tell me that I am an awfully poor farmer but I do a little bit of farming and I hope that some day I will qualify to go upon the platform with my hon. friends. I will be delighted to address them and I hope they will be pleased to listen to me, especially when they have a chance of coming back as they would be entitled to. I trust that those who now occupy the seats of the mighty at Toronto will loosen up a little bit and remember that while we city people are more or less benighted and dangerous, we are at the same time human beings, that there are quite a number of us, and that we think we are entitled to be heard occasionally even if we are not in power. The Government which has been formed at Toronto consists, I believe, of eleven members, eight of whom represent the U.F.O., two labour and one is a lawyer. The important mercantile community, the community of capitalists, if you call them such, the community represented by the great institutions of the country have no voice, nor are they likely to have a voice in the near future, in the legislation that will take place at Toronto. That is only one province and perhaps it will not do us much harm to have the experiment tried out there but I would hesitate before asking that such a course should be pursued in the Dominion. I believe that the people of Canada cannot afford to try the experiment of adopting a policy that will be one sided, because I believe that all our industries and resources, whether in the country or in the city, should be developed by any Government that is at the head of affairs in Canada. I trust that whether this election which our friends opposite would bring on comes soon or late, or whoever may be called to power and entrust-

ed with the duty of legislating for Canada, we will have a Government that gives every class of the people a chance to be heard in the legislative halls and that the right to take part in the consideration of public measures shall not be confined to any one class. The best interests of all concerned would seem to indicate that in the formation of any Government the various elements of our people, both religious and industrial, should be represented in the councils of the nation. That idea has been tried out in the past, it has succeeded, I believe it will succeed in the future and I trust that those who favour some of the experiments which are being made at the present time will not take unkindly to the suggestions I am making.

Because I believe there are many men in the West, and in the East, among the agrarian communiy, who do not care to see this experiment undertaken and who have said so; my sympathies are with these men. Therefore we have only to hold an even hand between this class and all the other classes, recognizing that all are greater than any one, that all parties are greater than any one party. But I say this, Mr. Speaker, and I do so, I think, without fear of contradiction, that as bad as the party system may be—failure as it may have proved to be in the past, to some extent—that the party system of Government, call it by what name you please, is better—has proved better and will prove better—than the class system of government. Bad as the party system may be, it embraces all classes in every community; and I for one—and I am considered to be a fairly bigoted old Tory by a good many people—would rather see my friend opposite, to some of whose remarks I have taken exception to-day, come into office representing a united Liberal Party than I would see any class—Capitalists, Manufacturers, whatever you may designate them. I would rather see there my hon. friend at the head of a united Liberal Party that comprised all classes than I would any one particular class with which a person might be pleased to associate himself, because I believe that a party of that kind will give us better administrative results than any class system can give.

Now I have spoken very clearly and plainly upon that point, Mr. Speaker, and I may have spoken perhaps more strongly, my friends may say, than wisely; but the matter has been on my chest for some little time, and I thought the time was opportune to get rid of it; and before our good friend the member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar), after the coming general election assumes the Premiership of Canada—which he is said to be aiming at and is likely to obtain, so we are told by many—I wish to advise him as a candid friend in a humble way, that he should not forget the little chaps outside as well.

With regard to the uplift legislation to which reference has been made time and again in this House, while I am a believer in endeavouring to assist people to live good lives by passing laws with that object in view, I have always been instructed and taught that in order to make men good there must be in the individual a right heart and a right conscience impressed with the verities of the Truth of God and of sacred things, and that we must rely more upon the goodness of people's hearts than the strictures of the law to cause them to be good. In that respect I believe that prohibition, good as some people think it is and necessary as it was during the war, has not justified the expectations of its friends.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I have supported prohibition myself on more than one occasion, but not because I thought it was the best thing to do as an exemplification of Christian duty and Christian charity, but out of deference to the opinions of many of my excellent friends who thought and believed it would work wonders and who promised us that great wonders would result. It is therefore, Mr. Speaker, a matter of disappointment to me that I read, that not only in Canada but practically the world over, a wave of lawbreaking and lawlessness of the most vicious type has been rampant during the past year, the like of which has not been equalled in any previous period. Now I am not laying that at the door of prohibition, and I do not want my hon. friend in my rear who applauds my statement to think that I am going to advocate that we should have the free use of strong drinks. I do not think that would be good for us. I believe in——

Mr. BUTTS: Did the hon. gentleman notice that under the prohibition law 22,000 cases of Scotch whiskey were landed in Halifax from one of the large liners, the name of which I do not at present recall?

Mr. COPP: What became of it?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I understood that that ship had gone down and had never reached port.

Mr. BUTTS: No, sir.

An hon. MEMBER: That whiskey went ashore at Cape Breton.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I do not wish to discourage any of our friends in the House who believe in legislation of that kind—

Mr. BUTTS: Or importations.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: —but I want to impress upon this House that in my judgment if the citizens of Canada are to be as good as we want them to be, adherence to the truth I endeavoured to lay before you in the early part of my address is a very much better, safer and surer road to follow than to enact any compulsory legislation that strives in itself to make a man good when his heart is wrong and he is swearing all the time at being compelled to do a thing he would not do if he followed his own inclination. I do not believe in legislation of that kind. I follow a Church and a bishop whose doctrines I believe are in close unison and in conformity with the stand I have now taken. I draw that inference because at a recent gathering the distinguished ecclesiastic in question said we must rely more upon scriptural truths and upon the law of God and the converting power of the salvation of His Son than we must in legislation, enacted sometimes by a majority and some times by a minority, to force people to go in opposition to their will and inclination. The result is, I think, baneful to the law and bad for our own faith; it is a case of trusting in our own works to do what the Divine Law alone can do. I put in the same category all these kinds of legislation that seek to force good down a man's throat. I believe in the efficiency of moral suasion and of right doctrines and right beliefs to influence a man, rather than forcing him to be good by legislation.

Perhaps I have said too much in that regard. I now want to commend this Government for some things it has done. I think that the right hon. gentleman who at present leads the House has enumerated enough to show that this Government has done more in great acts of legislation of a far-reaching character than any Canadian Government has done in a like period. It must be remembered that this Government is but a little over two years old, and the recounting of its acts would take a long time. Much of its legislation has been very far-reaching, and much of it has involved hundreds, almost thousands of millions of dollars, and I believe that the future will justify the formation of this legislation.

Mr. COPP: That is your opinion.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Whether it will be a continuity or not I do not know; it will have to brace up if it is going to carry the country, there is no doubt about that.

Mr. COPP: Hear, hear.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: We on this side will have to get out and talk to the people, because I notice that our friends of the other aggregations are about in the country, and we cannot expect Union principles to flourish while we sit silent in the House of Commons here and allow the other fellows to do all the talking and all the preaching and take all the encomiums for everything that has been done and make the charge that the Government was unwilling to do anything—that it would not have done what it has done if it had not been forced.

Whether that is the case or not, the Government has so far justified its existence. I agree with the member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) in this respect—I shall not discuss the subject now, as I hope to do so on a later occasion—that the economic question will be the next issue upon which the people of this country will be divided at the polls. Whether the member for Nicolet (Mr. Trahan) is justified in believing that Quebec will be just as solid against some other parts of Canada as it was in the last election, I do not know. It could scarcely be more so than it was at the last election, because on that occasion only three members who sit on this side were elected from the province of Quebec.

I believe that Quebec has considerable light on some questions, and of these the trade question is one. I am sorry that the member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) is not in his seat, for I should like to ask him whether his removal from Kamouraska to the manufacturing district of Eastern Quebec has had any effect upon his free trade notions. I miss my guess if his views on free trade and protection are not somewhat modified in the near future when they are applied to the good old city of Quebec. Quebec is a manufacturing centre, and Quebec will have something to say about the fiscal question if that is the issue at the next election. And if it is, I for one am quite ready for the fray. On many occasions the people of Canada have expressed a decided opinion upon that question, and if it is put before them again they will give the same answer. I therefore advise the leader of the Opposition to withdraw his amendment and to think it over for a year. If it should

carry and he were sent before the people tomorrow, he would be a disappointed man, because he is not as ready as he thinks he is to face the electorate. I do not wish him any harm so far as his resolution is concerned, but it would be a pity to see him make a failure of his first enterprise in the splendid surroundings of the new Parliament building. I advise him, therefore, to withdraw the amendment; if he does not, it will be ruthlessly slaughtered by the House when the vote is taken upon it.

Mr. J. E. FONTAINE (Hull) (translation): Mr. Speaker, it is my good luck to have my turn to speak after the honourable member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt), for it affords me the opportunity to reply to the question which he had the impertinence to put to the hon. leader of the Opposition, when he asked him what he had done during the war. I hold no brief to defend my leader, as he can well do it himself, but I am anxious to give the member for Brantford the following answer: During the war, the hon. leader of the Opposition, most conversant with labour questions, was settling some strikes of miners in the United States and was thus working towards bringing closer together employees and employers, thereby enabling munition plants to give their maximum output. The result obtained by the hon. leader of the Opposition, everybody will admit, was a most valuable assistance to the Allies.

But to you, the hon. member for Brantford, might I be allowed to put the same question? What were you doing during the war? You were here in this House and you were supporting, by your vote, all those who were thriving on the sufferings of the people, and permitting certain companies to realize scandalous profits of from 100 to 200 per cent, and you were yourself increasing the prices of agricultural implements of your own manufacture. Such is your patriotism.

I now wish to congratulate the hon. members who have moved and seconded the Address in reply to the speech from the Throne. They had to put forth a good deal of willingness and, above all, a lot of imagination in order to find means to praise the present Government, during half an hour respectively, and from that point of view, I do offer them my congratulations.

Every citizen in Canada was eagerly expecting the opening of Parliament. Every one hoped that the Government would at last declare in the speech from the Throne a well defined and settled policy which would enable the country to emerge from the chaos which the war had wrought, and make it enter upon the road to progress and promotion.

Empty delusion and empty expectation, Mr. Speaker, for this speech gives us no information. Yet, the hon. ministers have repeatedly told us of a reconstruction programme, of an after-war programme which would regenerate the country. What is then the reason of this predicament? It is because the Government have of union but the name; the ministers are at variance and cannot agree upon a programme. The Tory group wants to continue the policy of protection which brings wealth to one class only, whilst the so-called Liberal group is in favour of lowering the tariff, and so, in order to keep themselves in power and avoid appealing to the people, neither group imposes its opinions and the country goes on aimlessly. Those among the ministers who have preserved the sense of Liberalism and who do not want to become hopelessly ruined in the public opinion resign one after another, and the Prime Minister, unable to meet the situation, puts himself on the sick list and travels through unknown lands in order to recuperate.

Mr. Speaker, we have a debt of two billions, we are overburdened with taxes of all kinds, the cost of living is ever increasing, the people are in the power of the Trusts, and meanwhile the Government remain inactive and do nothing to improve the conditions. We are being told again every day that the remedy can be found in economy and overproduction. Economy, Mr. Speaker. Does the Government practise it? Far from it. Every day large amounts are uselessly spent, the ministers launch us into hazardous ventures, such as the purchase of the Canadian Northern, of the Grand Trunk and of the Grand Trunk Pacific; the militia expenses are doubled, fabulous amounts have been spent during the war in order to favour political friends, and now the hon. Minister of Marine informs us of the construction of a navy, after Lord Jellicoe's inspiration, which will imply an expenditure of several million dollars.

Sir, do you not think it would be more in keeping with patriotism to expend those millions towards developing the country, building railroads or building the Georgian Bay canal, a work required for such a long time and which would help developing and enriching the country to such a great extent? Now, what is the Government

doing to encourage overproduction while they so strongly recommend the people to overproduce? Should they not begin by helping the producers? The farmers must be helped, we must give them the means to produce at low cost by doing away with the duty on all implements required for farming purposes. Sir, I cannot believe that the farmer is obliged to pay one hundred and fifty dollars for a binder which he could secure for seventy-five dollars were the duty abolished. He is forced to enrich the manufacturer, and the consumer is bound to pay a much larger price for the goods which he needs.

Last year, the Government, yielding to public opinion, decided to appoint a certain commission called Board of Commerce. That board was to preclude the manufacturers and the big companies from overcharging the consumer, to preclude them from realizing big profits. But this was a mere allurement, the monopolists and the trusts kept forestalling all the products and piling them up in the warehouses so as to increase the prices, and the chairman of that board has just handed the Government his resignation out of disgust, saying that the law was ineffective and his hands were tied up by political influences. That is, Sir, what the Government has done to reduce the cost of living.

It is said, in the speech from the Throne, that a new Franchise Act will be brought down. I am glad of it. I am delighted to hear that the iniquitous War-time Elections Act will be struck off our statute book forever. I ask the Government to give us a Franchise Act fair and just and allowing the people to speak out freely. Let everybody be enfranchised. In a democratic country as Canada is, every citizen, whether rich or poor, whether big or small, should have the right to say what he thinks of the public men and of the political questions. The right to vote is a sacred advantage which should be enjoyed by the workingman and by the manufacturer alike, by the mechanic as well as by the farmer. Though wishing to make no prediction, I feel assured that if we are given a Franchise Act in keeping with ever so little honesty, of those who are now sitting to our right, Sir, not excepting even the honourable ministers, very few will come back to Parliament after the next general election.

I see it is also proposed to amend the law with respect to labour. That is most serious at this moment, Mr. Speaker. You are fully aware of all the uneasiness which now prevails between capital and labour, of all the strikes which have taken place throughout the country. As I have said it in this House on a previous occasion, as a matter of principle, I am not in favour of strikes, but I think that the workingmen are not entirely wrong, they suffered from the war to a greater extent than any other class, and now that the war is over, they suffer from the high cost of living to a greater extent than any other class also; and while they are toiling and enduring all kinds of hardships, the Government allows the manufacturers and the millionaires to double the amount of their fortunes. Is there, in this country, a single citizen who will claim that the workingman was properly treated by the Government? Let us better his position, let us secure for him better protection against accidents and in case he is out of work; in fine, Sir, let us grant him an old age pension. While not wishing in any way to worry the House, I would again repeat my request: It is my earnest belief that when a workingman has kept toiling all his life and, in many cases for a salary which was inadequate, to enrich his employer, who decides to dispense with his services when he has become old and incapacitated, should be protected by the State to the extent of being relieved of the alternative of remaining a burden to his children or of being obliged to take the road to the hospital. I know that this request of mine will not be favourably considered, for the Government is now dismissing hundrreds of employees at the Printing Bureau, under the pretence that they are too old. Such a course is shameful and I protest against such dismissals of old servants.

Mr. Speaker, I have fully appreciated the sympathetic remarks made by the Acting Prime Minister about the French Canadians, the other day; we have been so little accustomed to such flattering compliments, for a few years past especially, that we cannot believe what we hear. Though believing the hon. minister to be in good faith, I may tell him that it will take more than words to make us forget the abuse and the sufferings which we had to endure. He must give us our full share of representation in the Government, the commissions and all public appointments.

Of late years, this Government's policy has favoured the complete exclusion of French Canadians from public service. Today, you praise the the province of Quebec; you find that our citizens are peaceful and

clear-sighted. It is a fact Mr. Speaker. The best indication in this connection is the peace and tranquility which have prevailed in our province since the war is ended, while unrest and strikes are rampant in all the other provinces of the Dominion. What is the reason for this, Mr. Speaker? It is because my fellow-countrymen are imbued with the spirit of catholicism and accept the guidance of the Catholic Church which teaches the people to respect and obey all laws.

Before resuming my seat, Mr. Speaker, I urge the Government and all the hon. members to support the amendment moved by the hon. leader of the Opposition asking for an immediate election. A few days ago, I heard the Acting Prime Minister state here that the members of the Opposition were not in earnest and would find themselves in a sad plight if the writs were issued for a general election. Well, then why not accept our challenge, Mr. Minister? Dissolve Parliament and let us go before the electorate. For my part, I am confident of what the outcome will be. I remember that in 1896, the country was getting through a period of depression pretty similar to the one whose effects are being felt to-day. The Canadian people turned their eyes towards the Liberal party then under the leadership of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. There followed a period of fifteen years of wise and progressive administration. To-day as in 1896, the people of Canada turn their eyes toward the Liberal party which is under the direction of a new leader, young and talented, in whom we have placed all our hopes and who will also be able to give to this country of ours a prudent and progressive government.

Mr. FRED LANGDON DAVIS (Neepawa): Mr. Speaker, in rising to address the House for the first time in this magnificent Chamber I cannot refrain from complimenting the people of Canada upon the housing which has been provided for their representatives in Parliament. May the noble proportions of this building find reflection in our acts here. Should its magnificence and grandeur subject us to temptations by which we were not assailed in the old, democratic hall of the Victoria Museum; should we be inclined to give way to extravagance and to the adoption of measures without proper consideration, let us be humbled by the thought that much of what has been expended in the construction of this splendid building is borrowed money.

I wish also to compliment the mover (Mr. Cronyn) and the seconder (Mr. McGregor) of the Address. I have seldom listened to a better speech than that of the mover; by old parliamentarians it is said that it will rank with any that has been delivered on a similar occasion during the last twenty years.

Before dealing with the subject which I mean to make the main point of my remarks, I should like to refer for a moment to the amendment which has been moved by the leader of the Opposition. My mind goes back to the fact that in 1911, before the result of the last census was announced, we had an election which deprived the West of its proper representation in this House until the election of 1917, and it seems to me that the demand for an election immediately is going to perpetuate that, as I regard it, evil state of affairs. I think, therefore, that the mover of the amendment will not find very many western members in full sympathy with him in the consideration of that proposition, because the next census coming on in 1921 with redistribution after that, would give the West its proper voice in this House.

This House to-day is facing a situation which surpasses in its strain and stress even the days through which we lived from 1914 to 1918. We find to-day, after having raised vast sums of money to carry on the war, that we have financed this war without having engaged taxation in its carrying on; we have carried on the war with borrowed money. To-day we find our money at a depreciation of anywhere from ten to seventeen cents on the dollar with United States currency. We find ourselves faced with problems of taxation which must leave to our Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) very few nights of full rest, I am sure. Let me say here that while as a member of the party in power, I feel called upon to criticise the course we have followed, I cannot recollect hearing from the Opposition during the years of the war those demands for increased taxation which some of us on this side of the House have been constantly voicing. In the 1918 Budget I asked for $400,000,000 to $500,000,000 in taxation instead of what we were then raising. In 1919 I demanded double what we were raising. Let us compare our 1919 Budget with the Budget in Great Britain. We levied $280,000,000 in taxation and we had before that levied as high as $167,000,000 in taxation. That was an increase of somewhere about 60 per cent. What was Great Britain doing in the same year? £940,000,000 was her levy in 1919, and £207,000,000 was her last levy before the war. In other words she had not merely taken up the slack which had been

made by the depreciation in the value of money, but doubled her taxation on top of that. Had we done the same, our troubles to-day would be less than they are. Along with this let me refer to another matter. Mr. Joseph Cannon, who cannot be accused of lack of political experience said: "Creating offices is the easiest job in the world and abolishing them the hardest." We have had a large number of offices created during the war. Are we abolishing them? Recently, I saw a report that 25,000 returned soldiers had been placed in positions in the Civil Service. How many civil servants have been let out to make those places? In the main, there is an increase, a super-addition to a force that was already very large.

We face to-day a net debt of about $2,000,000,000. We face a need for taxation running from $325,000,000 to $400,000,000. Last year we levied for $280,000,000, and it is probable that that will be overrun by $20,000,000 or $30,000,000, partly because of the way in which increased exchange is encouraging imports. I am not going to sketch the whole situation, but I will endeavour to deal with some of the things that can be done to remedy it. One of the things that we have done has been, because of inflation of credit, also to inflate our currency. I hold in my hand a report of one of our great banks showing that the currency in the hands of the people has increased from $10 per head in 1907 to $30 per head in this last year; that the total amount of currency in the hands of the people has risen from figures around $100,000,000, to figures ranging from $210,000,000 to $240,000,000. One of the great causes of the high cost of living has been, without doubt, not merely the waste, the lack of production—these were first causes in themselves—but, adding to them and lending weight and effect to them, the course of our financing, our expenditure of huge sums of money representing the proceeds of Government borrowings put afloat among our people without any due regard to the limits of debt creation has greatly inflated both credit and currency. The consequence is that to-day we have far more currency out than we should have with the result that we have doubled cost of all commodities. We are not alone in this unfortunate position, and that in one sense makes our task the greater. If we have inflated our currency from 100 to 245, Great Britain has inflated hers from 100 to 285; there is a great inflation in the United States; there is four to five fold increase in Italy; there is an increase from 100 to 700 in France, a greater increase again in Germany, and not less than a twenty fold increase in Russia. Every industrial nation in the world has gone out on the same course. Hence, if we want to bring down our currency to proper proportions, we have to row against the tide. We have the pull of all of these other national currencies to contend with. How can you reduce the issue of currency? There is but one way, and that is to have a surplus of taxation over expenditure. When the Government puts out this money it puts it out in return for goods and services. Hence when the Government want to call it in, it can only do so by taxation. It can only withdraw a portion of it when its taxation exceeds its expenditure. If we have an excess of $20,000,000 or $30,000,000 of taxation over expenditure, we can use that in reducing the currency, but not until then can we make the reduction. Hence the man who looks for a reduction in the cost of goods in the next few years is chasing a phantom. It is impossible to do so until we have restored the balance and got the balance on the right side.

Let us now consider what we have been doing in the past year or two. Last year we levied for $280,000,000 of taxation and we spent about $900,000,000. We went $600,000,000 in the hole, and let us not be deceived by the fact that we borrowed a large part of this money from our own people. That does not help us at all; the debt is still a debt which the nation must shoulder. Therefore, if we are going to get out of this difficulty, we must cease borrowing which is one of the sources of inflation; we must make taxation and expenditure balance. That can be done in two ways; first, we can retrench and secondly, we can tax. Let us consider what means we have of retrenchment. There are four points at which there is control of expenditure. The officers in charge of expenditure can effect economy; the departmental auditor in his department can also effect economy, but under our system both of these are practically eliminated because the minister at the head of the department only finds his power and consequence increased the more he spends on his department. His political influence and his own personal record as an administrator are largely dependent upon the amount of money which his department expends, so he is not the person to trust for economy. You come next to the Minister of Finance. If he is not a very careful man, determined to have his own way, he will not effect economy. If, for instance, he is personally ambitious and wants to

gain the support of the members of the Cabinet, he will let them have their way. If he is a weak man he will let them have their way, perhaps for more ignoble reasons. The consequence is that Parliament is the one and only means of effectively controlling expenditure. That brings me to a consideration of the method of voting estimates. There is not a member of this House, I am sure, who has not felt the futility of our method. When the estimates are submitted to Parliament some member, on the Opposition side generally, and once in a while, under present circumstances, a member on this side of the House arises and makes a few remarks perhaps about some steamboat that has been taken off its usual course, or wants to know why some clerk has been dismissed. Sometimes these matters take up three or four hours, and finally the estimates go through in bulk, because that has been the practice for the last thirty or forty or fifty years. That is the degree of attention that Parliament gives the estimates. No man can possibly make himself familiar with all the estimates; indeed, it is pretty nearly a life work to make oneself familiar enough with one department to discuss its estimates effectively. How can we remedy this? Let us see what the Mother of Parliaments has done in order to get control over expenditures. In 1912 the British House appointed a committee on estimates. It acted through one session, and it was found that it could deal during the session with practically only one department. It was an ordinary committee of the House, without any clerical assistance, and had to do all its work within the session, and it was going to take thirty or forty years to scrutinize all the estimates. It could not get the necessary information on all the estimates and make a report in time for the House to deal with them that session, and consequently, when the war came, that committee was dropped. The next time you come across a reference to it is in the seventh and ninth report of the Select Committee on National Expenditure of 1917, of which the Hon. Herbert Samuel was chairman. The whole question was dealt with by that committee, and better means were devised for controlling the expenditure, which means I commend to the consideration of this House. The Committee, it was proposed, should have an officer known as "The Examiner of Estimates," as well as a clerical staff acting under the direction of the committee. The committee was composed of thirty members, I believe, divided into two sections, one section dealing with the main estimates, and the other with estimates for new undertakings, or what we would call subliminary estimates. There were two recommendations which must be considered if the project is to be successful. One of these is that the estimates as published should be more significant and that their allocation should be by objects rather than by subjects. The other recommendation was that a vote for reducing an estimate should not be regarded as a want of confidence motion. If it is made a want of confidence motion, the judgment of the House is no longer economic, but political. The Government supporters are not going to turn out the Government because they differ with them on the expenditure of $10,000 or $50,000 or $100,000. There may be cases where the Government would be justified in asking their supporters to pass a particular estimate, but in the main a motion to reduce an estimate should not be regarded as a want of confidence motion. I commend to the House the serious study of that means of retrenchment. It is the only one that will furnish the House with the machinery whereby we can attain the retrenchment that is going to be necessary in the immediate months. I should like to see this House appoint a committee on estimates this year. At the very least, I would ask that a committee be appointed to consider the matter and report to the House. One or two things have struck me in considering this matter. I think the House has been rather slack of recent years in its understanding of financial principles. Certain Bills have been passed providing for an expenditure of money over a series of years. For instance, the Highways Bill provides for an annual grant for the next five or ten years. The same is true with regard to The Agricultural Aid and Technical Education Grants. Now that system practically takes out of Parliament's hands the control over expenditure. It is a wrong principle, and the instance serves to demonstrate the need for more attention and greater care by this House in the passing of financial measures. We have got away from the old ideas which have brought us to where we stand to-day, the fear of the encroachment of autocracy, the fear, perhaps, even of an aristocracy. We are fully democratic to-day, but still we sometimes forget the sound principles which we worked out in conflict, and I take it, that is true in this particular case.

There are other matters in this connection which I think require the attention of the House. I cannot see, for instance, why in the present condition of exchange our Customs Department should not enter imported goods from the United States and England at their Canadian value instead of at the United States or English value. I understand that what our Customs Department is doing to-day is this: You buy, we will suppose, $1,170 of goods in the United States. Owing to the rate of exchange, these goods are valued in the United States at $1,000, and they are entered by our Customs Department at $1,000, and on that the customs tax is levied. On the other hand, when you buy $700 of goods from Great Britain, you get $972 worth of goods in sterling. When the goods enter this country they are valued at $972, and the consequence is that our British preference is wiped out by our application of the customs tax. The application is wrong, because when the exchange is running in our favour, as it is with Great Britain, it encourages exports to us from Britain, and when it is running against us, as it is with the United States, it discourages exports to us from the United States.

How far has the principle of protection been applied in this matter to decide the way in which we should treat the money value of the goods? I take it that this is a matter about which the people of Canada are very greatly concerned. It is contrary to sound principle that we should take the goods at other than our own value. If a man can buy $970 worth of goods in Great Britain for $700, he should have the advantage of his purchase, and I do not think the manufacturers of Canada have any right to say that he should not. I fear, therefore, that on that question our Government has made a concession which is a betrayal of principal. We should also give some attention to the Excess Profits Tax. The fact that a man may take out of 1919 earnings the tax he paid in 1918 is surely one way of adding his taxes to the cost of doing business. It enables him to escape taxation and tranfer the burden to the consumers. I have a very grave doubt as to the soundness of the principle of our Excess Profits Tax, nevertheless, while it is in operation it should be properly applied. I mention the matter now, however, by way of criticism. It seems to me that the Opposition are not the people who have been criticising the Government. Rather it has been the friends of the Government, as far as I have observed since I have been in the House. It seems to me that the matters of practical import and great consequence are suggested by the friends of the Government, —things that should really be done. A good deal of nonsense is talked about politics and the struggle between Ontario and Quebec, and I think we had better relegate to the region of oblivion all questions of the past. They are dead; and as we are faced with present problems which are serious enough I think more of us should get in on the Forward Movement and look to the future.

I should like to say a few words in regard to the question of co-operation. I observe that Judge Robson in his report the other day said that incidentally, and I am sure by oversight, there was in the Combines and Fair Prices Act an obstruction upon the principle of co-operation, and that it was not allowed scope for development. I believe that consumers' co-operation, and growing out of that, probably, producers' co-operation, will prove to be one of the solutions of our present industrial difficulties. There is no doubt that consumers' co-operation will be a regulator of prices as it has been in Great Britain. At present we have nothing but the industrial system and the production of goods for profit. Much criticism has been levelled at the doctrine that business should be carried on for use and not for profit. I have seen but one place where there has been a really practical application of that principle, and that is in connection with the co-operative movement in Great Britain. There profits are distributed in accordance with the amount of purchases, and prices are governed. Out of the retail societies, of which there are nearly fourteen hundred, wholesale co-operatives have been formed and these have started factories, which produce goods only for the use of the retail dealers who are their customers, and are co-operators with them. The fact that you have a large part of industry carried on under co-operation is more or less an index of needs to the remainder of the trade, and it is undoubtedly a governing influence as to prices and what are fair profits and fair dividends. The man who becomes a co-operator very soon comes to understand the use and value of investments. He has an interest in the present system, and is not apt to become a socialist or communist. He has property and understands its value and knows how it can be made to improve his position. In this House the late Mr. Monk, I understand, in 1907 endeavoured unsuccessfully to have enacted a Bill permitting the formation of

co-operative societies. I happened to be on the Cost of Living Committee last year, and we came face to face with the fact that the trade of Canada has its face set like adamant against co-operation. From the manufacturer down to the retail dealer there is no use for co-operation, and this House must therefore open the way by proper legislation for the formation of co-operative societies, and give them the opportunity they enjoy in Great Britain. To illustrate what is being done in Great Britain, I may say that the customers number ten millions of people, and there is a membership of two and a half millions. When recently, in connection with the establishment of a Board of Commerce similar to our own, the President of the Board of Trade was about to make appointments, he chose first a chairman, who from a slate, which was prepared by the President of the Board of Trade, selected from amongst the co-operators and trades unions, the men who should be associated with him on the board. Now, what greater recognition could there be of the sound democratic and public-service position to which co-operation had attained in Great Britain than that recognition by the Government of the United Kingdom?

Mr. ONESIPHORE TURGEON (Gloucester): Mr. Speaker, in rising to make a few remarks on the Address, I desire at the outset to discharge the pleasant duty of paying tribute to the mover and seconder for the splendid way in which they acquitted themselves in their task. Their speeches were unquestionably excellent examples of oratory, and the sentiments which they expressed were on the whole admirable. I trust that we shall have many such academic treats as those with which we were favoured on that occasion. I congratulate the seconder of the Address, the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. McGregor), whose début in this House certainly must commend him to the attention of his electors as well as of his province and the Dominion. As a business man might be expected to do, he gave a practical address, submitting figures which gave food for thought. I am sure that his electors have been reading his speech with delight.

It had been my intention also a few moments ago when I decided to address this House to extend some congratulations, which I believed were well deserved, to my right hon. friend the acting Prime Minister (Sir George Foster). My intention was to have given him my due and sincere congratulations upon the most eloquent speech that he delivered on the day of the opening of the House in the language of Racine, Boileau and Fenelon. His remarks were such as to commend them to the attention of every one who speaks the French language and who appreciates the nobility and beauty of that tongue. I was aware, as were others, that the right hon. gentleman could write the language with correctness and could use it when circumstances required that he should do so, but I was surprised and delighted with the facility with which he expressed himself on that occasion in language which was not a mere translation of English expressions but language which a Frenchman would have used had he been speaking under similar circumstances. I wish to congratulate him not only upon his ability to speak the French language with facility and lucidity but also because he has given an example to the whole of Canada that the French language is one of the dual languages of Confederation and which had the same official recognition as English throughout the Dominion. A few days ago in the city of Ottawa the Educational Conference declared that the French language was necessary in the future not only for the happiness and intellectual enjoyment of the people of Canada, but for the advancement of economic and social conditions. It was my good fortune four or five years ago to tell my compatriots in the city of Ottawa that under the British flag the French language was bound to get recognition and that in a few years that language would be on an equal footing with the languages of other countries. I see that to-day there is a tendency to give full justice to the French language in Canada, as it is being recognized that a wider knowledge of that language must contribute to the greater felicity and prosperity of the Canadian people. I hope my right hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) will kindly convey my remarks and congratulations to his colleague the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I have, in the exercise of my duty, given due credit to the right hon. the Acting Prime Minister, I deem it also my duty to call his attention to another subject upon which I am not able to felicitate or congratulate him; that is the absence of a Cabinet minister representing the province of New Brunswick for the last ten or eleven months, and, indeed, the absence of a Cabinet representative from all of the eastern provinces, including Nova Scotia. We see that the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden), who

represents that province, is not able to discharge the duties of his office. Personally, I need not say that if my good wishes could restore the Prime Minister to health he would certainly come back full of vigour to resume his official duties. But the eastern provinces have no representative in the Government—those eastern provinces which have been the backbone of Confederation, without which there could have been no Confederation—and it is the duty of the Government not to prolong such a state of affairs. We are told, and we can see, that the only reason why the Maritime Provinces are unrepresented is that if there were a by-election in New Brunswick the people would not be found to be very favourable to the Government. We cannot wait, until a new census is taken, as the hon. member for Neepawa (Mr. Davis) has suggested, to have representation in the Government from the province of New Brunswick. If for that reason a by-election would not be agreeable, then, I say, let us have a general election. When the Liberal party come back to power we will be able to have by-elections and we will have representatives from New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and the French elements of the province of Quebec. That was the main reason why I rose to-day to give my support to the amendment brought in by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King). In a speech which will long remain in the memory when it has been read, pondered and cogitated over by the people of Canada, the leader of the Opposition claimed that it was time for an election, that the Government were not here representing the aspirations of the people of Canada, were not here fulfilling the promises that were made to the people, and were not here for the purpose for which they had been elected. They were placed here as a Union Government for the duration of the war, but now that the war was over the people should be permitted, in the exercise of their right, to select another Government which would be representative of the opinion of the people as it would find expression to-day.

My hon. friend from Neepawa has said that a census will be taken in two or three years and that we must wait until the census is taken in order to give the West the representation to which it will have a right at that time. No one has more consideration for the constitution of Canada than I. At the same time, speaking more particularly as I do for the eastern provinces and for the farming interest, the basic industry of Canada, which is waiting to-day for some relief and some encouragement in its work, which has been clamouring for the last two or three years for a reduction of the tariff, more particularly on food products and the material necessary for carrying on its operations, I assert that the time has come to again consult the people of Canada. Having voted for our amendment last year, are these hon. gentlemen, among whom was the hon. member for Neepawa, going to say to-day: "We are willing to allow the Government to stand by the high protectionist tariff; we will put away our principles and our aspirations and wait for two or three years until the Government has taken the census and provided for a redistribution of seats in this country?"

If the policy of reciprocity for which the West voted almost unanimously—a policy under which the farmers' wheat and other cereals and live stock would have found a ready market in the United States, and which would have resulted in great prosperity in Canada as a whole—had been adopted in 1911 would it not have prevented much of the unrest which exists throughout the country to-day? Had that policy, which was so generally approved by the farmers in Alberta, Saskatchewan and a good part of Manitoba, gone into effect should we have seen as we do to-day the farmers of the West organizing in the manner in which they are in order to secure the passage of legislation better calculated to advance their interests? I must say that I sympathize with the movement because I have been for many years in my own constituency, closely identified with the great industry of agriculture to say nothing of the sister industry of fishing, and I have been very loyally supported for the past twenty years by the farmers and fishermen there. I am confident that they are prepared to continue that support for a like period of time because they know how warmly I am devoted to their interests. Why wait for two or three years until we have another census and a re-distribution of seats when that means the continuance of the policy of protection and the perpetuation of the existing dissatisfaction? Does my hon. friend from Neepawa under the existing circumstances expect to see any immediate reduction of the tariff, is he hopeful of securing free trade to the extent that is practicable, in view of the recent pronouncements of members of the Government, especially the deliverance of my intellectual and genial friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen)? In my opin-

ion the farmers will not see any free-trade policy adopted or very much in the way of reduction of the tariff or of taxation. We are told that the maintenance of a tariff is necessary in order to meet our yearly ordinary expenditures of some $150,000,000, the $35,000,000 to $40,000,000 of pensions to our soldiers, and other obligations. We are told that we must depend upon the tariff to meet obligations which would seem fabulous were it not that the public mind since the war has grown accustomed to think in millions. But the tariff is not the only source of revenue. The taxation of land values has been strongly urged and my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar) has been one of its strongest advocates. If the taxation of land values is a good policy to pursue it should have been adopted long before this. But even now why not put it into operation and thus raise the augmented revenues we so greatly need for our public demands? If I recollect aright the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crerar) speaking to this House last year estimated that a revenue of seventy-five or eighty million dollars could be derived from the taxation of land values. Why refrain from having recourse to this tax, especially at this time when the farmers are straining every effort to meet their necessities under the present high cost of living and the high rate of farm labour?

When we ask for an appeal to the people we are told to wait until there is another census and until there has been a re-distribution of seats. It is frequently stated, and some hon. gentlemen opposite as well as the newspapers supporting them take pleasure in repeating the statement, that the Liberals are not sincere in asking for a general election. Well, Mr. Speaker, you have known me for some years and you will admit that I do not make a statement which I do not believe or give expression to a hope which I do not sincerely entertain. I am of the opinion that the time has come when the Government, of its own volition, should appeal to the country. If the present Government should be returned well and good, but the people will not be satisfied until they have had an opportunity of expressing their will at the polls, because it cannot be denied that under the conditions which prevail this Government is not a constitutional Government.

The present state of exchange between Canada and the United States, in my opinion, is responsible for a great deal of dissatisfaction in the public mind. For this condition a great many people blame the United States but does the responsibility rest with that country? Undoubtedly that exchange rate is a matter for concern. It has been urged that the Minister of Finance, (Sir Henry Drayton) for whose financial and legal ability I have the greatest respect, should take steps to secure relief. I do not altogether agree with what has so far been done in that direction. We have been told that we should buy less from the United States and produce more, but in my opinion had the Liberal trade policy of 1911 been carried into effect we should have seen to-day a greater equilibrium in the figures of trade with our neighbours to the south, our exports would have been more on a parity with our imports from that country and eminent financiers of the United States would have had a more exalted opinion of our currency. Gold is the basis of currency in the United States, whereas we might say that Canadian currency is on a paper basis. As a remedial measure our Minister of Finance recently exported some $40,000,000 in gold to the United States. To my mind it would have been much better to have stored that gold in the vaults of Canada and issued against it a proportional amount of paper currency redeemable in gold. Had these measures, which I have urged, been followed I believe that to-day our currency would have been on a basis equally as satisfactory as that of the United States. I suggest that as much gold as can be got together be put in the vaults of Canada in order that the value of our paper currency may be increased and put on an equal footing with that of United States.

When we vote for the amendment which has been submitted by the leader of the Opposition we do so in the hope that the members of the Government will be led to carry out the constitutional duties involving upon them; that they will pass a Franchise Act which is in accordance with the British practice and the British spirit, giving every Canadian who is entitled to vote the right to the franchise, and then go before the people.

It has been said by some hon. gentleman that party government no longer exists in Canada. The member for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat) suggested yesterday that if hon. gentlemen opposite who were supporting the Union Government should make themselves a party, they would keep themselves in power. But whatever may be done in that respect I hope that when the Minister of Finance brings down his Budget there

will be found in it some departure from the old ways of the Tory administration, from the old practice of keeping to the same source of revenue—tariff, and more tariff.

I believe that hon. gentlemen who are supporting the cause of the farmers in this House are in sympathy with our programme. The programme of the farmers and the programme of the Liberal party are, in a sense, but one; there is no considerable difference between them. Whatever is embodied in either may easily be embodied in the other without any great violation of principle.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE (Edmonton): In the event of an election taking place immediately without redistribution, how long will the farmers of the West have to wait before the Government which my hon. friend boasts would come into power would bring about a redistribution of the representation in Parliament?

Mr. TURGEON: It has been the practice of the Liberal party—particularly was it so during the leadership of the late lamented Sir Wilfrid Laurier—to appeal to the people at frequent intervals. In order to give the country the benefit of the reciprocity agreement of 1911—

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: Will the hon. gentleman permit me? I put a question to him.

Mr. COPP: Let him finish his answer.

Mr. TURGEON: I was proceeding to answer my hon. friend; if he is in a hurry I will speak as rapidly as I can. I was saying that when questions of vital interest to the people have been at issue the Liberal party has always been willing, even after so short a period as a year or six months in office, again to go before the country and submit their policies to the people. In 1911, three years after an election had been held, the then Prime Minister, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, when the reciprocity agreement was brought forward and objection was made to it by the Opposition, might quite properly have let the agreement stand and remained in power for another two years. But in the interests of the people he immediately dissolved Parliament and went to the country. That principle will always be followed by the Liberal party; we are always ready to appeal to the people whenever occasion requires. It is only members on the other side who are talking about prolonging the present Parliament.

We would be well advised, therefore, to persuade the members of the Government that they are certainly holding a false position. The purpose for which the Government was elected has been fulfilled, and they should now appeal to the people. The ministers might not all be defeated, but certainly there will be a great change after the next election, in Ontario as well as throughout the West. The farmers all over the country are agitating for a change, and whoever may make up the new Government I am willing to accept the verdict of the people. The desire of the Liberal party is not so much to attain power as to uphold the principles which it endorses and which it wishes to be enjoyed by the people of Canada. Our object is to promote the interests of the Canadian people; whether we do that in Opposition or otherwise is not the most important matter. In the past the Liberal party have done great things for Canada, not only by preventing the adoption of measures which would not have been good for our country, but also by assisting in the enactment of legislation which, but for our labours, might not have been so beneficial.

I hope that the Government will bring down a Franchise Act which will give the franchise to every Canadian, every British subject in this country who has a vote, whatever his political views may be. The people have been asking for a proper Franchise Act ever since the last election—an election which certainly was no credit to the party which obtained the majority of the votes; an election in which neither the civilian population nor the soldiers were allowed to enjoy the full privileges of the franchise.

Therefore, with all this unrest in the minds of the people, the Government should hasten to bring down a fair and equitable Franchise Act, and also to bring down whatever appropriations may be required for carrying on the affairs of the country. Then let them appeal to the people, and if it be the will of the people to return them to power, we are prepared to abide by the result, although I do not believe that they will be returned to power. We want a just franchise with the British spirit in it. We want it to be just for everybody, for the man of the West as well as for the man of the East; we want it to be just for the man who came here ten, fifteen or twenty years ago under the promise of receiving the advantages of British freedom and British institutions, for the maintenance and preservation of which in Canada as in other parts of the British Empire our sons have fought and died. British principles and institutions form a large part

of our constitution. Therefore, let the franchise be in accordance with those principles, and more particularly in accordance with those sentiments which are conveyed in the term "British spirit," which means freedom in every possible way and justice to all. I trust that the Government will see fit to give us such a franchise.

On motion of Mr. H. P. Whidden (Brandon), the debate was adjourned.

At six o'clock, the House adjourned, without question being put, pursuant to rule.

Thursday, March 4, 1920.

The House met at Three o'clock.

REPORTS TABLED.

Annual Report of the Department of Customs and Inland Revenue for the year ended March 31, 1919; Shipping Report of the Department of Customs, containing statements of navigation and shipping of the Dominion of Canada for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1919.—Hon. Mr. Burrell.

LIBRARIAN OF PARLIAMENT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. C. A. GAUVREAU (Témiscouata): I should like to ask the acting Prime Minister if there is any truth in the report that the Hon. Albert Sévigny is to replace Mr. DeCelles as Librarian of this Parliament, and if it is true that Mr. DeCelles has asked for superannuation?

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No official action has been taken in regard to the matter of which my hon. friend speaks.

BOARD OF COMMERCE.

RESIGNATION OF JUDGE ROBSON.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Russell): Has the acting Prime Minister received any further correspondence in connection with the resignation of Judge Robson from the Board of Commerce or bearing on that resignation. If so, may I ask whether the correspondence will be laid on the Table, and when?

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have received letters, but I am not prepared to say just now what will be brought down.

[Mr. Turgeon.]

THE PRIME MINISTER'S HEALTH.

STATEMENT BY SIR GEORGE FOSTER.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Beauce): The day before yesterday we were led to expect and hope that a statement would be made to the House regarding the condition of the health of the Prime Minister and his proposed plans. The two members of the Government who went down to New York to meet the Prime Minister have been back for two days now, and the statement which we were looking for with some anxiety is not forthcoming. May I ask whether the acting Prime Minister or some of his colleagues would to-day be in a position to inform the House on this matter?

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I could have given my hon. friend the information yesterday or the day before if he had asked for it. I was waiting to give some hon. member opposite an opportunity to put the question. With reference to the health of the Prime Minister, I may say that for the two months that he has been away, the improvement in his health has been marked; and if the same rate of improvement continues as I hope it will,—and I have no reason to fear otherwise—we may expect to have him with us, I think, within two months time.

SPECIAL IMPERIAL CONFERENCE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. E. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): May I ask the acting Prime Minister whether the Imperial Conference which it was expected last session was to be summoned this year, is going to take place, and whether there is any truth in the report that it is likely to be held in Ottawa?

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is not definitely known, and up to the present it has not been definitely decided that the Imperial Conference will take place this year. I think I may say that Canada, the city of Ottawa in particular, and all our hon. friends on both sides, would be glad if that Conference could be held here. Canada will not put any obstacle in the way of that; in fact she will be very favourable to it.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Consideration of the motion of Mr. Hume Cronyn for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at

the opening of the session, and the proposed amendment of the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie King thereto, resumed from Wednesday, March 3.

Mr. HOWARD PRIMROSE WHIDDEN (Brandon): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak this afternoon, I wish to join with those who have already conveyed their felicitations to the mover and the seconder of the Address in reply to the speech from the Throne. Mention was made by one of the previous speakers to these gentlemen as "props beneath a crumbling edifice." I had rather thought of them as gentlemen who were pillars in the commercial, social, and political life of their country and in their country's Parliament, pillars that were not alone supporting these objects and institutions worthily, but endeavouring worthily to support a Government which, much as fancy and imagination on the part of some might otherwise desire, seems as yet to give no evidence of old age, senility or decay. I do not believe that they are fragile or failing props. They are stalwart supporters of a well based representation of a people's wish and thought in connection with the affairs of this country. There was also to be noted in their speeches a freedom not to criticise the Government, but to express their own personal views, and in so doing, they have simply carried out the practice of the supporters of this Government during the last two years. It is not necessary to have a dead level of monotonous agreement in order to have unity and strength. It is quite possible to have variety, difference of view-point, and yet to remain united on the great central and fundamental things. One hardly dare venture further to express appreciation of this Chamber in which we are gathered. I can only express the hope that its lines and lighting, its colouring and solidity, and the combination of strength and beauty which characterize this Chamber will more than ever characterize the Canadian people collectively and individually.

I must confess my great surprise at the amendment, though it may not be necessary at this stage to assign reasons for voting against it. One can have great regard for the earnest and able address of the leader of the Oppositnon (Mr. Mackenzie King) in moving the amendment, and yet perhaps because of that find it all the more difficult to understand the why, and the how and the what for. For it is known to not a few hon. gentlemen who have gathered here in the last week since the opening of Parliament that prominent supporters of his have of their own accord come to hon. members on this side of the House and said, "If any such nonsense is introduced by any of our men as to its being the duty of the Government to make an appeal to the electorate, take no stock in it. It is all bunk." This would seem to be evidence of a lack of unanimity of feeling among hon. gentlemen opposite or else of the failure of some of them to understand the mind of their leader.

In connection with the criticism of the speech from the Throne as altogether inadequately disclosing to Parliament the plans of the Government I should like to urge a word of dissent as well as of surprise in view of the references, prolonged and emphatic, to the War-time Elections Act, to the crumbling of representative government, or the ignoring of its principles, and in view also of the criticism of the promise in the speech from the Throne of a new franchise Act. Perhaps the greatest cause for surprise, in my case at least, was the reference to the Government as being infinitely more concerned with external affairs than with the home business of this country. I am reminded that in different words, but in somewhat the same spirit and with the same point of view, similar statements were made for the first time in my hearing a little over two years ago during a very vigorous campaign. Canada, as I shall try to show in a moment, has embarked upon world affairs, and can never consent to remain an isolated colony or nation on the northern half of this continent. Before referring to this a little more extendedly, I must express surprise also that there should seem to be drawn from the splendid edifice in which we find ourselves meeting, and from the way in which it has risen to its present almost completed form, a suggestion and symbolism of what the minds of men can do if they are set upon the great task of building well their country and their country's life, for I remember that in the early stages of the reconstruction of this building there were a great many who did not know what the Joint Committee was doing, and what the Government, the Department of Public Works, the architects and the contractors were doing, and consequently there was criticism right and left day after day and month after month, and yet all the time the work was going on. I take it, Mr. Speaker, that any government which is busying itself at any time in the nation's history with matters of vital importance will be so occupied and absorbed that it

will be impossible for it to explain sufficiently and to the satisfaction of all the fact that it is engaged in a great building or re-building piece of business. The work of reconstruction has been going on in our country, and I think time will show more fully that while ministers of the Crown have not been going up and down throughout the land announcing in strident tones their achievements and accomplishments, nevertheless they have been making a good record as stewards of the people.

I should like to urge that in spite of the difference of opinion in the minds of some of the members of this House as to the importance of having a new franchise Act there are at least two reasons why it is time for such an Act. In the first place we all know that there will be, or should be, a Dominion census next year. The people of Western Canada, no matter what their views on the problems that divide us, believe that when that census is taken they can rightfully claim a larger representation in the Parliament of Canada. I do not suppose that western members of the Agrarian party or of the Liberal party, although they are somewhat hard to find from the West, or of the Unionist group, can be expected to favour an early election in view of the fact that we should have something to show as evidence of the growth of our Western provinces, and that evidence we shall have at the conclusion of the next Dominion census. I have something else in mind, Mr. Speaker. There is need for a well-based and adequate franchise Act upon the Statute Books of Canada, as the outgrowth of a conception of citizenship which is to be broader and better-based than anything we have ever had. I am of the opinion that no franchise Act that can be brought down will be adequate unless it provides that only those who know enough and feel enough, and those who will to act enough at all times in the nation's history, but especially in time of stress and crisis, shall be given the standing of citizenship. If we have within our borders those who do not measure up to this standard, then let this Parliament demand of the present Government that there shall be conducted that kind of campaign of education in the interests of true Canadianism that will ensure that all who might oppose the view I have just enunciated will find that every person whom they originally might have desired to see included will be so qualified that, in accordance with the principle I have laid down, they will have the right to vote, and not otherwise.

[Mr. Whidden.]

Citizens, Sir, are not merely human beings living within the confines of a country; they are people who have certain attitudes and cherish attachments not merely to the material things of their land, but to that great undefinable something which is not comprehended within the laws and institutions and the customs of a people, and which perhaps can best be described as the national sentiment, or the national spirit. It is for all such, and none other, that the new Franchise Bill, when it is passed by this Parliament, should make provision. If it observes this principle it will prove adequate and will go far towards the building up of a real and sterling national character and national prosperity as well.

With regard to Canada's relation to external affairs, I am sure that even the dreamiest idealist who ever succeeded in getting into any parliament would believe in a country's representatives planning for the development of its natural resources, and giving their time and attention to the affairs of their country. But I am satisfied, from the remarks of hon. gentlemen opposite, as well from those who have spoken on your right, Mr. Speaker, that there is an increasing conviction in the minds of representative Canadians that this does not embrace the whole conception of national life, and that a country's business has become a larger matter in recent years than it used to be. The world was a very big place when even those of us who are young to-day were boys. But the world is a neighbourhood at the present time, and if it is to be a neighbourhood not only commercially and socially, but in the truest economic and international sense, then surely a new country like Canada should not be the last to recognize its part and its place in relation to external affairs.

I desire to read two or three sentences from Sir William Goode's report on economic conditions in Central Europe as presented to the Secretary for Foreign Affairs in the month of January; for I am satisfied that we in Canada who sent so many representatives to the war have never fully realized, since the armistice was signed, what the results have been across the seas. Sir William Goode, among many other pointed statements, writes in these words:

> In an endeavour to portray the economic chaos of central and eastern Europe one is apt to take it for granted that the world realizes the human suffering which inevitably follows in its wake. It is a horizon of so much suffering en masse that even those engaged in the work of relief may only be recalled to the individuality of it by a tug at

one's overcoat in the snow-covered streets of Vienna from some numb child begging for the food which is not there, or by a glimpse into the typhus stricken villages behind the lines where the Poles are still fighting Bolshevik Russia. Vienna, perhaps more than any city in Europe, visualizes the misery that arises from want of food and coal and from the cumulative effects of over four years of ruinous war. Here, in a city of 2½ million inhabitants, the sharp contrasts between pre-war prosperity and present day insolvency, between the nervous rich and the starving poor, between the relics of ill-fated monarchy and a revolutionary, but rather desperate, government, stand out with brutal appeal to the imagination.

Concerning Poland he states:

It is estimated that 500,000 tons of cereals must be imported in the year ending September, 1920, to supply the deficit of food in Congress Poland and the provinces of the east and the larger towns, and also to provide seed.

Concerning Czecho-Slovakia he states:

Imports of cereals are needed before the next harvest to the extent of 350,000 tons, together with about 400,000 tons of potatoes. The latter can be obtained from Poland. Large quantities of raw materials are required, including wool, cotton, jute, leather, copper, tin, nickel, oilseeds, oils, chemicals, nitrates, and other fertilizers. Czecho-Slovakia is short of locomotives, wagons and materials for repairs to rolling stock.

Not only does Sir William Goode speak in these terms, but in the "Hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means in the House of Representatives," under date January 10, 1920, I find confirmation and support of his views:

According to the best information obtainable the minimum grain requirement necessary to carry Poland until the next harvest, and which can not be filled anywhere but in the United States, is 300,000 tons. This deficiency is due to a partial failure of the wheat crop and to a lack of fuel for threshing. Poland is at present living under a hand-to-mouth regime. . .

In Austria the acute misery and suffering are probably greater than in Poland. Two-tenths only of the present Austrian State are self-supporting in food, and the remaining eight-tenths, even before the war, produced food to supply themselves for six months of the year at most, and were dependent for the remaining six months upon importations. Consequently, the situation to-day, especially in Vienna, has become exceedingly grave, due to a shortage of coal and food. . . .

What the effect of a general social breakdown in Austria would be can of course only be conjectured.

If time permitted I could quote from several different statements made by Mr. Hoover but one or two brief sentences will suffice:

Poland presents one of the most appalling and appealing situations in Europe. . . . The Austrian situation is the worst in Europe.

He estimates the coming crops in Central Europe as follows: Poland 75 or 80 per cent of pre-war normal; Southern Russia 80 per cent; Czecho-Slovakia 75 per cent; and Hungary 85 per cent. If Canada is to secure in a permanent way what has been won by her soldiers and others in the war, Canada must continue not only to have a theoretical and seminar sort of interest in Europe but a practical and political interest. If the members of the Government, who to-day should be specially charged with such matters, are not interested, then we who sit behind them, or in front of them, should see to it that they become sufficiently interested to rightly express the feeling and thought of the Canadian people who gave more than half a million of their sons to win the world war. I believe the Government, as those charged with responsibility, have been giving attention to these matters and that they will continue to give them such attention as Canadian sentiment demands.

Britain and the United States have done much to relieve distress. Canada has done something. Why should not Canada do more? Why should there not be an Anglo-American organization functioning to carry on and complete the kind of work that has already been well begun and in connection with such an organization? Why should not Canada have her own inter-related, and yet independent, part to play?

The Argentine has already passed a Bill to this end. Has the Argentine the same stake in the European situation that Canada has? Sir William Goode, in a later part of this same report, as the British director of relief for Central Europe, has referred directly and definitely to Canada. He says:

Invaluable advice was received from the premiers and representatives of the Dominions at the Peace Conference in Paris, particularly from Dr. J. W. Robertson, C.M.G., who, on the unanimous invitation of Mr. Hoover and his allied colleagues, attended the meetings of the Relief Section on behalf of the Canadian Government.

If Canada is to follow up and conserve what has already been gained in the way of an increasingly definite status, if Canada is to follow up and make secure that fuller and truer recognition of her nationality and increasing importance in the life of the world, let her not for one moment be so busily concerned in minding her own business that she forgets the business of other countries and so forgets her own.

I want, in resuming my seat, to put in a brief plea for a broader Canadianism, a harmonious, a united and a not merely tolerant relationship. Tolerance never exists as between friends, much less as be-

tween members of the same family. I want to make a plea for a united life and purpose that will be so broad based that Canada, as her views of democracy and representative government develop—develop at least in their interpretation and application —will recognize some things which were neither recognized nor in existence at the time of Confederation. I believe that a long step in this direction will be taken if we have the right kind of a franchise Act put into effect within the next year.

Then, too, I would like to say, and I am sure we will all agree with it, that in our efforts to legislate, to govern and to develop our own resources and our own life, we will desire and plan so to do these things by co-operation with the other members of the Empire and the other nations of the great wide world.

It is to be hoped that many of the funerals that take place during the next few years will be the funerals of the little Canadians. There are many types. There is the pure MacKay provincial little Canadian; there is the antique colonial; there is the narrow nationalistic Canadian and he may speak more than one tongue. He may have been born to speak the tongue that I am speaking now. There may be the high sounding Imperialist who is a little Canadian, there may be the insular, stay-at-home-on-the-northern-half-of-this-North-American-continent, and let-the-good-old-wealthy-British-mother-pay-the-bills type of Canadian. May these little Canadians rapidly—or as rapidly as a kind Providence sees best—pass off the stage and make room for their nobler and broader chested successors who will see a Canada which actually extends from the Atlantic to the Pacific and which has fair measurements north and south. Canada has moved out too far into the world and the world's affairs ever to be satisfied to retrace her steps. Her status in the Empire and in the League of Nations has been established, though definitions may be made more perfect in the coming years. We cannot go back upon what we have gained and what we have established. While our duty remains here on the northern half of this, the greatest continent in the world, our destiny will be linked up with the great brotherhood of the nations and external affairs will mean more to us in each succeeding year as we continue to take care in a large way of the growing, and increasingly important, business of this our Canadian country.

Mr. THOMAS W. CALDWELL (Victoria and Carleton): Mr. Speaker, after having listened to so many eloquent and able speeches in the last few days, it is with a certain amount of trepidation that I rise at this time to address the House. That feeling is all the more marked because I am the first member of the group of hon. gentlemen located on what is styled "the cross benches" to break the ice at this session, and judging by the remarks of some of the speakers who have preceded me the water will be fairly cold. The impression seems to exist among some hon. members of this House, especially among those sitting on the Government side, that the independent group in this House are here to represent solely the farmers. I would like to correct that impression and to warn hon. gentlemen who entertain such an opinion that while our numbers, as yet, in this Chamber are but few, I believe we represent a majority of the public of Canada to-day. I believe that fact is realized by the hon. gentlemen to whom I refer, and that if it were not for it they would not be quite so concerned about our appearance in this Parliament. It is not our "contemptible little army" they are worrying about; they are apprehensive of the public opinion they must meet at the next general election.

Regarding the amendment before the House, I believe that if the electors of Canada were asked to pronounce upon it they would support it by an overwhelming majority. They would do that not because it was moved by the leader of the Liberal Party or because it is a liberal motion at all. In the first place the Union Government was formed to carry on the war, and its term of office was to be during the war and until demobilization was completed. The Union Administration was also to be composed of fifty per cent Liberals and fifty per cent Conservatives. I may say that I was a supporter of the Union Government at that time and on those terms. Now the war has ended, demobilization has been completed, and it looks to me, Mr. Speaker, as if the Union Government was done, too, as a Union Government, because nearly all the Liberal members of the Union Cabinet have resigned, giving as their reason for so doing that they believed the term for which the Union Government was elected had expired.

In the next place, I do not feel that this Government has been consistent in its policy. It has preached greater production, and has not enacted legislation to encourage production; and although it promised to appoint a committee to prepare tariff legislation to be brought before

the House at this session, we have no intimation in the speech from the Throne that this will be done. In fact, the inspired press of the Government has stated that no tariff legislation would be brought down this session.

Some of the greatest economists in the world to-day claim that the most important factor in restoring the world to normal conditions is "Production and Economy," and I believe we will all agree with that statement. As I have said, the present Government has preached greater production but has not passed tariff legislation that would have that result, especially in regard to the necessaries of life. As for economy, I never heard the present Government accused of that. At the time the war was in progress, the Government instituted a campaign for the greater production of food, which was very necessary at that time, and is even just as imperative at the present moment. One would have expected that at a time when the food shortage was so acute the Government would have reduced the duty on fertilizers, which are so necessary, especially to the potato growers of the Maritime Provinces, if the yield was to be increased, and that it would also have lowered the duty on machinery, a very necessary step for the farmers to accomplish greater production, more particularly in view of the very great scarcity of labour. Instead of doing that the Government placed a seven and-a-half per cent war tax on machinery. Thus while the Government preached production, its own policy has been to penalize production.

But your High Protectionist will say "How will you raise the revenue?" While nobody would deny that the customs duty produces some revenue, I believe it is the most extravagant method on earth of raising a revenue.

Take fertilizers, of which we use large quantities in New Brunswick. I speak particularly of conditions in that province because it is that part of Canada I know most about. As I have already said, large quantities of commercial fertilizers are used in New Brunswick; they are devoted to the growing of potatoes, which is a staple crop in that province. The duty on mixed fertilizers, Mr. Speaker, is, as you know, ten per cent; and while the Canadian manufacturers of fertilizers import the raw material, or the chemicals, practically free of duty, they appraise against it the cost of the materials and the cost of mixing—manufacturing as they call it—plus the amount of the duty—and charge us the net result. The result is that you can buy a car of American mixed fertilizers, bring it into any part of Canada and pay the ten per cent duty, at as cheap a rate as it would cost for the purchase of the Canadian mixed material. There are a large number of so-called Canadian fertilizer companies that are merely branches of American companies. These concerns are therefore in the position of charging the consumers of fertilizers in this country with this ten per cent duty. That duty really does not reach our revenue at all; it does not even stay in Canada, it goes to swell the banking account of the American companies.

There are also a number of machinery firms in Canada which are merely branches of American concerns. In some cases they have factories in Canada but in other cases they have not; they merely have assembling plants where the partly manufactured American parts are assembled and put on the Canadian market. These firms also collect the duties on their machinery from the Canadian consumer and the same result happens; it does not go into the revenue of Canada; it does not even stay in Canada, it goes to swell the American bank account. In this way it is manifest that many thousands of dollars are lost to the revenue of Canada.

Now take the Ford car, which is the poor man's car. In singling out the Ford car I have no criticism of it to make; I have a Ford car which is pretty well worn out but it has given me excellent service. What I have said in reference to the Canadian mixed fertilizers and the Canadian assembled machinery applies perhaps more forcibly to the cheap Canadian made car, especially that type produced by American firms. This year in New Brunswick we are paying for Ford cars $240 more than our American neighbours just beyond the boundary line. Take the case of two men living on each side of the International boundary: The American pays only $660 for his car while the Canadian has to pay $900 for exactly the same car manufactured by the same firm. The Canadian car is assembled and put together in this country and sold as a Canadian car but it does not pay any duty into the revenue of the country—that goes to swell the American bank account.

Mr. Speaker, the party to which I have the honour to belong has no desire to "submarine the tariff." I believe that was the term applied with respect to our policy by a Cabinet minister speaking in

Montreal a few days ago. We all know that the minister in question (Mr. Meighen) is very apt at phrase making and forming expressions that attract the public ear. But we have no desire to submarine the tariff or anything else. The features of the tariff that we object to are those to which I have made allusion and which permit the Canadian consumer to be robbed without any benefit to the country. These features of the tariff in their operation work exactly the same to-day as the adverse exchange on Canadian money. No doubt the Canadian manufacturer will hail this adverse exchange as a Godsend to Canada, for it will effectually shut out American competition. It works exactly the same way as the items in the protective tariff, to which I have alluded. If you buy American made goods there is a discount on your money of nearly as much as the tariff will amount to—not as much as it would amount to on a Ford car, more than it would amount to on a mower, and as much as it would amount to on some other farm machinery.

Your high protectionist will say, "Oh, yes, it is just as I thought. Your plea is all for the farmers. You want free entry for fertilizers, farm machinery and the cheap car that the farmers use." And perhaps some people will say, "What does the farmer need with a car?" Mr. Speaker, in this day of high wages and scarcity of labour the farmer in the back concessions needs a car more than his city brother does. It is an absolute necessity when he has to leave his work to go on any errand of business for him to be back home as soon as possible. The old-fashioned method of locomotion by foot or by horseback or by horse and buggy is too slow for this day and generation. So it is absolutely necessary as a matter of economy that the farmer should own a cheap car.

On the other hand, if the duty on farm machinery and on fertilizers increases the cost of production of farm produce more than it should, does it hurt the farmer alone? I claim that it does not. If on account of this high rate of duty on his machinery and the raw material that goes into the production of his crop it costs the farmer more than it should to produce that crop, who suffers most? I claim that the farmer is not the principal sufferer, because perhaps he does not use five per cent of the crops that he produces on his farm. The labouring man, the city man—even I imagine my good friend the member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) uses some of the products of the farm. Of course, I do not suppose he would lose as much on the farm produce he uses as he would gain, say, by the duty on ploughs—and he manufactures good ploughs, too, I can assure you; I have used them—but I believe that this very feature of the tariff is a big factor in the present high cost of living and the unrest to which it gives rise. I believe that the high cost of living could be materially lowered by making the very changes I have just spoken of.

And here, Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to the letter that the right hon. the leader of the Government (Sir George Foster) placed on the Table on the 2nd of March—the letter from the Hon. H. A. Robson, K.C., Chairman of the Board of Commerce, as I think that perhaps a paragraph or two from it will corroborate the statement I have made, that the present Government or the past Government—I do not know which you would call it; perhaps it is not past yet.

Mr. A. B. COPP: It will be in a little while.

Mr. CALDWELL: The statement I made was that their legislation has not been favourable to production. Mr. Robson writes:

> Dealing with it as a measure to repress profiteering, I have further objection to the Fair Prices part of The Combines and Fair Prices Act (which is the important part of that Act) in that it picks out for profit regulation those classes of producers and traders who deal in the necessaries of life. This regulation does not apply to the great number of other branches of business and occupations. We restrain and discourage the citizen who supplies food and clothing but leave free to profiteer as he pleases the man who deals in non-essentials or luxuries. We do not touch any excessive charging for service involving mechanical or professional experience. There can only be one effect, i.e., to discourage persons from entering into the production and distribution of the necessaries of life.
>
> There is, to my mind, further objectionable discrimination in that the measures for controlling the selling prices of the retailer are in terms fairly effective, while those for reaching the manufacturer are not so.
>
> A profiteering measure to reach the distributing class should, in my opinion, be local in its character and be administered locally. Federal machinery cannot reach the grievance effectually throughout all Canada.
>
> It seems to me further that the Act actually contains a provision which removes the last chance the consumer had to do anything for himself in reducing the cost of living. There never was before the Act anything to prevent a group of consumers from co-operating in the purchase of necessaries. They took their chance of being able to buy. But a declaration of parliamentary policy crept into the Act, and a manufacturer or wholesaler is not bound to

sell to classes who were not accustomed to purchase from such manufacturers and wholesalers. This was designed to head off co-operative movements, which were likely to make progress for the benefit of consumer members and, as I say, restricted a remedy which elsewhere has been of some effect in price control.

If the remarks I have made need any proof, Mr. Speaker, I think you have it there in what Mr. Robson states, and you have it on the authority of a man in whom the Government had such great confidence that it put him in control of the Board of Commerce.

I do not wish to take up very much of the time of the House, Mr. Speaker, because I find as I travel through the country that the people believe Parliament wastes too much time in discussion on the reply to the speech from the Throne. But before I sit down I wish to assure the Government of my appreciation of the honour they conferred upon me in my recent election by sending three of their ablest cabinet ministers all the way down to New Brunswick to help my opponent to lose his deposit, especially at a time when Parliament was in session and such very important matters were before it for consideration. I believe that one of those ministers, the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) could hardly be reconciled to the statement which I made at that time that I considered that this visit or visitation of these cabinet ministers to my constituency increased my majority by at least one thousand votes.

4 p.m.

Well, Sir, I will try to enlighten him. I was nominated and ran as an Independent candidate, pledged to support any measure which I believed was for the best interest of Canada, irrespective of which party should introduce it. So that this very decided opposition of the Government to my election seemed to the electors of my constituency to be an admission by the Government that they did not intend to introduce any legislation that would be in the best interests of the people, and my electors resented it. Some of the electors were even mean enough to say that this assistance to my late opponent was for services rendered in the last general election.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to correct the false impression, which, as I have said before, some hon. members seemed to have or were trying to have: That the Independent party in this House is here to submarine the fiscal policy of Canada in the interests of the farmers, regardless of all other industries or people in this Dominion. I wish to assure this House, so far as in me lies, that we are here not to tear down, but to give what assistance we can towards the building up of a Greater Canada, so that not only the people of this Dominion but the people of the whole world may say, "Surely Canada is a bit of God's own country."

Mr. WILLIAM A. BUCHANAN (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, I will be quite frank at the outset and say the remarks I am about to make are not inspired so much by the speech from the Throne as by the amendment offered by the hon. leader of the Opposition. I am in this position that, so far as I am concerned, an election can come at any moment; but at the present time I want to make a choice and in making that choice I desire to consider the interests of the section of the country from which I come, and at the same time I do not want to be sectional in the observations I make though I wish to make them from the standpoint of the western provinces.

The leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) has moved an amendment demanding an election. Next year we know that a census is to be taken in this country, following which census there should be a redistribution, and in my judgment, as a result of that census and redistribution, we would have, in the Prairie Provinces, or if you were to take all the western provinces, twenty new members in the House of Commons. If I were to support the amendment of the leader of the Opposition and it carried, what would be the result? There would be an election as there was in 1911, and the West would not obtain, for four or five years to come, its full representation on the census of 1921. If the Government is prepared to state that there will be a census and redistribution next year, I prefer to take chances on the Government of the day rather than to withhold for four or five years the proper representation that the West should have in this House. I know there are represented in this country and in this Parliament of the Dominion of Canada interests which are anxious that the West should not have its full representation until the last possible moment. I do not know whether the leader of the Opposition desires to associate himself with those interests in Eastern Canada; but we know that those people do not want Western Canada to have any larger voice in the affairs in this country than it has at present if they could in any way withhold the representation to which Western Canada is entitled. In the West we feel that

we are entitled to our full representation, and that, if we are to have an election at this time, that representation will be delayed for four or five years.

May I be personal for a moment and explain my position as a member of this House? I do not feel at the present time that I am wedded to the support of the Government of the day. I feel that I have fulfilled my obligations to Union Government, because I was elected as a Liberal supporting Union Government. I advocated Unionism and supported it; I was elected as a supporter of Union Government for the purpose of carrying on the war, and, in my judgment, that period has elapsed. But am I at this moment to precipitate an election and thus prevent the section of the country in which I live from having its proper representation in the Commons of Canada? I prefer to act as a free lance in this House, and to avoid an election if necessary, in order that Western Canada may have, as soon as possible, its full and proper representation in this House. What would happen if we were to defer the question of an election for another year? We have only this choice to make: We have the Opposition and we have the Government; and so far as I am concerned, the toss of a coin would satisfy me in that respect and probably would satisfy a good many people in this country. I am prepared to take a chance on the Government for another year in order that we should have a census and a redistribution. I believe it would only be necessary to have one session of Parliament following the present session before we could have a redistribution and before an appeal could be made to the country on the basis of a representation in accordance with the census of 1921.

I have no hesitation in saying that I believe that Union Government fulfilled the purpose for which it was elected. I have always said so, and I have no apologies to make for supporting Union Government. But when we come to times of peace; when we are to discuss domestic problems, then there is bound to be a probability that I shall differ with this Government and that I shall want to align myself with those who agree with the views that I have consistently advocated in times of peace. I am perfectly satisfied with the record of Union Government as a war Government, and I think history will prove that Union Government served the purpose for which it was elected and was a great necessity to Canada in war time. I hope I have made my position clear on the question of the amendment.

I am not in favour of the amendment if we can have an election next year following the census and a redistribution. I prefer to carry on for the present in order that Western Canada may have its proper representative voice in the affairs of this country. As I said before, I know there are people and interests who do not want Western Canada to have its proper representation in this Parliament at the present time. I am not prepared to encourage those people in their views; on the contrary I am content to wait for the earliest possible realization of the representation to which Western Canada is entitled.

As I said in rising, my main purpose in speaking this afternoon was to make myself absolutely clear as to my attitude towards the amendment. While I am on my feet I should like to make some observations regarding what has been called the unrest which exists in this country and how it is best for us, as a people and as a Parliament, believing in the institutions which exist in Canada and which are the foundations of the Government of this country, to act towards this seeming unrest. I know there is a good deal of agitation in the country. There is what might be called revolutionary sentiment in Canada. People are going about spreading new doctrines, and what are we as members of Parliament and as citizens of this Dominion doing to combat that sentiment? I do not believe in repressive measures, but I do think we should have educational measures to counteract the agitation which certainly exists throughout a good part of the country. We should go out and educate as to our system of Government the new citizens of this Dominion, the people who are being appealed to by these agitators. We should let them understand that they have in this land the fullest freedom and opportunity to realize their ambitions if they can convert the majority of the people to their views. We should do that rather than adopt repressive measures which would make them feel that that kind of freedom does not exist in this country. It must be remembered that I am not in sympathy with the views that are being advocated by those people, but I am expressing my views as to what we should do to combat them in the best way so as to avoid further trouble and to restore amongst those people confidence in our institutions.

Many charges have been made that there is profiteering in this country; and that the control of the Government is in the hands of a few people. If that be the case, it is our duty to remove that control. If it be not the case we should enlighten the people. I happened to read the other day an article in an American paper concerning a district affected by the recent steel strike. One of the causes at the back of that steel strike undoubtedly was this continual talk of profiteering; that the steel corporation and its shareholders were making huge returns from the business and that the employees were not getting their fair share. One steel factory in the state of Ohio, taking its employees into its confidence, had enlightened them as to the business, as to the dividends that were being paid and as to the cost of operation. And as a result those men were satisfied that the industry was paying them all it could afford to pay them under the circumstances so that, when the steel employees throughout the United States were called upon to strike, the men at this particular mill did not go out. I think there is an obvious lesson there for all the industries of this country, and that is, to enlighten the men who are serving in those industries and to enlighten the people in reference to these charges of profiteering. That can be done quite easily, and it will save a great deal of the industrial unrest that exists, and help to remove a great deal of the suspicion which exists in the minds of the people. I believe that a good many of our industrial troubles in Canada are due to suspicion more than to anything else. The men are suspicious of their employers, and the employers are suspicious of the men identified with their unions, and this feeling of suspicion prevents them getting together. If both sides would only come out in the open and deal frankly with each other, a great many of our industrial difficulties could be avoided.

It has been my custom in this debate to make a declaration of my views on the fiscal policy of the country. I want to say that I stand where I have always stood, in favour of the lowest kind of a tariff. But I would say to the Government and to the House that in regulating the tariff we should aim at relieving the burdens that are imposed upon the mass of the people, and aim also at the development of our natural resources. If we could have had a tariff in this country that would enable all the implements of production that are used in the development of our resources to be got as cheaply as possible, it would do a great deal for the development of our resources and toward relieving the country of its financial obligations. If the implements that are used in mining, for instance, in lumbering, in fishing, and in agriculture, could be made as cheap as possible to the people who are producing along those lines, there would be an encouragement to greater production, and the richer the country becomes in production the better position we shall be in to meet our financial obligations. I am not one of those who believe we can go out and slash the tariff all to pieces at the present time. I know that for some years to come we must utilize the tariff for raising revenue. But, the tariff should be directed wholly toward raising revenue, rather than to protecting certain industries that have enjoyed protection in this country for a great many years. Possibly, members of the Government who are not moving around so much and getting in touch with the minds of the people would like to know what the feeling of the people is with regard to the protected interests. To be frank, the great mass of the people, who are finding it hard to live to-day, and who see everything they buy rising higher and higher in price, realize that the men who are engaged in the protected interests in this country are living in comparative ease and comfort, having amassed a considerable fortune. They say that is due to the high protection given to those industries. Surely if the men engaged in these protected industries have amassed fortunes through a protective tariff, it is time we reduced that tariff and gave the people who are working day in and day out to make an honest living a chance not only to do so, but to save a little. That is the view of the people I come in contact with from day to day. We must have a tariff to raise revenue, but I do not think that tariff should be directed towards the protection of industries that have enjoyed protection in this country for so many years.

I should like to make a suggestion about the income tax. I am an advocate of income tax. I believe that if it is properly administered it can be made to yield a great revenue to this country, but I feel (and I do not place the blame on the Minister of Finance) that the tax has not been efficiently administered up to now, and that we are not getting from it the amount of revenue we should. I believe there are people who are evading the tax. I have only recently received communications intimating

that some people are boasting that they have not paid the tax while some of their neighbours paid it. I have not their names or I would be glad to give them, for I have no sympathy with any man who evades paying the taxes imposed in this country. At the same time, I feel the administration has been weak, largely because an attempt has been made to centralize it instead of spreading out the organization a little more widely in the different provinces. In the province of Alberta, for instance, until quite recently I understand we had only one income tax officer, located in the city of Calgary. Another officer has since been located in Edmonton, but the officers must be closer than that to the population of the country, or they cannot reach the people who should pay the income tax. I think there should be officers in all the larger centres of all the provinces. I believe the expense would be repaid a hundredfold by the intimate knowledge they would have of the people liable to pay this tax.

I should like to make another observation. We have at the present time government ownership of railways on a very extensive scale, and I am glad we have it. I believe that government ownership can be made a success, and the Government of the day should see that every effort is made to encourage the efficient operation of our government roads, but I do hear complaints that some of the roads we have had in our possession for some years are not being operated efficiently—that the roadbeds have not been improved to the necessary extent to make operation successful. As an advocate of government ownership I would urge the Government to use its utmost efforts to get at the head of the Government system the most efficient administrator that can be obtained. We have a big system, bigger than the Canadian Pacific. I do not think the question of salary should be a consideration. We should get the very best railroad man on this continent at the head of the system and pay him a big salary. That is the only way to make the system a success. Politics should be kept entirely out of the operation of the system. So far as I know, politics have not entered into the operation of the railway, but the people generally feel a little doubtful of the success of government operation, and it is up to the Government to prove that government operation can be made a success; if they do, the people will be satisfied.

In closing, I should like to pay a tribute to the attitude that has been taken recently by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) in connection with the reservations to the Peace Treaty proposed in the United States Senate, which, if adopted, would take away from Canada its place in the League of Nations. I believe that the President of the Privy Council has the bulk of the people behind him in his attitude. I do not want to see Canada participate in any more wars, but I say that the part Canada played in the recent great war in Europe entitles her to a place in the League of Nations, and to a voice in deciding whether or not there shall be wars in the future. I have no desire to cast any reflection on the United States, but I will boast of this fact, that Canada was in the war from its inception, and sacrificed thousands of men for the principles for which they were fighting; and this nation therefore has just as much right to a voice in the councils of the League of Nations as has the United States of America.

Mr. OLIVER ROBERT GOULD (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I rise with considerable diffidence to make this my maiden speech in the House of Commons, and I trust that hon. gentlemen at the other end of the Chamber will be able to hear me distinctly, because it is my desire that some of the remarks which I intend to make shall reach them. In my new capacity as a member of the House of Commons I have watched with considerable interest the gladiators, as I may perhaps term them, on both sides of the House. I have seen blows offered and parried, and the proceedings, I must say, have at times been rather diverting. As I have listened to the debate I have wondered whether all these charges and counter-charges have been really indispensable to the conduct of the affairs of the Dominion of Canada, or whether they have become necessary as a matter of tradition. Be this as it may, I beg to add my small mead of praise of the sentiments that have already been expressed by so many hon. gentlemen in this House in reference to the admirable addresses that have been delivered by the mover and seconder of the Address in reply to the speech from the Throne. The exalted office discharged by those hon. gentlemen has not fallen to my lot, and my remarks must of necessity be more of a practical kind. Nevertheless I can assure this House that I duly appreciate the lofty ideals and the broad views to which expression was given in both of the addresses in question, and though I may lack a full conception of the height and broadness of vision which should characterize a representative of the people, I hope

to prove that I am absolutely sincere in my appreciation of the views which my hon. friends, the mover and seconder of the Address, have so well stated. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I was gratified to have the privilege of being present at the opening of Parliament in this beautiful building. As I viewed its imposing magnificence and its beautiful architectural design from the outside; as I have promenaded the corridors; as I have listened to hon. gentlemen describing the beauties of the building, I myself have acquired a deeper conception of true Canadianism than I heretofore had. I have no doubt that this building is a fitting monument to the greatness of the Canadian people; and to the architect and those associated with him I am constrained to offer my congratulations on the splendid result of their genius. I admire, and indeed almost envy, the mind of the man who has such a large conception of everything that is worthy and inspiring as has been so ably exhibited in the beautiful and spacious building in which we are privileged to be assembled. I am sure that this building will stand out as a prominent landmark among all the public buildings, not only of Canada but of the North American continent, and will be a credit to this newly recognized young giant, the Canadian nation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have not come here in any fighting spirit; I have come in a measure to tender to hon. gentlemen the olive branch. I am temperamentally a man of peace, not essentially disposed to combat; although it has been known in the past, I think, that I can retort when severely attacked. But I do believe, and sincerely so, that the hon. gentlemen who compose this House on both sides will listen with reason, and I trust with more interest than we have seen displayed in the past, to every statement of conditions as they really are. I am inclined to think that when we express our convictions, and place before this House our conception of conditions as they exist in the country to-day, hon. members may be disposed to revise their ideas, and that possibly some of the decisions that have already been arrived at may be reversed. I think that the consensus of opinion in this House inclines to the view that what we shall have to say will be hearkened unto, because whatever stand we may take on any question that may call for consideration in this House will be taken in all sincerity. Naturally my viewpoint, as I address this House, must be taken from western conditions, and I believe that I am in a far better position to know those conditions than many hon. members in this Chamber. I deplore the fact that any inference should be sought to be drawn that the movement with which we are associated—the Agrarian Movement as it is called—is a class movement. Let me assure you, Mr. Speaker, that in its initiation it was not intended to be such, and that fact has been proclaimed on platforms and in the press. Indeed, Sir, we know that it never could succeed as a class movement. The platform of the Canadian Council of Agriculture, called now the new National Policy, is big enough and broad enough to embrace all classes in this Dominion of ours, and to protect the interests of the nation, and if hon. gentlemen refuse to accept this statement as true and insist upon describing us as a class organization, then I can only say that the fault is not with us. For we hold an open hand and are ready to co-operate with all in order to further the interests of Canadian life. This statement is known to be true by those who have had an opportunity of studying our platform at first hand. They know that no distinction has ever been drawn between rural districts and urban centres, and an examination of the returns will show that the people who are best conversant with that platform have all approved of it, whether in the urban centres or in the rural districts. That fact should be sufficient to dispel the idea that ours is a class movement, and it should not be necessary for an individual to stand up in this House in order to proclaim it. It has been stated with great insistence on the hustings and elsewhere that in this movement there is an aim to further the interests of a class.

It is a fact that our own conviction was that such an idea could not, and should not, succeed. If hon. gentlemen accept my statement and my interpretation of our attitude, I am sure we will not have the charge thrown at us that we favour class legislation or a class movement. I am proud to be able to say that that is the feeling of the great farmers' organization of the West, whose platform, as I said before, is big and broad enough for all who may wish to stand upon it and to assist us in our effort to make Canada a better place to live in than it has been in the past.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: If I join your organization, not being a farmer, will I be permitted to take any part in determining its policy?

Mr. GOULD: I am pleased that the hon. gentleman has asked me that question and I will reply in the affirmative. I wish to make this further statement that at the convention which we held—and I believe we held one of the most democratic conventions that ever took place in Canada—there were eighteen names upon the slate. four of them divines, three of them merchants, two professional men and the rest farmers, and that it took five and a half hours to ballot it through. That is a sufficient answer to the hon. gentleman and it is the best evidence that we do not have a class movement. Urban and rural centres both sent their delegates; fourteen hundred men and women sat in that skating rink and it took them five and a half hours balloting in order to find this unworthy individual. Surely that should be a sufficient answer, surely that should be proof that the words that I have spoken here have been spoken in all sincerity and that there is no basis for the fear that some hon. gentlemen seem to have that this is destined to be a class movement.

Mr. HALLADAY: Is it not true that in the rural constituencies in Alberta they will allow no one but a farmer to be a member of the organization?

Mr. GOULD: I speak for the province of Saskatchewan alone where I am best known. I am the only representative from the West who has been elected on the platform of the Canadian Council of Agriculture. Consequently, the experiences of Alberta are as yet an unknown quantity—I do not know. While I speak to the House to-day I speak across what may be called No Man's Land for what, as my colleague who preceded me said, may be regarded as the contemptible little army. Perhaps I should not use that expression but if we go back to find a precedent for its use on the war-torn fields of Europe we find that the term was made applicable not to the assaulting party but merely to the defensive party. While we take that position here to-day, we hope the day will come, and come quickly, when hon. gentlemen seated in this House will accept our policy and help us. That is our hope and ambition.

My hon. friend who preceded me made reference to the assistance he received during his election down in New Brunswick. I have a somewhat similar tale to tell although the fact is that my opposition did not come from members of the Government. I entertain no animosity towards the hon. gentlemen who came to my electoral district—none whatever; in fact, I believe our friendship has been cemented as a result of their visit. Scripture tells us that wise men invariably come from the east. We were always led to believe that when wise men came from the east they came in bodies of three. It was heralded all over the electoral district of Assiniboia that three were to come. However, when the train pulled into our little station, only two got off. They were dressed immaculately and they carried leather grips, something that was scarcely understood in the west. These hon. gentlemen, as they gazed upon the people who were working in the town, were no doubt filled with wonder that these people simply went on about their work although they were in the heat of a political campaign. Yet it is a fact, to make a long story short, that these gentlemen returned east and I am satisfied that they returned wiser than when they came west. I would give a cheque for a hundred dollars of my sessional indemnity to find out what actually took place among the three when they again met after the election in Assiniboia. An hon. gentleman on the Government side of the House made reference to the election in Assiniboia and said that the majority was approximately 4,000. Let me inform the hon. gentleman that there was a majority of 5,294 which was amply sufficient to tell the people of the Dominion that the electors of that constituency at any rate believed they had a grievance. It was perfectly expressed by the exponents of our new platform and it is a fact that the people of Canada have become educated. They have become educated along lines of progress which they believe it is necessary for this Dominion to pursue and the people of Assiniboia showed the result of their belief in the action they took on the 27th day of October.

A sentiment was given expression to by an hon. gentleman on the Opposition side of the House to which I wish to make a brief reference. That sentiment, expressed by an hon. gentleman who stands high in the Liberal party was that he would not trade with any nation that would not recognize our Canadian dollar as being worth one hundred cents. I would direct the attention of the House to the fact that immediately after the American Civil War the American dollar went down in value to about 37 cents and it is not on record that the Government of Canada refused to take advantage of the difference in exchange in dealing with our neighbours to the south. There must be consistency. If that hon. gentleman lived near the inter-

national boundary in Saskatchewan and Alberta and he found that his neighbour within a mile or two of him was receiving from 70 cents to $1 a bushel more for his wheat than he was privileged to receive on this side, I am sure he would take advantage of every opportunity that was afforded to take his wheat across the line, receive that extra 70 cents or $1 and bring back good American money and spend it with the merchants in Canada. That is just as loyal, just as true as the position which the hon. gentleman takes and it is the proper business attitude. Consequently I do not think the sentiment of not trading with a country that refuses to accept our money at par should carry much weight with the real business men of Canada. I do not suggest this so much in a spirit of criticism as I do from the purely business point of view. Business is business and the best interests of the country require that we should encourage an interchange of commodities across the international boundary rather than that we should place obstructions, sentimental or otherwise, in the way. I visited the town of Sherwood, North Dakota, during our campaign to get direct information on this subject. The operator in one of the elevators there had compiled figures, and he showed them to me, disclosing that $12,000 of good American money on the proportion of wheat that had been brought into that town from the Canadian side—a $12,000 equity—had been paid at that time to Canadian producers who had marketed their wheat there. How near will the price we shall receive for our participation certificates equal the price we feel we should receive. I have a few of those in a little box at home for which I was offered five cents a bushel. That was the valuation some of the business men of Canada placed upon our participation certificates. I refused, of course, to accept the offer; but the fact remains that I would prefer to accept nothing for my participation certificates than take a premium of five cents a bushel. I for one never expect to receive for my participation certificates the same amount that my American cousin on the south side of the line enjoys.

The question has been asked "for what do we stand?" From our viewpoint one of the most important things we stand for is a big reduction in the tariff, a question that was well taken by the hon. gentleman who preceded me. He explained the matter in a manner that well commends itself to me and I am not now going to discuss at length the protective features of the tariff. I quite understand that later on an opportunity will be given of going into the subject at length. I shall simply now content myself by placing on record the statement that I am utterly opposed to the high protective principle involved in the tariff and let the matter go at that.

We not only stand for a reduction in the customs duties but we advocate the nationalization of our national resources and various other policies which I will not occupy the time of the House by dwelling upon at the present.

The planks set out in our platform have on many occasions given cause for alarm to many of the "interests" in this country and they have asked in dismay "where will the revenue come from if these policies are carried out?" Some of the planks in our platform have been called destructive, but we have a constructive policy to replace anything that may appear as destructive, a constructive policy Sir that I believe would be in the interests of Canada as a whole. What that policy is can be determined by a close and earnest study of the provisions set out in the planks of our policy.

Mr. BURNHAM: Does the hon. gentleman believe in the principle of protection at all, whether it be high or low?

Mr. GOULD: I do not.

Mr. GAUVREAU: That is a plain statement.

An hon. MEMBER: The grain growers do not want any protection.

Mr. GOULD: I would like to further add that I never did believe in that policy and I do not expect I ever will.

Mr. COPP: That is quite explicit.

Mr. GOULD: Now as to the question of where the revenue is to come from. That has been a very interesting subject of debate during our campaign in the West and where the merits of the question have been discussed the people who have heard our explanations have been thoroughly and perfectly satisfied. Let me give an illustration as to possible sources of revenue. On the Atlantic coast, at Montreal, at Fort William, at Hudson bay, and on the Pacific coast there are great stretches of water frontage which have fallen into the hands of private individuals. Providence created them but through the operation of the institutions and organiza-

tions of our country they have been acquired by private individuals. The owners of these frontages through their development have become wealthy. Possibly as low a sum of $100 was paid for some of these privileges and ultimately they were sold for as much as $600,000 for no effort on the part of the individual who received the equity. I maintain and I insist that it is only right and proper in the interests of the people of Canada that the Dominion Government should appropriate ninety per cent of the money that accrued to such speculators and use it for the purpose of administering the national affairs.

We are told by scientists that the whole of the province of Alberta and large areas of Saskatchewan are underlined with coal. Up near the Pas in Manitoba we also know that large and valuable deposits of copper occur. I was informed that on one quarter section alone the vein was known to be worth $1,000,000. The profits from these great natural resources are going to the country to the south owing to concessions to American capitalists. They are taking our heritage. Our birth right and heritage is being handed over to outsiders and yet we are bewailing the fact that we cannot find sufficient revenue to run the country. I have indicated possible sources of revenue to say nothing of other planks in our platform with respect to taxation —not indirect taxation. The policy of direct taxation is something that the people can see and understand. That indirect taxation should have been resorted to means that the people have not understood and do not appreciate the conditions involved. It is a form and system of deception and I think no Government should follow out any such principle. At any rate that is my earnest belief.

I desire now for a few minutes to discuss conditions that pertain to my own electoral district. It is a fact which has already been mentioned here that for three sessions Assiniboia has been unrepresented. Let me qualify that statement, in a measure and at the same time pay my tribute to the hon. gentleman who preceded me in the representation of the constituency and who has now been elevated to the Senate. I know for a fact that the hon. gentleman in question on many occasions did his best for Assiniboia and succeeded admirably in having that district represented. That however was a form of indirect representation and owing to the extra burdens that have been placed upon the hon. gentleman in question by his elevation to the Senate the district of Assiniboia has been deprived of the direct representation to which it was entitled. I am not now speaking in criticism of the Government. The time perhaps was not ripe for the great agrarian movement which has since developed such strength to manifest itself had a by-election been brought on earlier. The fact nevertheless remains that Assiniboia has for some time been unrepresented and conditions there have been more or less in a state of chaos. The conditions that have developed there, from an agricultural point of view are deplorable and before I came here I had some correspondence with members of the Government asking that some relief might be afforded to certain of the farmers in south eastern Saskatchewan as a result of repeated droughts, loss of crop, and last year the devastating havoc caused by grasshoppers.

I hold in my hand representations made by six municipalities regarding the deplorable conditions resulting from the devastation caused by grasshoppers last year. I have asked that these settlers, these men that want to produce for the sake of the country, be given an opportunity to retrieve their position. I am told that they are to be given an opportunity—that the Dominion Government will back their efforts to purchase seed. But what is the use of seed for their horses this winter? These men want money. In 1916 rust and hail destroyed a large portion of their crops. I myself suffered a total loss that year. In 1917, 1918 and 1919 there were partial losses. These men need help—not protection, not for a moment. They want assistance so they can purchase feed for their animals and go ahead and produce 100 per cent. I do not wish to read the letters which I have here corroborating the statements I have made, letters from the reeves and the secretaries of the municipalities affected, but I would ask you to accept my word that I am truly representing the conditions that obtain in that Western country. I would respectfully ask for recognition of the appeal I make on behalf of those people that they receive greater assistance than has been tendered to them through the medium of the Provincial Governments, and I would like to know that they will receive such assistance very soon, because at this season of the year they are making strenuous efforts to carry on; but under existing conditions, no matter how strenuous each individual effort may be, those people are going to be absolutely incapacitated from producing what they are so anxious to produce—one hun-

dred per cent, a percentage which the country needs and wishes them to produce.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, referring once more to the three sessional indemnities due Assiniboia, I would suggest that a requisite amount be added to the total of those indemnities and given to these people to afford them a chance to overcome the adverse conditions which have almost overwhelmed them, for it is a fact that they have suffered much, and I am sure that any help that may be accorded to them they will repay one hundred fold. I have spoken in the interests of my constituents, and I am pleased that you have given me your earnest attention, and, thanking you for your kindness, I will now resume my seat.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take this opportunity to say that while there is no disposition on the part of the Chair to restrict debate upon the Address, I would remind hon. members of the subject before the House, and also of the circumstance that there will be a Budget Debate later on in the session.

Mr. WILLIAM F. MACLEAN (South York): Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity in making my first address in this very fine Chamber to appeal for a re-
5 p.m. turn to parliamentary government, to parliamentary practice, and to parliamentary responsibility for the conduct of our public affairs. Partly because of the war no doubt we departed from parliamentary government and from parliamentary responsibility, but I think the time has come when an effort should be made to return to the former well established principles, and, in the first place, I hold the Unionist Party and the Unionist Government responsible for the maintenance of those principles.

I have always been a supporter of Union Government. I pointed out early last session, when opportunity presented itself, that to deal with the war it was necessary to have a union of parties, and that it would be necessary in some measure to depart from the practice that had hitherto obtained in this country. But now the war is over, and to my mind it is high time we got back to the observance of the rules of parliamentary Government that have obtained not only in the Mother Country but in all the Dominions, and which have proved to be the only foundation of democratic government.

I regret to say, Mr. Speaker, that the departure which has been made in this country is most pronounced in connection with the office of Prime Minister. Most of all the Prime Minister must be the actual leader of his Government, and he must lead one at least of the Houses of Parliament. That has always been the practice, and I regret that owing to the illness of the Prime Minister he has not been able to lead this House for many months, and there is not much prospect that we will soon return to the old practice. On behalf of the people of this country, irrespective of any party, I say that it is time we discussed for a moment what constitutes parliamentary government, to see if it is not in the interests of the country to come back to it, and particularly to come back to it in connection with the office of the Prime Minister.

Not only must the Prime Minister lead the House and the Government, but he is also responsible for something else: He must select the ministers of his Government, and he must see that those ministers are elected. We have reached a hiatus when that is not taking place, and the responsibility is on the Unionist Party—the party that won the war and has a very creditable record to its account. Therefore as a friend of Union Government and as one who has supported every proposal made by that Government in this House to win the war, I shall call attention to what I think ought to be done to recover our position.

The main thing I wish to call attention to is that we must come back to the old practice. I regret that the Prime Minister is away. I regret that he saw fit to offer to resign his position because of overstrain due to his strenuous labours of the past few years, and he has my fullest sympathy. But the government of the country must go on, and the Unionist Party must vindicate its position and carry on the government of this country on established lines or something will happen.

Now, what is to be done? I am waiting to hear from ministers of the Union Government to tell us what they propose to do.

Mr. COPP: They do not know.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: I am waiting to hear when they intend to resume parliamentary responsibility and to have a Prime Minister in the House who leads the Government, who selects his ministers, who sees that those ministers are elected, and who can make an appeal to our fellow-countrymen who live in the province of Quebec. There never was a period in the history of this country heretofore when that appeal was not made and the Government of the

day was not able to get support from the province of Quebec and also from some of the western provinces. It may be all very well to trifle with this question and attempt to "put it over" and to suggest this and that artifice, but in doing that you get away from the question of responsible Government. Let us come back to responsible Government; and will the House bear with me when I say this: That I am making no personal comment or criticism on the right hon gentleman who has led the House so successfully as head of the Government, and who has made a great place for himself in the history of the conduct of this war. But the King's Government must go on, and it must do so under Parliamentary rules and practice. We are getting away from that. The Prime Minister is not here, and he has not done what the Unionist party have been promising for two years now, ever since they came into office. When they first had Union Government formed, we were promised that later on there would be a reconstruction of the Government. Why is that reconstruction not going on? There is some reason for that, and probably it is owing to the absence of the Prime Minister. If that be the case, I say that the responsibility is on this Union Government to correct what is wrong and to try to return to that responsible Government that we have had in this country in the past, but that we do not happen to have at the present moment as we ought, especially now that the war is over. The people want responsible Government. I have been out in the country; I have met the people; I have read the newspapers; I have heard discussions at various public meetings. I saw what took place in Ontario recently when there was an absence of responsible Government there, when not even a caucus of a party was called to see what sort of a policy the Conservative party would have in the provincial election that took place there. And what happened? That party disappeared in a night, because it had failed to call together its friends and the people of Ontario in general to discuss the welfare of the country and the programme under which it proposed to appeal to the people. The same thing may happen in the case of the Dominion if we do not come back to Parliamentary practice and if we do not have in this House a responsible Prime Minister leading the House, forming his Government, having his Government elected, and seeing that all the country is fairly represented in the administration that attempts to carry on the affairs of the country.

[Mr. W. F. Maclean.]

There are many other questions that I should like to bring up on this occasion. I should like to discuss the question of public ownership of railways. I should like to discuss our future relations with the Empire. I should like to discuss what I know or rather what I do not know about the commitments that have been made in connection with the Imperial Conferences that have been held in the old land. We, the people of Canada, do not know what has taken place there; we do not know what commitments have been made in connection with those conferences, and we have not our Prime Minister here to tell us what took place at those conferences although he was one of the chief actors at them. While the war was a great success, I should like to know whether we shared in the proper responsibility of that war, and I should also like to know something about our position in the League of Nations.

I hope to be able to discuss that later on I should like to discuss the fiscal policy of this country. I have heard a good deal about it here to-day, and I heard the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Buchanan) and another hon. member speak about a measure of redistribution that should take place next year. I do not want to see an election in this country until that measure of redistribution has been put through this House; but when it has been put through, I want to see representation by population as the groundwork principle in that redistribution. We have not had it. I represent in this House about 100,000 people; some time ago, I represented many more than that, and my constituency is growing rapidly. We ought to have in this House three votes from that constituency in settling the policy of the country and in maintaining Parliamentary and democratic institutions in Canada. You cannot have democratic institutions in this country unless you have representation by population. The United States have that, if it exists anywhere. We must have it here, and I want to appeal especially to my friends from the West who were saying here to-day, and justly saying, that there should be full representation from the West in this House before we have an election. I want to see full representation for every section of the country, for Quebec, for Ontario, as well as for the West. I bring this up merely because I desire to say that that is another topic that I should like to discuss in this House, but I am going to leave all those questions for another opportunity. The debate is not over; and while it has wandered

far afield, and while the leader of the Opposition has asked for an election, a proposition which I cannot see my way to accept, what I want to see is a return to responsible Parliamentary Government, no matter who makes the sacrifice in order that it may come back. Especially do I appeal to the members of the Government and to its supporters to see that we come back to a condition of affairs where the Prime Minister is in the country at the head of the Government, where he is reconstructing the Government as he promised to do and as the people expect him to do. I say this all the time remembering that he is ill, but nevertheless, the Government must go on. In all fairness and in the most respectful way I direct the attention of the Government of the day and my fellow members of the House, especially those who have supported Union Government, to try to come back to the principle of responsible Government and to show that the Unionist party is able to strengthen itself, to select ministers, to elect them in the country, and to put forward a policy necesary for reconstruction. If we do not do that—and I am going to speak very plainly, and I think I can see what is going on—we shall have cabals in the ministry instead of leadership, instead of a progressive policy. Every one can see signs of these things. Unfortunately, those who wish to depart from the observance and maintenance of responsible Parliamentary Government in this country seem to be ministers of the Crown. I hope the ministers of the Crown will realize their double responsibility and come back to responsible Parliamentary Government, and have the Government reconstructed. Let us have a Prime Minister in his place who will assume responsibility and lead the House and the country in this great duty of reconstruction.

Mr. H. S. BELAND (Beauce): Does my hon. friend suggest that the Prime Minister should resign?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: I do not make any suggestion at the moment. I say that the Prime Minister wished to resign and did resign, and probably that is his disposition now, but apparently some of his friends wish to keep him in an irresponsible position.

Mr. JOHN BEST (Dufferin): Seeing that the hon. member has attacked the Prime Minister, would he be good enough to say whether he has attended one-fifth as many sittings of this House as the Prime Minister during the last five years, during which he has been drawing his full indemnity?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: I have not attacked the Prime Minister. I have the greatest respect for him. Many a time has he asked my advice, and I have been pleased to give it to him. Many a time I have spoken on the platform with him in constituencies and helped him to elect his candidates. I have not always been in this House as much as I should have been, but I have been in this House a good deal, and whenever I have spoken it has been on a real question. I am speaking on a real question to-day, one that is uppermost in the minds of the people of this country, and uppermost in the minds of the ministry, many of whom are anxious to lead a way out of the situation. I am not calling for the Prime Minister's resignation. I am calling for the observance of the principle of responsible parliamentary government. I have heard a good deal around this House and have seen a great deal in the newspapers about this very question. I saw it in the Montreal papers, for instance.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton): Might I ask my hon. friend whether he was in his seat to-day and heard the statement of the leader of the Government (Sir George Foster) in reference to the absence of the Prime Minister, and if so, whether he approves of the statement that was made?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: I heard the statement.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: What objections have you to it?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: The objections will be removed when we return to responsible parliamentary government. That is all I want. We have not had responsible parliamentary government in this country, I must tell the hon. gentleman.

Mr. H. S. BELAND: What do you suggest should be done?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: I am calling attention to the situation. Perhaps we shall have a further discussion of it. I am discussing a real question, and I believe I am speaking for the people of Canada to-day. I am passing no reflections whatsoever on the right hon. gentleman who leads the House. I am simply trying to speak for the people of this country on a matter

of paramount importance to them. The disturbance following the war is great, the dislocations are many, and all sorts of new conditions have come into existence. One underlying principle of our constitution is that of responsible parliamentary government, and I say that we have got some way away from that in this House. During the war the country was ruled by Orders in Council, and very properly so perhaps; other nations had to do it, but now we should return to responsible government and get on with a policy of reconstruction. There is many a minister in the Government to-day who I would like to see giving most of his time to framing policies of reconstruction to lay before the House. Any such measures will have any little support I may be able to give them. Again I say, I arose in my place here to-day to ask that the Unionist Government come back at the very earliest possible moment to responsible parliamentary government and bring forward the necessary legislation for the reconstruction of the country. I do not think there should be an election, if it can be avoided, until there has been a numbering of the people. That could begin on the first of April next year and be completed thirty days thereafter and a report made, on which a redistribution measure could be based and introduced in the following May, then with a new Franchise Act and a new Redistribution measure, let there be an appeal to the people in a general election.

Mr. H. A. FORTIER (Labelle). (translation): We are meeting this year in our new Parliament Building which adorns the historic hill of the Capital, resplendent like a gothic marvel of old. Fifty years ago, Mr. Speaker, the representatives of the Canadian people were meeting here for the first time after Confederation.

On that occasion, the representatives of the people came from all the provinces and there were on the ministerial benches the two minsters representing the two great races in this country. Those ministers had joined their efforts to make Canada a great country, a united and prosperous country. They gave the first administration we had in this Dominion the name of Macdonald-Cartier, a name never to be forgotten. If I recall this happening of bygone days, it is to show by what spirit the Fathers of Confederation were prompted and, at the same time, to underline the present policy of the Unionist party, which has become occasionally the successor of the former Governments, of the Macdonald-Cartier Government, and which is, nevertheless, driving the country to disunion and to ruin.

In 1867, we, in the province of Quebec, were associated with the English provinces of Canada and put on an equal footing with them by a federative compact assented to by the Imperial Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. In this agreement the rights of the first pioneers, the rights of my ancestors were preserved; they could say that the survival of all their rights, customs and traditions was secured by this Act.

When the negotiations previous to Confederation took place, Macdonald was not in favour of a Federative Act, he would have preferred a Legislative union; but Cartier, whose opinion finally prevailed, wished the provinces to retain their full autonomy, while Canada would be ruled by a central federal power. The first meeting which took place under the Confederation Act carried with itself a meaning far different from and far more eloquent than that of our present meeting. In 1867, both races were represented in the Cabinet, which took pleasure in asserting this dual character to the extent of styling itself the Macdonald-Cartier administration. Therefore though the House of Commons of 1867 was smaller than that of 1920, it embraced more, because it was taking in, amid the cheers of the people, a ministry, it was taking in members who came from all the provinces and by whom all nationalities were represented. On that occasion, Cartier might well say to the Dominion, as he did " For more than a century, the British flag, which bears the name of Union, has unfurled its folds on the horizon of Canada. That century, now elapsed, was rather marked by quarrels between the two races which are going to constitute a new people, the Canadian people. That protracted strife has known hours of conflict more cruel than others, but the secular contact between the two races seems to have finally resulted in creating a better conception of their respective worth and, as a sequence, a new spirit, born of a friendly understanding which prevails at last. In time, we shall have a country where there is neither victor nor vanquished, neither a superior nor an inferior race. We have Confederation accepted at last by the Mother Country and by the colony. Confederation will give us a Canadian country, a country which will be really united, for on the occasion of an event of this kind, the union of the minds cannot be but a word, an empty word, it

carries with itself a cordiality which will make a people endowed with the gifts of the two most glorious nations of the world and, therefore, a people which, young though it be as yet, will undertake, in a masterly way, to carry out its destinies."

On the other hand, Macdonald withstood, in the full measure of his might, the brunt of the attacks of the few British statesmen, more enthusiastic than clearsighted, who required the help of the colony in the wars of England with the nations of the world, his answer being that Canada was under no obligation to contribute money or men to enterprises with respect to which she had no say. How far we are, Mr. Speaker, from the spirit of those leaders all engrossed by the problems of Canadian politics and devoting the whole of their intelligence and the very best of their heart to the realization of the ideal which had inspired the Fathers of Confederation: "Make Canada a united, happy and prosperous country." The policy of the Government, as expressed in the speech from the Throne, deals but with external affairs, matters concerning the world at large, which may offer some interest to the Allies now that the peace treaty has been signed, which may have a direct interest for London, Paris or Washington, for instance, but those questions are of such a nature as to have us, citizens of this country, perfectly indifferent. It might perhaps be interesting to hear it mentioned in the speech from the throne, among the great deeds of the Government, that a commercial treaty has been signed with the most powerful nations; but what is to us the signature of a peace treaty with Bulgaria or with Turkey? Have we ever declared war to those far distant countries? And was war ever declared to us by those countries?

I am sure the Government do not think we are gullible enough to believe them when they say that we should be glad of these signatures being there because they mean a diplomatic success for an ambassador of the Canadian nation. Has not the Government anything besides matters of foreign policy of which they could assume the merit in the Speech from the Throne? Have we become, perchance, an independent state? I should be glad of it, for it means the crowning of a people's legitimate aspirations toward complete autonomy and freedom. But nobody here spoke of breaking our colonial bonds and so far Great Britain has not notified us that starting from a certain date, say from the coming into power of the Union Government for instance, we should become an independent and free country, not a sister nation, but an absolutely independent and self-governing nation.

Fortunately we know by experience what a speech from the Throne means for a Government. It is an official document in which no mention is made of the questionable legislation which the Government intends enacting—as evidenced at the last session when they brought up at the last minute the monster bill for the acquisition of the Grand Trunk—but which gives the Government credit for foreign legislation to which they never contributed, or expresses delight at the occurring of events which we may look upon with indifference but which however are a disguise for the shameful sacrificing of our autonomy to imperialism.

Imperialism, Mr. Speaker, is the enemy. It is on account of imperialism that our national debt reached the enormous figure of $2,000,000,000 and that nothing seems to be able to stop its rise which is leading this country to disaster. It is also on account of imperialism that our expenses, including the cost of administration, the large sum of interest on our loans and the necessary funds for the soldiers' pensions, are continuously widening the abyss of our indebtedness which taxation is unable to fill. That is not all the harm that Imperialism will cause this country. It is bound to lead us to militarism.

The League of Nations finds it impossible to control the war-like preparations of the Allies. The Great Powers have never been so anxious to keep up and to increase their military force than since the signing of peace: Great Britain and the United States, their navy; France, her army.

What is the secret mission on which the representative of the British navy, Lord Jellicoe, was sent to this Government? What new contribution did the Government pledge to Lord Jellicoe? There is nothing in the speech from the Throne about it and the acting leader of the Government remains silent on the matter. But deeds are more eloquent than words. The very warm and cordial reception given to the admiral—thanks to which our Prime Minister was taken aboard the flagship to be carried away to other colonies of the Empire as a living mark of our subjection—the silence observed by the Government and the comminatory stand taken by its leader, are so many facts which are much more telling than any speech from the Throne could be.

Canada is being threatened now more than ever by this dangerous policy and

active form of imperialism which will bind our future welfare, our resources and our children to satisfy the ambition of a country devoted to militarism.

I am happy to be a member of the political association which, at its last session, held in Ottawa last summer, did not hesitate to adopt as an important plank of its platform: That the constitution of Canada shall not in any way be modified as regards our relationship to Great Britain, without the people being previously consulted.

We, the descendants of the discoverers and pioneers of this country, as well as the newcomers who wish to make of this fertile land their home, were not entrusted by Providence with the task of perpetuating on this American continent the causes of conflicts which are keeping the old European countries continuously afire, but we were asked to devote our efforts to the beneficent works of peace, to work with a legitimate emulation for the development of our immense resources and to establish here a free, contented and prosperous country.

There is another question which though it does not appear in the speech from the Throne, hovers however in the mind of the Government. I am referring to divorce. At a previous session, the Government had already overlooked an attempt to introduce a bill to make divorce easier. Owing to persistent rumors which have been circulating even in this Parliament, there is some apprehension that the Government will favour such anti-christian legislation.

The country is bound to suffer from such a law if it be adopted by this Parliament. Divorce is the greatest menace to the maintenance of family ties, and the family is the basic social institution.

At this dangerous period where revolutions are about to break out, where the spirit of bolshevism penetrates and spreads almost everywhere, and where strife between classes, animated by passions which are a menace to public order, voiced even in this Parliament, it is time that we should prepare to safeguard the interests of society and see that they are preserved from the scourge of divorce. Christian minds and orderly people understand that such legislation would be most dangerous. Are we not, then, in a Christian country? The Fathers of Confederation themselves had foreseen the disastrous consequences which society would derive from a law by which divorce had been made easy. They have shown toleration for it, but at the same time they have rendered it as difficult as possible at every turn, surrounding the proceedings with all kinds of precautions and intrusting the responsibility of the decree solely to that honourable and revered body which personifies the wisdom of the nation. Such toleration by the constitution may lead to abuse. I would suggest that the British North America Act be amended so as to make divorce an impossibility, in this country.

The Government prides itself of its recent participation in the first international labour congress. If it be an honour for the Government to send representatives to a conference of that kind, where they will meet the spokesmen of capital and of labour, let us wish that this participation may procure such amount of experience as is necessary to solve the anguishing problem of labour in this country.

But who will supply the generating principle of happy solutions in social life? I have the honour to belong to that class of men who believe that this problem can be solved only in the light of christian principles. Such solutions, obtained through a recourse to the great principle of social truth, with which the Church is possessed, are yet the most durable and the most practical. The revered leaders of our church have had very much at heart, for a long time, the happiness of the workingmen, of all the men who toil; but one of them has dealt with the social question, in our age, with more striking effect than the others. His authority was recognized by all the statesmen and his advice was followed, and happily so, in many countries. The great Pope Leo XIII, surnamed the workingmen's Pope, gave the universe the encyclical letter "Rerum novarum". The document was greeted in all the industrial cities, as the charter of the social world, that is, as a full treatise on that subject, as a symposium of the reforms which the working classes of the world have the right to seek for the betterment of their condition and the welfare of their families as well. It is in the light of those two principles so marvelously just and true, that so many national and catholic trade unions were organized in our province of Quebec. Whenever those associations have sought to assert themselves publicly among the working classes of Canada, they have invariably been spurned by this Government.

I pray this Government, as I would particularly pray the hon. minister of Labour if he had a seat in this House, to give a just attention to the legitimate claims

of those bodies of workingmen in my province. You will perhaps find, in the useful work which they have already accomplished, some guiding principles which may help you in your future legislation with respect to labour.

Now, Mr. Speaker, much has been said about a particular item of the speech from the Throne relating to a new Franchise Act, which leads us to discuss the opportunity of a new general election in this country.

I was amused, a moment ago, to hear the reflections made by some hon. members on the other side of the House. They would have us believe that they have no fear of the electorate, but they lay down as a principle that we should differ, as long as possible, to consult the people. I think that is a false principle and that it is impossible to wait till the next census has been taken, before we have a general election in this country. The last census was taken in 1911 and the next one will be taken in 1921. That does not mean that the election may be arranged in such a way as to satisfy the claims expressed by the members from the Canadian West and take place during the year 1921, because the delays necessary to complete the work must be taken into account, and therefore, a general election could not be held before the year 1923. What is just and what the people is expecting is that a general election should take place as soon as possible. There seems to be a unanimous chorus of protests not only on this side of the House, but on the other side as well, to the effect that the affairs of the country should be administered by another government.

Quite often and how emphatically have we been told that the present Government was returned in 1917 for the period of the war, that this was a Government formed so as to win the war and styled a Union Government.

Now that war is over and peace is signed, that we enter upon an era of reconstruction, the citizen of Canada are bound to call upon their leaders to lay their policy before them so that they may choose their representatives. The present Government is inclined to wait until the next census before holding general elections. General elections woud be as fair now as in 1923. The people might avail themselves of their privileges during 1920 and again during 1923; they would be at liberty to choose their representatives and their rulers.

As for us, we can see no reason for the delaying of the elections on the part of the Administration.

In the province which it is my privilege to inhabit, where we are under the rule of a Liberal Government, they do not wait, like the Conservatives and the Tories, until the end of a parliament to hold new elections; they know how to respect the rights and bow to the will of the people, every three years, or every four years at the utmost. The Union Government should follow such an example; and we on this side of the House would be only too willing that general elections should be held as soon as possible.

The old walls of the first parliamentary buildings of Confederation had witnessed many events redounding to the glory of our Canadian statesmen. Indeed, within those walls flourished such men as Cartier, Macdonald, Mackenzie, Mowat, Chapleau and Laurier, and many others, and I must be content with mentioning only those who have departed, omitting the men who are still in active life on either side of this House. It is no part of these remarks to extol what they have done. But let us feelingly remember them and hail their patriotism.

The last and greatest of that line of illustrious men used to say: "The twentieth century will be the century of Canada." Like him, let us have faith in the future of this country. Let the new walls of these precincts forever bear through ages the stamp of events which shall conduce to the greatness and success of our common country.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. JOHN WESLEY EDWARDS (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) this afternoon, you will have noticed, mixed with his tears and lamentations on the loss of responsible and representative government and the decay of democracy several earnest expressions of hope, together with the utterance of a desire to speak on this, that and the other subject and to deal with matters of various descriptions. The trouble with the hon. member for South York, who, as every one knows, is possessed of a very fertile brain, is that he does not attend the House often enough to have an opportunity to give expression to these excellent ideas of his.

Consequently they accumulate and become an incubus upon the hon. gentleman. We are all, I am sure, in perfect sympathy with that hon. member in his expressions of opinion with regard to representative government. These are good words; they have a pleasant sound. The word "democracy" also, which unfortunately is often misused and sometimes much abused, nevertheless is equally well-sounding, and no person can use it with greater unction and force than the hon. member for South York. It is true that Cabinet ministers, by virtue of the position they occupy, are clothed with special responsibilities; but it is likewise true that members of Parliament who are elected to represent the people in the House of Commons have also certain responsibilities to their constituencies, one of which responsibilities—a most important one—is that they shall be as regular as possible in their attendance and shall give as much time as they can to the business of the country. I say this, Mr. Speaker, merely because I think that possibly a criticism of the absence of the Prime Minister or of any other Cabinet minister would come with rather better grace from any other hon. gentleman in this House than the hon. member for South York. I do not know whether the statement is correct or not, and I will not attempt to vouch for the truth of it, but I have been told that on more than one occasion, notwithstanding the fact that the Parliamentary Guide shows that the hon. gentleman has been elected for a great many years, it has happened that the officers at the doors have been changed and others appointed and the hon. member at such times has had to be identified before being allowed to enter the Chamber, so infrequent was his attendance.

I have listened, as I am sure all hon. gentlemen have listened, with a great deal of pleasure and interest to the speeches delivered by the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton, N.B., (Mr. Caldwell), and by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould). I hope I shall not be misunderstood when I say that I think that the hon. gentleman who represents the constituency in New Brunswick is a vast improvement on his predecessor. Still, I trust the hon. gentleman will not infer from this statement that I do not think there is room for some improvement in himself so far as his political views are concerned. I do not by any means want him to rest complacently under such an impression.

Now, Sir, in the speech of the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) the other day, that hon. gentleman bewailed the fact that there had been some delay in calling on elections, and he waxed eloquent in referring to the lapse of time between the occurrence of the vacancy and the calling of the election to fill it. He drew the attention of the House to what he described as the crime against the constituency in its being unrepresented in the House of Commons, and naturally, of course, he attached the blame to the Administration. I do not think that it just occurred to the hon. gentleman when he was speaking that when the Government of this country was led by the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier that gentleman was elected in two constituencies and, if I mistake not, sat for two constituencies in Quebec from 1908 to 1911. I believe also that Sir Rodolphe Forget sat for two constituencies in Quebec during the same period. Now, the remedy lay in the hands of the Laurier Government, of which my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie King) was a distinguished and shining light even at that time, and it probably did not occur to the hon. gentleman that he might with propriety direct some of his remarks to some of those whose seats would be near him if they were in the House. The former Postmaster General in the Laurier Administration, (Mr. Lemieux) I think I am right in saying, sits for two constituencies at the present time. Why does not the leader of the Opposition get busy and put a stop to that sort of thing? It would put him in a more consistent position when finding fault in this House with the Government for not bringing on an election in the constituency of Elgin, which has been vacant only a few days. This, however, is something which does not seem to occur to the hon. gentleman as calling for some attention on his part. The hon. gentleman also told the Government, and I am sure they were very much pleased to be given the advice from such a distinguished source, that by-elections were of great service to an administration as indicating the trend of public opinion on public events. But the hon. gentleman in that statement was exhibiting a modesty of which I really did not think him capable. He might have said that a by-election was also extremely useful to the leader of an opposition in indicating the same thing. Perhaps he will allow me to remind him that there was a by-election out in Assiniboia. We had a most eloquent speech this afternoon from the representative of that constituency (Mr. Gould), who bears a very attractive name. But apparently, in

the mind of the leader of the Opposition, "All is not gold that glitters."

Mr. McMASTER: Oh.

Mr. EDWARDS: At all events,—and this will be particularly interesting especially to the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster)—this afternoon the member for Assiniboia, in answer to a question from this side of the House, said that he did not believe in the principle of protection, either high or low; further, that he had never believed in that principle and did not suppose that he ever would believe in it. I think I am quoting the hon. gentleman correctly. I say that that statement of the hon. member for Assiniboia will be particularly interesting to the prophet from Brome, who has lately on several occasions posed in this House as an out-and-out free-trader. Why, then, did the leader of the Opposition send the hon. member for Brome and the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Pedlow) out to Assiniboia in order if possible to defeat this gentleman, who assuredly goes as far in the direction of free trade as any man can go? Why was it that a Liberal candidate, a man who occupied a Cabinet position in the Saskatchewan Government, was brought out against this gentleman? Evidently the leader of the Opposition canvassed the situation, and perhaps had heard something about the free-trade proclivities of the hon. gentleman who represents this constituency now, and said to himself: " No, that man wont do; he is too much of a free-trader for our side. We cannot go so far." At all events he sends these two gentlemen out to Assiniboia to defeat, if they possibly could, the hon. gentleman who now represents that constituency. It seems to me one of the cruelest things that ever happened in public life, that a man holding the views of the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster), who has denounced protection as vociferously as his former leaders did in the eighteen years before they came into power, should have been chosen to go out there to try to defeat an out-and-out free-trader. The hon. member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell) suggested the number of votes that had been added to his majority by a visit to his constituency. The hon. member for Assiniboia has not been good enough to give us any information as to how many votes he thinks the hon. members for Brome and South Renfrew added to his majority in that election. Perhaps, when we become better acquainted, the hon. gentleman may open out and give us his candid opinion in regard to the matter.

It seems to me that we can gain something else from the attitude of the leader of the Opposition in moving this amendment, and that the election in Assiniboia has a bearing upon it. Certainly the leader of the Opposition sent his man out there to carry that constituency for the Liberal party. There was no consideration for the farmer movement at that particular time from that particular source but, when he got the returns showing over 5,000 of a majority against his candidate, notwithstanding the magnificent eloquence and arguments which had been advanced, no doubt, by the hon. member for Brome, to say nothing of what was added by the hon. member for South Renfrew, he had that majority staring him in the face. What was he to do? Wait until the next census was taken when the western provinces would have about twenty members more than they have now? No; there was no hope in that for him in so far as the last election returns were concerned. He had nothing to hope for and so he brought in this amendment with the idea of bringing on the election, if he possibly could, before the West had another twenty members to send down in opposition to him. There is no other conclusion to come to.

But Mr. Speaker, let me just say a word in regard to this amendment as it appears to me. If you look at the amendment you will notice that the leader of the Opposition calls particular attention to the absence of the right hon. the Prime Minister of this country (Sir Robert Borden). He makes the absence of the Prime Minister one of the reasons—in fact if I read the amendment correctly the main reason—for moving the amendment in the House. I venture to say that, under the circumstances, having regard to the fact that the Prime Minister is away at the present time in an attempt to regain some of the health which he formerly possessed but which was shattered by his devotion to Canada and the Empire in the most trying time of their history, there is nothing else in the resolution, worded as it is, than a reflection, and a serious reflection, on the Prime Minister. We on this side of the House—and, I venture to say, many hon. gentlemen on the other side—hope most sincerely that the Prime Minister will be entirely restored to health. We hope that the word given to us by the right hon. the acting Prime Minister (Sir George Foster) this afternoon

may prove true, and prove true sooner than he anticipated or mentioned. We on this side of the House hope that within a few weeks, or within a month or two, the right hon. gentleman (Sir Robert Borden) will be restored to health, that he will come back to his place in this House, will once more place his hand upon the helm of the ship of state and direct its affairs. And, hoping that, I for one, and many more in this House, are going to vote against the amendment because we want a chance to see that hope realised. Take it as you will, the vote on that amendment means that those who vote against the amendment are giving expression to the hope that the Prime Minister will recover his health and come back to this House, and those who vote for the amendment are giving expression to the hope that the Prime Minister will not come back to resume his duties in this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No; no.

Mr. EDWARDS: That is exactly what it means. What else does it mean? That is what it means in practice. You cannot disassociate the practical side of it from the wording of the amendment. It means that and nothing else.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would ask the hon. gentleman if he noted the one word "regrettable" before the word "absence" with reference to the Prime Minister?

Mr. EDWARDS: Yes, I did note the one word "regrettable," but I have lived long enough in this world to know what uses and abuses can be made of the English language.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Hear, hear.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. EDWARDS: I am glad to see that sentiment so heartily endorsed and by none more than by the hon. member who represents East Quebec (Mr. Lapointe), because no man has abused the English language worse than he has. I do not attach very much importance to the word "regrettable" as coming from the leader of the Opposition, and I will tell the hon. gentleman why. Throughout his speech he casts reflections upon the Prime Minister and upon the Government which are not borne out by the facts, as I shall show before I sit down.

The leader of the Opposition complained that there is no Cabinet representation from the Maritime Provinces. May I remind the hon. gentleman that the Prime Minister comes from the Maritime provinces, represents a constituency in the Maritime Provinces and that he is a member of the Government yet whether the hon. gentleman thinks he is or not? That, I think, disposes of his statement that there is no Cabinet representation from the Maritime Provinces. But he went farther; he said there was no representation in the Cabinet of the French-Canadians of the province of Quebec. Some hon. gentleman asked him when he had made that remark: "What about the Postmaster General?"—and here is what the leader of the Opposition said: "Well, sir, we will not say that the Postmaster General represents the French-Canadians." His running mate, the hon. member for East Quebec (Mr. Lapointe) frequently, during the speech of the leader of the Opposition, interjected remarks just to call attention to the fact that there were other leaders besides the nominal, recognized one, on that side of the House. The hon. member from Quebec East said that Hon. Mr. Blondin could not get ten votes in any riding in his province. On what does the hon. gentleman base that conclusion? The leader of the Opposition was good enough to point out that Hon. Mr. Blondin, the Postmaster General, was defeated in one constituency in Quebec by 1,247 votes, and in another constituency in which he ran, by 6,623 votes. Those are very telling figures, but the leader of the Opposition might also have added that on the same day that Mr. Blondin was defeated in Laurier-Outremont by 1,247 votes, he himself was defeated in North York by 1,078 votes. While it is true that the Postmaster General was in a minority in the constituency of Champlain of 6,623 votes it is also true that the former great leader of the Liberal party, the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, was defeated in the city of Ottawa on the same day by 5,258 votes—

Mr. MARCIL: That is not creditable to the city of Ottawa.

Mr. EDWARDS: —and the hon. gentleman might have also said that while the Postmaster General polled 6,196 votes in a certain constituency in the province of Quebec, the leader of the Opposition only polled 2,870 votes in North York, whilst his brilliant side partner (Mr. Lapointe) only polled 3,453 votes. If we are going to take the votes polled by a candidate in an election as an expression of public endorsation, or of public opinion, I have this to say: That even in the province of Quebec, where the

tide runs strongly, I admit, against any person who favoured conscription and the Military Service Act, nevertheless the Postmaster General did succeed in polling in one constituency in that province as many votes as the present leader of the Opposition and the gentleman from East Quebec who is associated with him taken together.

May I add a word or two further, and inform my hon. friend (Mr. King)—and I do so because this is not the first time that there have been flings at the Postmaster General—that Hon. Mr. Blondin polled more votes than thirty-two men who now occupy seats in this House from the province of Quebec, of whom thirty-one sit on the Opposition benches. So the Postmaster General polled more votes and had a greater endorsation of public opinion in that regard than did the thirty-one hon. gentlemen in question.

The leader of the Opposition in the course of his fault-finding says that the Postmaster General does not represent the French Canadians of the province of Quebec, and that they have no representation in this Government. I will grant at once that Hon. Mr. Blondin does not represent the great majority of the voters of that province, but I will say this in justification of the appointment of Mr. Blondin to the Cabinet and his elevation to the Upper Chamber: If ever there was a time in the history of Canada when a Government was justified in making two such appointments that justification existed when such recognition was accorded to Hon. Mr. Blondin. There were a number of people in the province of Quebec who did not agree with my hon. friend across the way who has just given utterance to a laugh. That hon. gentleman and other members sitting with him were opposed to the Military Voters Act and the other legislation along that line which the Government caused to be passed. But looking at the returns from the province of Quebec which I have before me it will be found that notwithstanding the fact that the majorities in most of the Quebec constituencies were very large and therefore strongly expressive of disapproval of the Government and the course which it followed, a careful examination of the returns will show that there were thousands and tens of thousands of voters in the province of Quebec who thought just as the Government and Mr. Blondin thought; and in appointing Mr. Blondin to the Cabinet and to the Senate the Government were according recognition to the thousands of men in Quebec who were bold and courageous enough to come out in defence of their principles and for the maintenance of Canada's honour.

The matters to which I have referred the leader of the Opposition might very well have left alone. After all what did the vote in the last general election mean? It was a test of public opinion and the issue was very plain. The issue was whether we should hearken to the appeal our boys overseas who were putting in four times the hours and four times the work in the trenches that they should have done. The question was whether we should send them the help they were asking for. Hon. Mr. Blondin took the ground that that help should be sent, and he received in one constituency over six thousand votes in support of his attitude. I know perfectly well that the stand which he took does not correspond with the view held by the leader of the Opposition, but I venture to say that the attitude and the policy of the Postmaster General will be endorsed by the general public of Canada to a far greater extent than the attitude taken by the leader of the Opposition. That hon. gentleman has told us that the War-time Elections Act was a most infernal piece of legislation.

Some hon. GENTLEMEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. EDWARDS: I expected that statement would be given such an endorsation from hon. gentlemen opposite as it has received, but may I ask one or two questions in regard to it. The leader of the Opposition has asserted, and he has correctly voiced the opinions of the hon. gentlemen around him who shout "hear, hear," that the War-time Elections Act was an infernal piece of legislation. I ask why was it so denominated? Was it because the Act gave a vote to the women whose husbands lie buried in Flanders? Did that make the legislation referred to too "infernal" in its character? Was it an infernal piece of legislation because it gave a vote to the sister of the boy who was in Belgium or France doing his bit and doing the bit of lots of fellows who should have been there helping him? Is that what makes the legislation "infernal?" I ask again, why did the hon. gentleman call the law in question an infernal piece of legislation? There were two things which it did. It gave a vote to women in this country whose relatives—sons, or fathers or brothers—were overseas fighting for Canada and the Empire. I challenge the leader of the Opposition to rise in his place now and say that he be-

lieves that that particular feature of the Act was "infernal." He will not and dare not say it. Neither dare he open his mouth in regard to the matter for fear of offending some of those gentlemen who shouted "hear, hear" when he designated the Act in question as a piece of infernal legislation. Then the other feature of the Act was this,—it took the vote from certain people in this country. From whom? From certain aliens whose sons or relatives were in France and Flanders on the fighting line and killing our own Canadian boys. Is that why the War-time Elections Act is called an "infernal" piece of legislation? I know of no other reason.

Those are the two salient points of the Act. What has the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition to say in regard to that? The issue, I say again, was clear and distinct. There is no doubt at all that the question put to the people at that election was: Shall we conscript our men and send them overseas to help in the fighting? Imagine putting that question to an alien in this country whose son or brother perhaps was in the fighting line of the enemy! Imagine that man going into the polling booth and saying anything but "No, of course I won't vote to send more men over there to fight against my own flesh and blood"! What else could you expect him to say?

The Act was manifestly fair, and to no people in the country was it fairer than to those aliens from whom it removed the franchise for the time being. We asked nothing of them in the way of equal responsibility as citizens in fighting for the life of this country. We merely asked them to step aside for the time being, so far as that election was concerned, and let the people whose sons and brothers were overseas risking their lives for Canada to say whether further help should or should not be sent. And yet this is what the leader of the Opposition terms "an infernal piece of legislation."

But, carried away by the force of his own eloquence the hon. gentleman also attacks the Military Voters' Act. I desire to pay some attention to that for a moment, for in referring to that Act he implied that it was even worse, if anything, than the War-time Elections Act. Let me quote his own words:

> It has been openly stated in this House, and it will not be denied by hon. gentlemen opposite, that as a consequence of that legislation—that is, the Military Voters' Act—whole bundles of votes of soldiers overseas—votes by bundles—were taken and put into this riding, and into that riding, and into another riding, at the instance of some committee that was in the confidence of the Administration.

[Mr. Edwards.]

An hon. MEMBER: Hear.

Mr. EDWARDS: That is the statement of the hon. gentleman. I hear a little timid voice over there breathing out a faint "Hear"—not quite so certain now as he was a little while ago whether he will endorse his leader; the "hear, hears" were very vociferous at an earlier stage, but now he is not quite so certain. Well, I do not blame him for that. I presume that this gentleman with the timid voice was in the House when this matter came up last session when the then leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) was going to do great execution with a certain telegram, which he thought he had and professed to have, and which fizzled out very badly indeed so far as the hon. gentleman's argument was concerned. But, that aside, the statement is made by a man holding an important position in this country—it does not matter whether the man is very important or not, to hold the position of leader of the Opposition makes a man important—notwithstanding that the statement is made by the leader of a party (though that party is not so big or important as it used to be, and does not show any signs of getting stronger, but no matter, whether it is strong or weak, he is still leader of it as it is) that the soldiers' vote was manipulated in bundles for the benefit of this riding and the other riding. And the hon. gentleman to his right, who was at one time leader of the Opposition but now has to occupy a secondary place—and see the other fellow draw the salary—the hon. gentleman from Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. D. D. McKenzie), if I mistake not, in his remarks made a similar statement—that there were men in this House who owed their seats to the way in which the soldiers' votes were manipulated. I have already dealt a good many hard blows at this assertion, but I am going to ask the indulgence of the House while I give it another crack, in the hope that hon. gentlemen will be satisfied that there is absolutely nothing in the statement that the military votes were pooled for the benefit of members on this side of the House.

Let me call attention very briefly to one or two facts, Mr. Speaker, which I am taking from a summary of the general election returns of 1917. I will take first the province of Ontario with its eighty-two seats. How did the overseas voters affect the return of those members? All but four of the eighty-two were elected by the civil vote, to say nothing about the military

vote, and if you give to those four, not the military vote that they polled overseas, but only the same proportion of the vote overseas as they received of the soldier vote at home, every man of them would have a majority. I think that disposes of that erroneous statement so far as Ontario is concerned.

From the province of Quebec with its sixty-five seats only three members were elected to support Union Government. Who were they? The Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne), who had 1,446 of a majority of the civil vote—to say nothing at all about the military vote,—and who had 1,957 of a majority on the soldier vote; in other words, had he been so disposed or could he have done so he could have handed his opponent 1,000 soldier votes and still have defeated him by a majority of over 1,400. Will any person then say that a bundle of soldiers' votes effected the election of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries? Then we will take the member for St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames), who secured a majority of 1,583 of the civil votes. He could have given his opponent 1,000 soldier votes and still have had over 1,100 of a majority. Finally we will take the Hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), who had 2,099 of a majority of the civil votes, and who could have given his opponent 1,000 soldier votes and still have had over 1,930 of a plurality.

So, Sir, we can go on. Take, for instance, the province of Manitoba—and will any person say that the soldier vote was so manipulated as to elect a member from that province? Why, Mr. Speaker, every Laurier candidate except three in that province lost his deposit, so there was not much chance, I think, of applying that there.

In British Columbia, out of thirteen seats, every member but one could have handed his opponent his entire overseas vote and still won out. If we give the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Peck) only the same proportion or percentage of overseas votes as he obtained of the home vote, he would win out with a majority of 469, and is it not reasonable to suppose that that hon. gentleman should be given at least as large a proportion or percentage of the overseas vote as he obtained of the home vote when he was not at home while voting was going on?

Let us take the province of Saskatchewan with sixteen seats, and if you credit every soldier vote to his opponent, that would not deprive any member from Saskatchewan of his seat in this House. The same thing is true of Alberta with the exception of one seat, Edmonton West. But if we give the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Griesbach) no larger a percentage of overseas votes than he obtained of soldiers' votes at home, where his opponent was right on the job all the time, and hand the rest of his votes over to his opponent, the hon. member still wins out with a majority of 2,288. Therefore, he could give his opponent not only the percentage but another thousand votes and still be elected. That disposes pretty effectively of the statement made by the leader of the Opposition in regard to a manipulation of the overseas votes. There never was a statement made by any hon. gentleman in this House on either side further from the facts than that made the other day by the leader of the Opposition.

I should like to call attention to another little thing which, I am sure, will be extremely interesting to the leader of the Opposition. In the course of his remarks and in his hunting around for some cudgels with which to beat the Government, looking through the speech from the Throne the hon. gentleman finds fault with the paragraph referring to restrictions on the opium traffic. The hon. gentleman says that that is simply dabbling in small affairs. I should be astonished at a remark like that coming from any hon. member, but coming from this particular hon. member it is especially astonishing. Why do I say that? Because probably no other hon. gentleman in this House has been more intimately associated with an investigation of the opium traffic than the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition. In 1908, the hon. gentleman who was then, I believe, Deputy Minister of Labour, was appointed to go over to England and from there to China to attend an International Conference dealing with this opium question. On that occasion the hon. gentleman, taking advantage of the opportunity which was afforded to him by the reporters of getting his name into the press, just before he took the steamer at New York, gave an interview in the course of which he said that the only way in which this matter of restricting or doing away with the evils of the opium traffic could be handled was through a conference of the representatives of all the nations concerned. He thought this conference, the one to which he was going, would be unquestionably successful. How could it be otherwise? With the hon. gentleman there, it was bound to be successful. In March, 1908, he was commissioned to go to England; he went over

and returned about the end of April, and in May he went out to Vancouver and he issued a report in regard to opium conditions on the Pacific coast. Any person who reads that report will be still more astonished that the man who was so conversant as the hon. gentleman is with the terrible evils of that traffic could speak slightingly of any steps being taken to control, restrict, or put an end to that evil.

I might just incidentally call attention to the fact that the hon. gentleman who was Deputy Minister of Labour and who was slated for Minister of Labour, was away all the session of 1909. Yes, this same gentleman was not in the House at all; his constituency was not represented on the floor of Parliament during all the session of 1909. He was away, I will not say hobnobbing with the Chinese, but over there in Shanghai and other parts of China very properly looking into the evils of the opium traffic. But he was away from Parliament, and he was an important member of Parliament, and soon to become still more important by being a member of the Government. These little things the hon. gentleman has forgotten. In the multiplicity of things which crowd his grey matter, I suppose we should not be too hard on him if he forgets some of them. But for fear he has already forgotten this matter I must remind him, when he condemns the Government for having Cabinet ministers who are not members of this House, that Sir Richard Cartwright, Hon. Richard Scott, Hon. Oliver Mowat, Hon. David Mills, all held portfolios in the Laurier Administration and occupied seats in the Senate, there being no opportunity of questioning them on the floor of this Chamber. A similar condition of affairs is a terrible thing at the present time because we are here and the hon. gentleman is there. But when he sat as a minister of the Crown in the Laurier Administration and some of his colleagues sat as ministers of the Crown in the Senate, that was perfectly all right and no criticism came from the hon. gentleman. Then responsible and representative government was not in danger at all. The hon. gentleman at that time was sitting to the right of the Speaker, and he was a Cabinet minister and, of course, he was a host in himself. What did it matter that three or four Cabinet ministers were away while Mackenzie King sat as a Cabinet minister to the right of the Speaker? He was capable of doing not only his own work, but that of half a dozen others.

[Mr. Edwards.]

There are just one or two other things to which I should like to refer, but I am not going to take very many minutes in doing so. My principal object in rising was to show, as I think I have conclusively and clearly shown, that the remarks of the leader of the Opposition with regard to the War-time Elections Act and the Military Voters' Act were remarks which come with bad grace, especially from him, and that his statements in regard to manipulation is not borne out by facts. I have the facts here in support of my statement which I challenge any person to dispute.

I want to offer a criticism of the Government. We on this side of the House feel we have a right to offer criticism where criticism is needed, and in this case I think it is due. Very briefly, my criticism is this: I want it distinctly understood that I as one of the members of this House of English descent think that the Government of this country should take action, and at once, to stop the Hearst papers from circulating throughout the Dominion. There may be some people in this country who do not object to the lies and dirt which are being circulated throughout the Dominion by this man Hearst, but I as one of the Anglo-Saxon race and the son of an Englishman resent it most strongly. I think it is a shame and disgrace to the Dominion for these papers to be allowed for one minute to circulate through the mails of this country. Let us at least attempt to be consistent. I have no sympathy with agitators like this man Ivens and some of those other fellows in Winnipeg, but what in Heaven's name is the good of putting Ivens behind the bars for giving expression to views which are likely to lead to riot, when we permit the Hearst publications to come into this country and sow seeds which cannot bring forth any other crop than disloyalty and disunion. I say that is not consistent, and I condemn as strongly as I can the lack of action on the part of this Government in not putting a stop to this sort of thing.

This is not the time to go into a detailed discussion of tariff matters. The proper time, as you, Sir, pointed out, to discuss the tariff is when the Budget is under consideration, and I shall therefore refrain from making any reference to the tariff until that time comes.

Before taking my seat, may I say in all kindness of spirit that I was sorry to hear the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Rouville (Mr. Gauthier) speak as he did the other day. He saw fit to tell this House that

one of the great provinces of this Dominion was simply waiting for its "hour." Well, there was a time some years ago when a certain man and a certain people toasted "The Day" and waited for its coming. I did not think I would ever live to hear a man get up in this House and say that one of the great provinces of Confederation, if not toasting "The Day" was waiting for the "hour" when it could get its revenge. The hon. gentleman may think himself justified in making that statement. He may feel that the province of Quebec has grievances against the rest of Canada, but if he will look closely into the history of the past he will find that if there has been one province of this Dominion which has shown a disposition to interfere in the purely local matters of other provinces it is, unfortunately, the province from which he comes. That is undoubtedly the truth, and I merely say that because I want to impress the fact on the mind of the hon. gentleman, and of any others who think and feel as he does. I shall not follow that matter any further. I hope, and indeed believe, that the hon. gentleman when he said the province of Quebec was waiting for its hour and would not confer with other provinces until that hour arrived, was not expressing the sentiments of the people of the province from which he comes, and for whom he presumed to speak.

Hon. THOMAS ALEXANDER CRERAR (Marquette): Mr. Speaker, it had not been my intention to speak to this resolution this evening, but as I have some opinions in respect to public matters in Canada that I should like to place before the House at the present time and as I understand a vote is to be taken this evening, I must avail myself of the opportunity that now presents itself.

It is a matter for congratulation that after four years of absence from the regular meeting place of this Parliament we are now assembled in our new home. I wish to express my appreciation of the magnificent building our Parliaments will have for their home in future. I am among those who believe that it is a good thing to have fine public buildings in a country, and I think we are certainly fortunate in the results that have been achieved here.

I also to wish to make a passing reference to the absence of the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden). It was my lot to be associated with him for a considerable period of time during the progress of the war. He doubtless may have made mistakes, but I wish here and now simply to bear testimony to this fact that the Prime Minister of this country carried a burden which very few citizens of Canada appreciated, and discharged the most onerous tasks with a conscientiousness and sense of duty that certainly challenged the respect of those who were intimately associated with him.

I also wish to make a passing refer- to the mover (Mr. Cronyn) and the seconder (Mr. McGregor) of the Address. I congratulate the hon. member for London (Mr. Cronyn) in particular. He delivered an address that will rank high in the records of this Parliament. With a great deal of what he said I am in entire agreement. The seconder of the Address endeavoured to give the House a great deal of useful information, and while I cannot agree with some of the statements he made and some of the conclusions he reached, I wish also to extend to him my felicitations.

In my opinion the speech from the Throne was rather a meagre document. It was reasonable, I think, to expect, at this juncture of our history—shall I say this critical period in the life of the nation—when after the turmoil of war, we are setting about the reorganization of our affairs and the reconstruction of our society upon, we hope a new basis, that the speech from the Throne, which is supposed to foreshadow the legislation that will be brought before Parliament at this session, should contain something more than it did. I say that it was only reasonable to expect this, and had it been done it would have been more to the point. In this regard I would direct the attention of the Government to the speech of the hon. member for London (Mr. Cronyn), in which they will find much food for thought. If they wisely and closely study that speech they will, I think, find much therein that they could apply in the legislative programme which they may bring before the House. I should like, also, Mr. Speaker, to extend my congratulations to the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) who has assumed a position of very great responsibility. Under our parliamentary form of Government the leader of the Opposition has a duty which, in my judgment at any rate, is only second to that of the Prime Minister; and I am sure, no matter what our views may be we can lay long enough aside the turmoil of party strife to express the hope that his career may be long in the position he occupies.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. CRERAR: Well, Mr. Speaker, hon. gentlemen opposite sometimes find such little comfort in this House—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. CRERAR: —that I for one have no desire to begrudge any pleasure they may derive from a trivial slip of the tongue. Let me qualify my statement, which I did not mean in the sense in which hon. gentlemen opposite have construed it. I am sure that, whether as leader of the Opposition or leader of the Government in this country, the hon. gentleman who has lately assumed the responsibilities of the office which he now fills has the good wishes both of this House and of the country as well. I have to offer, however, one or two criticisms of the speech delivered by the leader of the Opposition. If there has been any departure in this country from the strict principles of representative Government, I am in entire accord with my hon. friend in his desire to see those principles firmly re-established. But I for one should have liked to hear something from the leader of the Opposition as to what he proposes to do, should he be called upon to discharge the onerous duties of Prime Minister, in respect of many of the matters that are now engaging the attention of the people. After all, his speech, and the admirable speech of the acting Prime Minister (Sir George Foster) who followed him reminded me a good deal of the days of long ago when it was almost a contest between the "ins" and the "outs" as to who would hold the premier honours in debate in this House. In my judgment, Mr. Speaker, this does not measure up to the occasion and to the needs of the hour. We are facing problems which five years ago we never dreamed we would have to face. We have tremendous issues to settle, and to my mind it would have been more appropriate had the leader of the Opposition and the leader of the Government devoted a little more attention to these great and pressing matters than they did in the speeches they delivered a few days ago. Probably it may be regarded as being a trifle forward in a young member of the House to proffer words of counsel to those who occupy these responsible positions. Nevertheless, there are questions of great and urgent moment before us, and in the brief time I shall take up this evening I shall endeavour to discuss a few of them. When all is said and done, there is not much profit in raking up the past and in resuscitating old party strifes and fighting them over again, I care not which side it comes from; because, with the great problems facing the country at the present time it is the duty of the citizens, and particularly of their representatives in Parliament where our laws are made, to devote their attention with all the ability and energy they can bring to bear, to the solution of the questions in the manner that will bring the greatest benefit to our country.

Now, the speech from the Throne tells us that peace has been concluded with Bulgaria and that the Treaty ratifying that peace will presently be submitted to this House for its consideration. The fact that Canada has found herself in the position of making a Treaty of Peace with Bulgaria carries a great significence with it, and brings home at once to one's mind the place our country occupies to-day among the nations of the world. We have heard a good deal from ministers of the Crown in regard to the altered position which Canada now occupies as a result of our participation in the war, and particularly of our participation in the making of peace. The President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell), who, I regret, is not in his seat, has told us—and it has also been told us by some of his colleagues—that Canada has attained the full status of a nation, that we have grown away from the position which we occupied in the past. My attention was attracted a few weeks ago by an address delivered by the President of the Privy Council in the city of Ottawa, in the course of which he took strong exception to certain resolutions that were about to be brought before the American Senate dealing with Canada's relations to the League of Nations. If I remember rightly, the hon. gentleman took strong grounds, even going so far as to state that if these resolutions were carried through Congress at Washington either Canada or the United States would step out of the League of Nations. I do not for a moment mention this as a challenge to the hon. gentleman's position on that point, but I would direct this consideration to the House, and particularly to the Government—that at the time the President of the Privy Council was making that speech in Ottawa, one of his colleagues, my esteemed friend the Minister of The Interior (Mr. Meighen) was making a speech in the city of Winnipeg in which he spoke of Canadians as "subjects of Great Britain." Now, there is to my mind a distinction here, and One can understand the position that some

of our American cousins take upon this question, and I would offer the suggestion to the Government that they should walk circumspectly in regard to it. After all, this question of Canada's status as a nation has yet to be determined.

We were told by the hon. the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell), in his speech on the Peace Treaty last autumn, that Canada had acquired a new status, that every one recognized it and that at the forthcoming Imperial Conference which was to be held this summer he felt quite sure that the steps would be taken to accord Canada that position. If that is to be done I think it is a question that should be discussed by this Parliament before it is settled by any members of the Government which may attend an Imperial Conference. No matter what these changes may involve, they are too momentous, too far-reaching in their possibilities to be delegated to a small group from our Government, no matter how able or conscientious these representatives may be. Consequently, I for one, take the position that if the Government have in contemplation anything which they propose to place before the Imperial Conference in this regard they should bring it before the House and get an expression of opinion from Parliament before Canada is committed to any particular line of action in respect to it.

There is one other point that has come up in the speeches that have been made in this resolution. There has been considerable discussion of the exchange situation. It certainly is a matter of very great importance to this Dominion. As far as that question is concerned, it does seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that the disease, if it is a disease, must run its course like any other disease and find its own remedy ultimately. It was with some regret that I noticed in the speech delivered by the hon. the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) in Winnipeg a statement, when he was discussing this question, which seemed to betray upon his part rather a carelessness of expression —because the Minister of the Interior is not one who usually speaks without knowledge of what he speaks about, but his remarks on this occasion would indicate a carelessness of expression or a lack of knowledge of the conditions underlying the question of our exchange at the present time. There also crept into his remarks a note which I was sorry to see there. Let me read a quotation from his speech. After discussing the question at some length in regard to the United States he said:

> Consequently there is one way only in which this country can rescue itself from the humiliation which it is now suffering, of having the value of its dollars dictated by Wall street—and that is by setting our lines of policy so that the adverse balance will be wiped away and if possible sell them as many goods as we buy.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. CRERAR: That latter sentiment is one with which I am in entire accord, but I do regret to see the suggestion thrown out by the Minister of the Interior that the manipulation of Wall street is the cause of the unsatisfactory conditions existing in our relations with the United States. Which country suffers the more, Canada or the United States, from this question of exchange? Certainly, the United States does, because if the exchange goes against Canada in the United States to that extent it is more difficult to ship goods from the United States to Canada, therefore, from the plainest business reasons, the business men of the United States are just as much interested as we are in seeing this question of exchange set right.

The minister also stated upon that occasion that the present exchange situation was due to the fact that we had purchased from the United States last year $746,000,000 worth of goods and had exported only $477,000,000. That is partially the reason, but it is not the complete reason. I would point out that in 1911 this country exported to the United States only $112,000,000, while it imported from the United States $274,000,000. In other words, our exports to the United States in 1911 were only 41 per cent of our imports from that country, while in 1919 they were 64 per cent of our imports from the United States. But, there was then no discount on the Canadian dollar in the United States, and consequently we have to seek elsewhere for a reason for this adverse exchange situation. It is found largely in the great disruption of international trade. Prior to the war we exported more to Europe than we imported from Europe, and we settled our adverse balance in New York with the surplus sterling we had from the sales that we had made abroad. In that regard I should like also to take issue with my hon. friend from Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie). In speaking on this question in the House the other day he made this statement:

> Let me say this to the Government and to the country—and I am not particular in what way it will be understood; in fact, it can only be understood in one way—that while I am anxious for the widest possible trade with foreign countries, I would not trade to the

extent of one five-cent piece with any country which will not recognize my Canadian dollar to the full face value of that dollar. If this country is loyal to itself, loyal to its principles, loyal to its institutions, it will stand by Canadianism in the matter of having any trade with any country that will not recognize the Canadian dollar at its full face value as international currency.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. CRERAR: My hon. friends opposite say "hear, hear." Let me draw their attention to the fact that if this is a sound principle of business or of political wisdom for Canada to apply, then it is a sound principle for other countries to apply. We cannot deny to other countries what we would do ourselves. In what position do we find ourselves with the Mother Country? We exported to the United Kingdom in 1919 $560,000,000, but we imported from the United Kingdom only $73,000,000.

Mr. BURNHAM: What was the rate of exchange? It is absolutely necessary to know that.

Mr. CRERAR: I do not understand the hon. gentleman's question.

Mr. BURNHAM: In his present reference the hon. gentleman is applying the whole business of exchange to the old country.

Mr. CRERAR: I still fail to grasp the point that my hon. friend is endeavouring to make. We know that while under normal conditions sterling exchange is worth $4.86 in New York, which has been the clearing house for exchange on this continent, it has fallen to $3.20 and even below that, and consequently the English pound sterling in Canada to-day is at a very great discount.

Mr. EDWARDS: The Canadian dollar is not worth one hundred cents in the United States. Is the Canadian dollar worth one hundred cents in England?

Mr. CRERAR: Certainly it is worth one hundred cents in England.

Mr. EDWARDS: I can see that was the point that the hon. member for Cape Breton and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie)

Mr. CRERAR: The hon. gentleman (Mr. Edwards) I am afraid does not understand the A.B.C. of the economies of this question.

Why should not our dollar be at a premium in the United Kingdom when we are exporting $560,000,000 worth of goods to that country and only buying $73,000,000 from her? What I am endeavouring to place before the House is this: That if the argument of my hon. friend from Cape Breton North and Victoria is sound it could be advanced with equal force by the Britisher, in the United Kingdom, against trading with Canada.

An hon. MEMBER: Stop trading altogether, that would settle it.

Mr. CRERAR: Stop trading altogether? That would not be a very desirabl- way of dealing with the question. I think it is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that statements and inferences of this kind should proceed from public men in Canada. After all, one of the things that we are aiming at and hope to achieve, is international good will. If we cannot secure as a result of the great war, a better understanding between peoples and nations, then it does make one wonder what this old world is coming to. We know that in private life animosities or differences of opinion that sometimes ripen into strong antagonisms between individuals often arise from very small causes; and it is a duty, indeed I think an imperative duty, resting upon every public man who occupies a position of any responsibility that he should endeavour to avoid leaving wrong impressions in the minds of the people of other countries. If my hon. friend from Cape Breton and my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior should go to Great Britain and preach the doctrine they have preached in Canada I am sure they would not be very well received. We are setting out on the career of Nationhood and such being the case we must develop a foreign policy of some kind or other. I sincerely hope that the one alluded to is not the foreign policy we are going to develop in this regard.

Mr. EDWARDS: Having regard to the rate of exchange between Canada and the United States, and the rate of exchange between Canada and Great Britain, does not my hon. friend think it would be the part of wisdom to direct our trade to England rather than to the United States?

Mr. CRERAR: At the present time?

Mr. EDWARDS: Yes.

Mr. CRERAR: I certainly cannot agree with my hon. friend, and again he exposes ignorance of the most elementary principles of political economy. The Minister of the Interior told us in his speech in Winnipeg that we should sell more to the United States. We are already selling over $500,000,000 worth more of goods to Great Britain than we are buying from that country.

Mr. EDWARDS: The minister also said we should import less.

Mr. CRERAR: I grant that is one way to help the situation out.

Mr. EDWARDS: But that does not conform with what the hon. gentleman has already said.

Mr. CRERAR: I do not wish to get into any controversy across the floor with my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) whom I esteem very highly.

Now, Mr. Speaker, where does the remedy lie for this condition of our exchange? It lies in greater production in this country and in selling more goods. It lies also in curtailing imports from United States. But we shall make a mistake if we adopt the policy, by artificial means of controlling and regulating the imports into, or even the exports from Canada. As to this question of greater production I would suggest to the Government—I am not sure that the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) whom I hold in very high respect will be willing to take my advice—but at any rate I suggest for his careful consideration when he is framing the Budget to be shortly submitted to Parliament, that he give due regard to this question of encouraging development of our natural industries and of encouraging production in this country in all its forms.

After all, where does the wealth in Canada come from? It lies within our great undeveloped natural resources. We are producing, for instance, in Canada on an average three hundred million bushels of wheat a year, and we have scarcely touched the fringe of the possibilities of development in that regard. Much of our great mining areas are as yet scarcely touched. We also have large timber resources in Canada. How are we going to make these productive? We must place people upon the land. But when we do that we must furnish them with the implements of production to work with. I would therefore suggest to the Minister of Finance that when he is framing his Budget for the coming year he take this fact into account and that he remove from the tools and implements of production in Canada, whether it is for the forest, the farm, or the mine, the duties that at present increase their cost.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON (Muskoka): Would the hon. gentleman go as far as he is reported to have said he would go in removing all duties in this country?

Mr. CRERAR: My hon. friend should not get excited. If he will wait for a moment he will get the information for which he is seeking.

Now, in what field of development can we most readily and easily find a response in this country? I submit, Sir, that it is in agriculture; and I venture this statement, that if Canada in the last forty years had given one quarter of the assistance in the development of agriculture that she has accorded directly by way of bounties and indirectly by way of a protective tariff, to manufacturing industries in the Dominion, our wealth as a nation would be greater and our population would be larger than it is at the present time. I would point out to the House the excellent and splendid advantage that Canada enjoys in this regard. We have a country that is essentially an agricultural country. We know that our provinces, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, are rich in agricultural possibilities. We can take the Maritime Provinces, and we can take the province of Quebec and the province of Ontario; they contain vast undeveloped agricultural possibilities. We have our Western prairies that are as capable of producing one billion bushels of wheat as they are of producing three hundred million bushels. Finally we have the province of British Columbia where resources, although more varied, still contain great agricultural possibilities. I would direct this thought again to my protectionist friends in this House, that the farmers of this country are to-day in the position, where they are selling practically everything they produce in open competition with the world and are buying in a restricted market everything they require for the purpose of production. I can say also that it will take a very long time indeed to convince the farmers of western Canada, for example, that there is any virtue in the principle of protection, especially in a customs tariff. The argument of the protectionist is that we must have this form of state assistance to industry in order to build up a home market and make us independent of outside countries.

But the fact is that we would require 50,000,000 souls to consume the wheat we now produce in this country, and the same applies to practically every other line of our agricultural products. Let us look at the opportunities that lie ahead of us. Canada occupies the northern half of this continent. Immediately to the south of us. there is a vast country that will soon become a food importing country. To-day

the population of the United States probably reaches 112,000,000 to 115,000,000 souls; within fifteen or twenty years that population may reach 140,000,000. To-day they are within measurable distance of becoming a food importing nation—indeed, in some respects they are now importing the food stuffs we produce.

Mr. EDWARDS: They have a surplus of everything the farmer has to sell, and we have not.

Mr. CRERAR: They are reaching the point, I say, when they will be a food importing nation. We have also the excellent advantage of our relationship with the British market, which is a great consuming market. Where does the Britisher get the greater part of the food he eats—the meats and the wheat, and the coarse grains that he requires for his live stock? He has to buy them in the outside markets of the world. When he buys from the Argentine Republic he has to haul his purchases twice the distance that he requires to carry them from Canada; if he buys in Australia he has to haul them three times the distance, and if he buys in India the haul is more than double that from this country. Consequently, I say again, Canada as an agricultural country occupies a unique and splendid place in the world to-day. And it does seem to me, Mr. Speaker,—and I have never stated anything with more sincerity than I state this to-night—that it is the part of very great wisdom that we in future direct our energies to the development of our agricultural resources, and in fact to the development of our natural resources of all kinds.

To-day we are supplying a very large percentage of the pulpwood that is consumed in the United States; over ninety per cent of the pulp and paper manufactured in this country is exported to the United States. We have great pulp forests yet in reserve, and I would offer this suggestion in that regard—that I think the Government might well take into consideration the question of reafforestation. We have large areas that could well be reforested. These bounties of nature will not last forever, and it is the part of wisdom now to lay the foundation for maintaining the supplies of these resources that are necessary for human happiness and human progress.

Now I come to a point that was mentioned yesterday afternoon by my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt). He at any rate is honest and frank; there is never any doubt as to where he stands on any question that he has opinions upon, and, let me say, I have the highest respect for an opponent of that kind. But I do not think that my hon. friend was quite fair in some of his allusions yesterday afternoon. He referred to the Agrarian Movement, and he associated with that the idea of class legislation and class domination. I take issue with my hon. friend in that regard. He has been a Protectionist all his life, he has believed in that principle during the many years it has dominated the fiscal policy of this country, and yet I maintain that there never was perpetrated upon this country a greater instance of class legislation than is to be found in the operation of that principle. What is the purpose of a tariff? It is designed to benefit a particular section of the people, it operates in no other way, and consequently the operation of this protective system in our fiscal policy, which has obtained largely for the last forty years, has conferred upon a special class a privilege that in my judgment is not compatible with a true democracy. And I would point out to my hon. friend from Brantford and to other hon. gentlemen also who believe in a protective tariff, that Protection is nothing more or less than a type of State Socialism. It is State assistance to particular industries, and just as surely as night follows day it will bring this development in its train. If you have a protective tariff you must have your boards of commerce and your regulative bodies that will endeavour to control the thing that you have built up. It was true in Germany, and it was true in the United States, for they were inevitably coming to it if they had not largely modified their fiscal system some seven or eight years ago.

I wish to say this further, Sir, in respect to what my honourable friend terms the Agrarian Movement, that this is not a class movement. It was not a class move in the constituency of Assiniboia, because in that constituency the towns and villages gave as good support to my honourable friend (Mr. Gould) who represents that constituency in this House as the farmers did. It was not a class doctrine in the county of Victoria and Carleton, N.B., despite the fact that my honourable friend, the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) went to that constituency and warned the electors against the dangers and evils of "occupational politics." But you must test and judge this by the platform that the Agrarians, if you wish to call them by that title, have laid down. I have stated it on public platforms and in this House,

and I challenge any honourable member, Mr. Speaker, to take that platform word by word and line by line and point out anything in it that is of a class character. Such a thing cannot be found within its four corners.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Will my honourable friend allow me a question? Would he say that the new Government formed in the province of Ontario is fully representative of all classes of the people residing in that province?

Mr. CRERAR: I am discussing federal issues, Mr. Speaker. But let me answer my honourable friend in this way: The Government of Ontario, which contains, I believe, eight farmers and one lawyer, is just as representative of the people of Ontario as the Government that preceded it and which contained eight lawyers and one farmer.

Mr. CASGRAIN: There you have got your answer.

Mr. CRERAR: Mr. Speaker, the question has also been asked: Where will the revenue come from if we do away with the protective tariff? In that respect I have just this to say, that I am not at all sure that we would not get more revenue, for instance, out of woollen duties if they were on a basis of fifteen per cent than when they are on a basis of thirty per cent. But the Agrarians—and I thank my honourable friend from Brantford for coining that title for me—do not wish to sweep away the tariff at one fell blow as some people are trying to make out; that is not their policy. Broadly speaking, their policy is based on the principle that the implements and tools of production should be free and that the necessaries of life should be made as free as possible, and in that regard they asked for a substantial all-round reduction in the customs tariff. A tariff on luxuries? Yes, keep it on and raise it higher. but I cannot see the exact wisdom of having certain classes of luxuries imported into this country as they are to-day at a lower rate of duty than that imposed on necessities of life such as cotton, boots and shoes. I would offer this suggestion to the Minister of Finance that he might well raise the tax on luxuries to 50 per cent if he likes; but when he does that, he should also impose an excise tax on the manufacturer in Canada of such luxuries.

But those who have been called the agrarians have certain concrete proposals in respect to revenue. We have the income tax, and the income tax has come to stay in this country. I find from the statistics that for the years 1915 to 1918, the little country of New Zealand collected in income tax over $55,000,000. The population of New Zealand, based on its census of 1916, is roughly 1,100,000. I would direct this to the attention of the Minister of Finance, that if Canada in the same period had collected income tax in the same proportion, we would have collected $470,000,000, when as a matter of fact we collected nothing from income tax during those years, and only $34,000,000 in business profits taxes. In other words, during that period, the little country of New Zealand with a population of about one-eighth of that of Canada collected over $20,000,000 in income taxes and profits taxes more than Canada did. I would suggest this as a fertile field to explore in respect of securing revenue.

We are told that if we raise our income taxes, all the wealthy people, who enjoy large incomes will cross the border, and that consequently that source of income would be shut off from us. What do we find in the United States? In the year 1919, for instance, the United States collected in income and excess profits taxes over $2,600,000,000. If Canada had collected at the same ratio according to population we would have collected over $200,000,000. I know the difficulty of organizing a system of income taxation. But I will point this out, that in New Zealand and Australia these income taxes were, I believe, practically in all cases assessed after the outbreak of war. In these countries, British countries like our own, they have perfected their machinery at any rate to the point where they are getting vastly more for their revenue than we are in Canada. Moreover, Canada occupied a very favourable position. We know the orders we had for munitions; we know that our factories of every kind, after the outbreak of war and practically during the whole period of the war, were running day and night to fill the demand for goods to maintain the armies at the front. On the other hand, New Zealand and Australia, from the position they occupied in the world, from the shortage of shipping on the high seas were placed where they could sell practically nothing except the wool which they produced. Yet those countries, with smaller income than that which we enjoyed during the war, far outstripped us in the amount they contributed in income taxes. I believe that one of the mistakes we have made—and I do not wish to attribute blame in any particular direction in that regard—is this, that we have not

paid enough of the cost of the war as we have gone along, with the result the inflation of our currency has been increased and our debt larger than it otherwise would be.

We have also the suggestion—and it is a very wise one—that if we are to get out of the difficulties that may be ahead of us, one of the means of assisting in that is to secure additional immigration to this country. With that, I am in entire accord, but I am not sure that I agree with the estimates that have been made in some quarters that within the next ten years the population of this country will have increased to 15,000,000 souls. I hope I am mistaken, but I am afraid that when the next census returns come in, they will be disappointing to the Canadian people. We have spent large sums in promoting immigration to this country, and with what result? We have spent large sums in promoting immigration from the United States to this country, and with what result? Our Department of Immigration and Colonization returns, unfortunately, do not give us the number of people that leave this country for foreign lands. We have records of the number of people that come into this country, but none of those that go out. In this connection I want to give the House a quotation from the last report of the American Commissioner General of Immigration, a United States government report, regarding this matter. To me, it was a surprise, as I am sure it will be to many members of this House. Here is what he states:

> During the eleven fiscal years, 1909-1919, the total immigration from Canada to the United States, including returning American citizens, was approximately 1,288,000, compared with an immigration into Canada from the United States of 1,072,000, or a balance of about 216,000 in our favour. In the movement of United States citizens alone to and from Canada, the balance is in favour of the latter, for during the past ten years nearly 562,000 have gone there and about 367,000 have come to the United States.

In other words, of the immigrants that we have received in Canada from the United States, amounting in that period to 562,000, according to their figures, 367,000 have returned to the United States.

Mr. BURNHAM: Which country had the higher tariff during that period?

Mr. CRERAR: I am afraid that I do not follow my hon friend. I am anxious to get through and I am taking up, perhaps, more time than I should. It continues:

> It should be understood that these groups do not include those who cross the border temporarily in either direction, but only those who come or go for expected permanent residence.

[Mr. Crerar.]

But there is one other statement, and this also is significant.

> The movement of alien immigrants from Canada—

That is alien immigration from Canada as against native-born Canadians.

> —to the United States is very largely made up of persons of northern and western European descent or birth, the chief element in the order of their importance being English, French, Scotch, Irish, German, and Scandinavian. Peoples of southern and eastern European stock form relatively a small part of the movement.

What does that mean? It means that of the immigrants we bring to our shores from England, France, Scotland, Ireland, Scandinavia, and Southern and Eastern Europe, the greater percentage of those who leave us to go to the United States are from those who are considered the best and most desirable class.

These are not pleasant things to contemplate, but I say again to my protectionist friends on the other side, if this is the product of forty years of protection in this country, surely it is time to consider a change. If we are going to keep these people whom we bring to our shores we must make Canada a cheap country to live in for the ordinary man; we must make it a good country to live in. Why do people stay in a country? Because it is a good place in which to get along and raise their families. They will not stay if they are up against circumstances which make it difficult for them to make both ends meet. There is also this fact, which may very well be taken into consideration in conjunction with this: In Canada in 1918—and I would call the attention of my manufacturing friends in the House to this—we raised 80 per cent of our federal revenues by taxes on consumption. In the same year the United States raised 20 per cent of their federal revenues by taxes on consumption. What does that mean? Simply this, that taxes on consumption are taxes on things that people must have in order to maintain existence. The result is that on the whole the cost of living to the working man is lower to-day in the United States than it is in Canada, and if wages are as good in the United States—and they are, and in some cases they are better—I ask my manufacturing friends how long they are going to keep in Canada their skilled workmen and artisans when that condition of affairs exists. There is only one way in which the situation can be met, and it is to use every possible agency

to make this country a cheap place to live in. When we have done that, I think we shall have largely found the means of retaining within this country the people who come here.

Perhaps the most important item in the bill of fare presented in the speech from the Throne is a new Dominion franchise. A new franchise measure is to be brought before the House. In my judgment there are two main principles that should be embodied in the Franchise Bill when the Government brings it down. First, it must be a fair and just franchise.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. CRERAR: I am delighted I can make at least one remark that provokes applause from both sides of the House. Secondly, it must provide fair and just electoral machinery.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. CRERAR: From the applause I anticipate that when this measure comes before the House there will be very little difficulty in getting it through. Those are two cardinal principles that should be embodied in our Franchise Act, and in that connection I wish to take issue with my hon. friend from Frontenac(Mr. Edwards) in respect to the War-time Elections Act. I have never been one who supported the War-time Elections Act. I believe it was unsound in principle. I believe it has brought bad consequences that will remain in this country for many years to come. I do not base my criticism of the Act so much on the grounds on which it has been frequently criticised in the past, but rather upon the effect it has had upon the people we have brought to this country, and whom we hoped to elevate into good Canadian citizens. What has been its effect? We invited these people to come here, and they came. I am free to confess that in many cases we gave them the franchise too easily, but I hold that once a man has been admitted into the brotherhood of Canadian citizenship we should be very careful indeed in taking away from him any of the privileges that go with that citizenship. Its effect on our people has been two-fold. Thousands of these men who were disfranchised took no exception to it. They said: You take the franchise from us, but you relieve us from military service; that is a fair trade. Are those the ideals of citizenship we should instil into our people? Sir, I think not. Every man of Canadian citizenship should have been obliged to shoulder the obligations of Canadian citizenship under the Military Service Act. There is no other fair way of working this thing out. On the other hand, there was another class of our foreign-born people who were disfranchised. They had lived here for years and were good Canadian citizens, and they felt that a slight and an indignity and an injustice had been done to them, and they now harbour in their hearts a feeling of bitterness against their adopted country. That is not the way to create good Canadian citizens of the type we wish to have. I repeat, we have been too lax in the past in making easy the way to Canadian citizenship. I would be very careful whom I admit to that citizenship; but once a man is admitted to it he should be protected in all the privileges and enjoyments that go with it, and should be made to shoulder equally with other Canadian citizens the responsibilities and obligations that go with it.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON (Muskoka): May I ask a question?

Mr. CRERAR: My hon. friend is prolific in questions, but I have no obligation.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON (Muskoka): Would the hon. member give to Germans who had relatives fighting against us, and who were pro-German, the right to vote in this country during the war?

Mr. CRERAR: I would have done this: If he was a Canadian citizen I would have left him his privileges of citizenship, and I would have made him fight. I would have required him to do his duty to his adopted country the same as others had to do. I hope that the defects that exist in the War-time Elections Act will not be introduced in the new Franchise Act. I believe that it is possible for us to make the vast majority of our foreign-born people good citizens. I had the opportunity only a short time ago of coming in contact with some of these people. The first Ruthenians brought to this country were settled within forty miles of the place where I was brought up as a boy and lived to manhood. I saw these people go into what was practically a wilderness, a place where no English-speaking person would ever think of endeavouring to make a home—and what was the result? They got their 160 acres of land, and to-day we find there smiling fields, fine barns, splendid houses, and, let me add, their children going to school and learning the English language. I recently held a number of meetings in my constitu-

ency. I did that because I believe it is the duty of every member of Parliament at proper intervals to meet his constituents and give an account of his stewardship and give them an opportunity to meet and discuss public questions with him. A number of Ruthenians were present at one meeting I addressed. Among other things I said: "We can have no divided allegiance in Canada. The man who comes here and is admitted to Canadian citizenship, no matter from what country he comes, must be prepared to accept the responsibilities and obligations of that citizenship, and he should be protected in his rights of citizenship."

After I was through one of these settlers got up and said: "We come here with the desire to be Canadians. We want to be such, and, to use his own words, "We want to place heart to heart and good will to good will with the other people of this country." That is the spirit in which we can make these people into good Canadian citizens. Let us deal with them fairly and justly, and, if we do, I am sure we shall in the future find in them a valuable asset for our country.

I have already spoken at greater length, than I had intended, but I desire to say a word or two in regard to the amendment which has been introduced by the leader of the Opposition. I do not think he has been at all happy in the phrasing of that amendment, and personally I do not like to see in it any reference to the absence of the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) that would in any way be construed in the country or elsewhere as being directly or indirectly a reflection upon that right hon. gentleman. Nevertheless, I intend to support the amendment for the following reason. When the Union Government was formed it was formed for one specific purpose. There was just one issue before the country, and I worked in the interests of that issue because I believed it to be right. In this connection I shall repeat what I have said before, that under similar circumstances I would do the same thing again. There was, as I say, no other issue than this one before the Canadian people at that time. But now we are faced with a new condition of affairs in this period of reconstruction. We are spending vast sums of money and are embarking on great national policies of one kind and another, and I know enough of democracy to believe that the people of Canada should have an opportunity at this juncture of electing a new parliament and of expressing thereby their views and wishes on the important questions which are clamouring for consideration at this time. I believe that it is the desire of the people that they should again be consulted and have these questions thoroughly threshed out in debate from one end of the country to the other. After all, Mr. Speaker, we are simply servants of the people, and it is our business to embody in legislation what the majority of the people require; and I submit that in the present state of affairs this Parliament has not a mandate from the country upon the many problems we have to face and solve. I am not speaking particularly of either the Government or the Opposition, but of Parliament as a whole. We are not qualified to express the wishes of the people on the vast issues that confront us because we were not elected upon those issues. The one and only issue upon which the present Parliament was elected has ceased to exist; it has passed beyond the horizon. We are now facing many great problems, and it seems to me only fair and right that the people at the earliest opportunity should be able to express their opinions upon them.

If we survey the past political history of this country we shall find that there has been a great deal in it that has not been elevating, or worthy of our country. I should like to see the members of this Parliament, and those who may succeed them, animated in their attitude to their duty by the splendid spirit of heroic sacrifice that animated our men overseas. If we can bring to bear, in the responsible and important positions we occupy as the law-makers of our people, the vision, the outlook, and the devotion that inspired our men to such heroic deeds, then I have no fear for the future of Canada. We have recently erected this building, with this noble assembly hall, as a fitting evidence of our deep faith in the future of our country, and I say again that if we, as Canadian citizens, seek only what is good and noble and honest and true, and look only for what is best, in one another, I have no fear for our future prosperity and welfare. If we do this we shall rear in this Canada a nation great not alone in the things that are material but in the character of its institutions and of its people.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Minister of the Interior): Perhaps the frequent references of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) to my humble self, and, I fear, his very frequent inaccurate references to a speech I recently made, will justify me in departing from the determination I had

come to until a few moments ago not to take part in this debate. The hon. member for Marquette, who until recent months was a colleague of my own in this Government, left the Administration on a question of policy, and is now a private member as a consequence. In passing, it is worthy of note that though some others have resigned from the Administration, feeling that they had performed as much service to their country as they could, the hon. member for Marquette alone has left the Cabinet because of a difference in point of policy. That is, possibly just worthy of reflection on the part of the leader of the Opposition, who seems to think that when ministers resign, not on questions of principle at all and still support the Administration, it is a sign of disintegration and decay. The hon. member for Marquette has, through some months, so conducted himself as now to be regarded as the head of what is termed the Farmers' Movement in Canada, a movement which he objects to having called a class movement, which he describes as a national movement, but which, if it is of the character and scope he attributes to it, might in my humble estimation very well change its name. I do not know that it is of very great importance just how you describe the movement or the party; names do not count for a great deal. But I should think that a class movement was one that was originated by a class; and having a very simple and ordinary mind I should conclude that the farmers of this country were a class. If this movement was not originated by the farmers as a class, by whom was it originated? I do not know that any other class in Canada had anything to say in the formation of the platform upon which it now appeals. That platform is now a completed fact. It became a completed fact at the dictation and after the sole consideration of the class that originated the movement.

It is true the leader (Mr. Crerar) who has just sat down states that they are ready to welcome the votes to office of all and sundry in this country. No doubt in the world they are, but does that make it any more than a class movement, being originated as such? However, that matters little. It does matter though what the platform is. It does matter what course of policy that movement calls to have adopted in this Dominion? That is of first and vital consequence? It does matter as well that any Government in office in this Dominion shall be of such a general and cosmopolitan character as may fairly be said to represent all classes of the people. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar), when he was confronted with one of the necessary consequences of any movement of this kind—the first outcome of the political phase of this movement in Canada, being the election of what is known as a farmer's government in Ontario, and the fact that it contains eight farmers, two labour men and one lawyer—answered that it was just as representative of all classes of the Ontario people, containing eight farmers and one lawyer, as the previous administration, as he said, which contained eight lawyers and one farmer. I would have expected an hon. gentleman, who had attained to the high position that the hon. member for Marquette has, to see that his statements to this House, however much he might be tempted to indulge in repartee that seemed momentarily effective, would bear some resemblance to the facts. Would he be justified in making that retort if the previous Ontario Government had not contained eight lawyers and had contained more than one farmer? What would be thought of his statement if it should be the fact that the Government contained among its number less than half lawyers? Yet, that is the truth; there were five lawyers in that administration and there were six men of other callings. Was it quite right, or was it treating this House fairly that the hon. gentleman should have made the retort that he did? There was in that Administration in Ontario more than one man who had nothing else to do but farm, who did nothing else and who had done nothing else. I do not know how many it may have contained who were occupied in other things as well as on the farm. I do not know that that makes very much difference if the interests of all the people are taken care of, but facts are facts and should be respected as such.

In this connection, let me remind the hon. gentleman that a Government for which he has great respect, and which I for the moment do not attack at all—the Government of the province of Manitoba, a Government from which he holds back the hand of slaughter of those who follow him—contains no individual at all actually engaged in farming, and Manitoba is probably more of a farming province than the province of Ontario, proportionately speaking. I do not say that this is a charge against the Government of Manitoba but I do say that his profession in this respect reflects somewhat on the consistency of the hon. member for Marquette.

He made some references—such as have been made more than once in this debate by hon. gentlemen opposite who, when they get a subject that they like, do not hesitate to refer to it very frequently—he made some references to the War-time Elections Act, an Act which has resuscitated a whole lot of adjectives and seems destined to live long in the memory of many. I am not going to enter into an elaborate defence of that statute now. It was argued in this House as fully, as carefully, and as thoroughly as any legislation ever presented to Parliament. It received the assent of Parliament and it was not a party assent alone. Independent members of this House when the debate was heard, supported the principle of the measure. The hon. gentleman was put a very pertinent question by my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. Peter McGibbon). Did he, he was asked, favour that men lately arrived from alien enemy lands (and they and none others were disfranchised), men possibly and probably whose brothers or whose fathers were fighting against our country, should be given a vote in the election which determined the course of this country in the war? "Yes," he said, "I would give them the vote and I would make them fight." That was not the judgment of the military authorities of Great Britain or of the military authorities of Canada.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: It was the judgment of the military authorities of the United States. They enrolled these men and the casualty lists, when they came back to the United States, contained many foreign names.

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: I am informed on authority of the highest character that the military men of the United States did not allow them in the front line. But, I would prefer to take my example, even in matters of the late war, from the British Empire, rather than from the United States. These men described by my hon. friend from Muskoka were voluntarily enlisted. Many of them enlisted—relatively, of course, few compared with the rest of the population—but many of them enlisted. When it was found that they were of the character described by my hon. friend from Muskoka, although they enlisted voluntarily, they were turned back and were refused permission to go to the front for the sake of the safety of the boys of Canada who were fighting. These were the facts and this was the situation that faced us. Were we to stand in our places here and say: "We know better than the men who are actively commanding the forces at the front." Yet, that is what the hon. member for Marquette would have done. That surely is not sound policy. Although I do not like to use the term, it is scarcely common sense.

Mr. W. H. WHITE: Did the Government a month or so after the election was over, not conscript thousands from the class that were disfranchised?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Never in the world—not a single man.

Mr. W. H. WHITE: I am afraid the hon. gentleman is wrong.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We could not do it; the law prevented us from doing it.

Mr. W. H. WHITE: I know of hundreds of cases myself.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman cannot know of cases because the statute did not provide for their conscription, nor would we have done so any way because the military authorities would have refused them.

Now, it was of course to be expected that the hon. member for Marquette should refer to the subject of the trade policy of Canada. This is not the appropriate occasion, as you, Mr. Speaker, have taken occasion to remind us, to enter into any specific controversy on that subject. At all events the more appropriate time is the debate upon the Budget. I will enter into no discussion of it at the present time, therefore, because I believe that when we take the question up at all we should do so in a thorough manner—the debate should be full and free and specifically devoted to that subject. But let me say this to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crerar) and to those who sit around him. They regard—and they have led many others to regard—this question as a great issue between those enjoying special rights and the common people of the country. They affect to believe themselves, and undoubtedly they have led many to believe, that he who associates himself with one side of that cause, who believes that the one principle that I, at all events, affirm is the true principle for this country, necessarily is in some way a subject of high and special privilege and the enemy of the common people. Surely one reflection alone will be sufficient to disabuse that impression. The principle that the hon. gentleman attacks, right or wrong, has been more the subject of debate and has been more thoroughly reviewed on this continent than

any other principle ever presented to a free people for one hundred and twenty-five years. Its first sponsor on the American continent was the father of the American Republic, George Washington. Was he the friend and ally of special privilege and the enemy of the common people? The second statute that he placed on the statute books of the United States, after it became a nation, was a statute embodying in very pronounced form the principle that the hon. gentleman impugns. Its next prominent sponsor (indeed very, very few opposed it), was the founder of the other great political party in that country, Thomas Jefferson. Coming nearer to our own time, the man who laid the foundations of the present tariff policy of the United States in general form was the man who emancipated the slaves in the United States, Abraham Lincoln. Abraham Lincoln was an adherent throughout his life to the principle that the hon. gentleman attacks. Was he either the servant or the ally of special privilege? Was he the enemy of the common people of his country? Can such an allegation be levelled at Theodore Roosevelt, whose principles were just the same? Can it be levelled against a single one of the sponsors of that principle during the whole one hundred and twenty-five years of American history? This thought is presented for the honest reflection of disciples of the opposite faith.

A number of other thoughts occur to me at the moment, but I will reserve them for a more appropriate hour. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Crerar), however, spent a lot of time on the question of immigration and emigration. He showed that though we did get a good volume of immigration we lost a lot of immigrants to the United States. Well, I draw his attention to the fact that we have not lost very much to Great Britain, so I do not see how he gets very much of an argument out of the emigration statistics.

The hon. gentleman has spoken about abandoned farms in this country. Let me say that I have seen a whole lot of farms that ought to be abandoned, but on which people are struggling along and making a living in some way or other; but I do not know myself of a single farm that is abandoned that does not deserve to be abandoned from the character of its soil.

An hon. MEMBER: Not one.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know a whole lot though of that type across the Atlantic, for I have seen them, and I also know that the Prime Minister of Great Britain lately regretted that between the year 1870 and the present hour four million two hundred thousand acres in that kingdom had gone out of cultivation, and I do not know that he ascribed it to the same cause that, to the hon. member, seems to be the fount of all evil.

A pleasant reference was made to myself by the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell), whom I am glad to welcome to this House, whom I have always understood to be in actual life not only a farmer but a good one—so good, indeed, that I understand he performed some service for a farming enterprise that is now under my administration. The hon. gentleman thanked me for coming down to his constituency, and ascribed to me the credit of having given him another thousand of a majority. I do not know just how the hon. gentleman figures it out but I do remember this, and I say it without seeking to take any credit to myself—no doubt I was fortunate in the location of the meetings at which I spoke—we were rather busy here in Ottawa at the time of the election and could not get away, but I was able to visit his county. I managed to hold two meetings, one in the town of Woodstock and one in the town of Andover. Both are thriving communities, and in both the hon. gentleman was soundly defeated by a very substantial majority. I am afraid the hon. gentleman placed his gratitude on a rather false foundation, and that he could have found a much better one if he had been inclined to be reasonable. I do not think he would try to tell the House that he would have been beaten by a thousand more votes in Woodstock if I had not gone there, surely he does not think the electors were so badly as that against him. That is not what he had in mind. What he must have had in mind is this: That those who did not hear me, those in the rural parts, resented the idea of any one but a farmer talking in the constituency at all and consequently rolled up an increase of a thousand majority in his favour. That must be what the hon. gentleman had in mind; there is no other legitimate conclusion. If that is the case I am afraid he had better be very careful before he tries to convince this House that what he is supporting is not a class movement after all.

Some reference to me was made also by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould). We are glad to welcome the hon. gentleman here because of the good it will do him. The hon. gentleman devoted some time—I do not know that I gathered his exact point, and if I misinterpret him in

any way I hope he will correct me— to lamenting the adverse position occupied this season by the farmers in his province, in the matter of the sale of their wheat, compared with the competing farmers south of the line. The inference that apparently had to be drawn from what he said was that less favourable position was in some way due to the policy of the Government in its creation of the Canadian Wheat Board. I know it has been the practice of many in that country—I hope the hon. gentleman is not one of them—to seek to give the impression down the concession lines that the embargo which the American Government placed against the importation of Canadian wheat was in some way ascribable to the Dominion Government or to the Canadian Wheat Board. I know that impression is very general, but I do not know who can be the author or authors of it, unless it be some who do not wish very well towards the Government of Canada, like the hon. m mber for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould). Surely he is fair enough to admit —and if fair enough why did not he admit? —that the unfavourable position of the Canadian farmer compared with that of the man to the south had nothing whatever to do with Canadian policy or with the Canadian Wheat Board, but that the American embargo was the work of the United States Government, and that we were not consulted in any way, nor had we anything at all to do with it. He also knew, or should have known, that the creation of that board with the purposes and functions that it has was not only recommended by the organization of which he is a member, but has since been endorsed by that organization. But he would like to convey in some way the impression that fairness has not been done to the farmers of Canada in the creation of the Wheat Board and in the course that it has pursued.

Mr. GOULD: Might I ask the hon. minister a question? In reply to the charge of lack of information, I might state that I made no reference whatever to the Canadian Wheat Board, neither can anything I said be misconstrued to have any reflection upon that board. I merely made the statement that the man on the Canadian side received approximately one dollar a bushel less than his neighbour to the south.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why did not the hon. gentleman say why? He knew why it was.

[Mr. Meighen.]

May I ask whether he approves of the policy of the creation of the Canadian Wheat Board and of the course that board has pursued?

Mr. GOULD: I am quite sure, Sir, that we are in favour of the establishment of the Wheat Board, and I think that possibly we are on record that we would like to have that Wheat Board continued. I have made no charges against them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then I hope the hon. gentleman will not again seek to convey to the House the impression that he does not like the idea of having to rely on participation certificates of the Wheat Board.

The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) referred to certain remarks I made at Winnipeg. First of all he quoted me as saying, that we Canadians were subjects of Britain. Well, I do not know that I would be disposed to make any apologies if I had uttered those words, though they would not be strictly accurate, but I have read the speech over hurriedly, trying to fulfil the double occupation of reading it and listening to the hon. member at the same time, and I have not any such words there.

Mr. CRERAR: Oh, yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think he is relying on some second-hand criticism. I know that in parts of his speech he quoted pretty much from a criticism in the press that I read myself.

Mr. CRERAR: If the hon. minister will allow me to interrupt him? The words are in his speech. I did not use them in any way to reflect on the hon. minister, but rather to contrast his attitude with that of his esteemed colleague, the President of the Privy Council.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: A contrast!

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is no contrast at all. I am afraid the hon. gentleman spoke too soon. We in this country, as our brothers in Great Britain, are subjects of the King of Great Britain and of the Dominions overseas; that is the correct phrase. As a subject I do not lament the fact; I glory in it. But we can be subjects of Britain's king and at the same time be a nation here with the powers of nationhood that we possess to-day. I think I have stated pretty fairly the common position assumed in this regard by the President of the Privy Council and myself. I do not know that I would feel any better if we

changed the word in this country and used that adopted across the line. They use the term "citizen" there. We are just as much citizens as they are; in no respect whatever does the relationship between the individual in this country and the State become inferior or subordinate in any particular to the relationship between the citizen in the United States and the Republic.

My hon. friend also quoted me as making some remarks on the question of exchange, and in that respect he ventured to assert that I was wholly wrong on matters of economics—almost as wrong perhaps as he intimated the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) and the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. McGibbon) to be. I did refer to the fact that the Canadian dollar was quoted at eighty-five or less in Wall street and anywhere else in the United States. I quoted newspapers as to the course we ought to follow, and I gave my own opinions on the same subject. I did state that it was due almost wholly to the fact that because we buy more goods from the United States than we sell to them the demand by Canada for American exchange is so great that our friends are in a position to that extent to dictate the price. I never referred to any financial manipulations. It is a necessary result of the trade conditions that exist. When you buy $746,000,000 worth and sell only $454,000,000 worth you are going to need a whole lot of exchange in New York one way or the other, and when you need a lot there against what they need here, it is very likely to depreciate our exchange.

Mr. CRERAR: Might I ask my hon. friend why did not the same result obtain in 1911 when the balance was even more adverse?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I was just about to explain that, and would have done it sooner had the hon. member waited. I have not read the report of my speech in Winnipeg, but I stated there that it was true that we had an adverse balance with the States before the war. We had an adverse balance in 1911.

But I will tell the hon. gentleman the difference then. At that time this country was a heavy borrowing nation, not only in the United States, but to a far greater extent in Great Britain—borrowing as a nation, borrowing by provinces, borrowing by corporations; and the moneys that we borrowed were payable in New York and we got the exchange out of our borrowings. If we could adopt the same course to-day, the situation would be improved; it would be improved as well if we could get actual cash, which we cannot, for the goods we sell overseas. As we are not able to do the latter, would the hon. gentleman suggest that we cure the situation now by the same process by which it was cured in 1911, by recommencing the borrowing habit over in Great Britain and London? He knows we cannot do that, and he knows also that we should not do so if we can possibly avoid it. That method of getting exchange in New York is gone. It existed in 1911; it cannot exist to-day. Therefore, the only possible method of curing the difficulty, is the method suggested by the Toronto Globe, namely, to sell more and to buy less. That is the only method in the world. The hon. gentleman applauds. If that be the way to cure it, is not the opposite the cause of its existence? If we cure it by buying less and selling more, then is not the reason for its existence the fact that we sell less and buy more? The hon. gentleman applauded the first, the second necessarily follows. Why did he dispute the second? Yes, he says, that is true; we have to sell more and buy less, but, for goodness sake, do not, he says, make any regulation to that effect. Do not do it, he says, by artificial means. Well, what means does he propose by which this country shall do that? By exhortation?

Some hon. MEMBERS: By prayer.

Mr. MEIGHEN: By prayer and meditation. I do not know any way in which a country can act effectively except by passing laws that will have the desired result. It was the only way in which we could act during the war, and the hon. gentleman agreed with us at that time. Something that will not have that result will be found in a plank in the hon. member's platform, namely, to tear down duties against the United States. Such is what I argued in Winnipeg, and I do not know anything wrong with the argument yet. I do not know how we are going to buy less from the United States—I have not much faith in the exhortation system—to achieve the desired result by a process of levelling duties against that country.

Mr. CAHILL: Try reciprocity.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Try reciprocity?

An hon. MEMBER: Grievance.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, the hon. gentleman has a grievance. In the first place

what the hon. gentleman sought to obtain by reciprocity in the way of helping us to sell goods, we have got to the extent of 90 per cent, and now having obtained that he wants to take off our duties 100 per cent and so aggravate the trouble we suffer from to-day. If he wishes duties lowered, surely it must be in order to buy more, not less, from the United States.

So much for the subject of exchange. Let me come for just a moment to the amendment that is before the House. The leader of the Opposition moves this House for what? Have hon. members stopped to consider what he is moving this House for? What he wants is an appeal to the country —at least that is what he says he wants. The hon. member has appealed to the country before, and I do not know that his memories are any too sweet. But according to the terms of this amendment he wants to appeal to the country again. On what question does he want the country appealed to? Has he submitted a principle that he wants debated before the electorate of Canada? Has he told us what he proposes to do that is not being done? No, all he wants is an appeal to the country, and the only conviction he seems to have is this, that this nation is hungering and thirsting to make him Prime Minister of Canada.

This is the first ground of the appeal:

> The regrettable protracted absence of the Prime Minister, the widely accepted belief that it is not his intention to return to the duties of his office.

That is the first condition that he wants appealed against. That is the first reason he gives in his resolution for going to the country. What would the people say about that? Does the hon. gentleman say that it would be well for Canada, because her Prime Minister is ill, that he should immediately resign; that there should be no sufferance at all; that there should be no time to determine whether he will be able to return to his great duties or not? Does he want the people appealed to on that question? What is the next question he wants them appealed to on?—

> The makeshift arrangements for the direction of important departments to which no minister has been regularly appointed.

Because there are certain men acting ministers at the present time. I forget how many there are, but I think there are two. The hon. member was a member of a Cabinet that was in office for fifteen years. Can he tell me a single month in which there was not an acting minister in the whole fifteen years? I do not think there was one month. I have not had time to go back over the record, but I doubt if he can find a whole month in the fifteen years when there was not an acting minister. Were those "makeshift arrangements"? I have heard criticisms from hon. gentlemen opposite that we had too many ministers of the Crown. If we have, the only way to remedy that situation would be to have one minister take charge of two departments. But as soon as we do that, he says that is a "makeshift arrangement".

He says that there are three provinces unrepresented. I think there are two, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, but I am inclined to think that the province of Nova Scotia is fairly well represented in the Prime Minister of Canada even although he is absent. But that, he suggests, is a cause for appeal to the country. Let me remind my hon. friend that no sooner were the three western provinces created by the administration to which he belonged, than the very calamity which he now deplores began to exist and continued to exist through the whole course of that administration. Never from the hour that the three western provinces were created until the day that administration was hurled from power were there ever less than three provinces unrepresented in the Government of the day. One would think that if he were really sincere in his conviction, that such was an awful state of affairs; that he would not have sat in that administration. He was an additional member that edged in from the province of Ontario. Why did he not resign and make room for somebody from the unrepresented provinces? Every hour that he sat as a Minister of the Crown, three provinces of the Dominion were unrepresented in the Government of that day. When Manitoba had a representative, Alberta had none, Saskatchewan had none, Prince Edward Island had none. When Alberta had a representative, Saskatchewan had none, Manitoba had none, Prince Edward Island had none: Did he think that was cause for an appeal to the country? If not, why does he think so now? Then he says:

> These and other things—

He has got to the end of them, but he says:

> These and other things operate to produce a condition of uncertainty an instability from which a vigourous and efficient administration of the Dominion's affairs cannot be expected.

Just before that he says that there are new conditions now that did not exist when

this Government was elected to office. We are two years and a half ahead, and, therefore very likely the conditions are different—conditions always change in two years and a half. Were not the conditions of 1914 wholly different from the conditions of 1911? When war broke out in 1914 the conditions differed very radically and very suddenly. Was that a cause for appealing to the country? Why we had the leader of the Opposition of that day, and the hon. gentleman himself, and scores of them across the way crying to high heaven against the crime of a war-time election. They said it was just cause for not going to the country, but surely it was just as vast a change of conditions, far vaster indeed, than any that has taken place between December 1917 and the present hour. It is true, and here let me attract, if I can, the attention of the hon. member for Marquette, that the great issue before the country in 1917 was the conduct of the war, but that was not the only issue before the country, as he would seek to impress upon this House. The Government of that day, in a manifesto to which he subscribed, laid a programme before this Dominion that contained somewhere around eleven to fourteen different proposals, and very few of them, if more than one, referred to the conduct of the war—proposals relating to woman suffrage and subjects of kindred character, proposals relating to reconstruction and machinery for the purpose of reconstruction. Reconstruction, the very thing he says we have no right to deal with at all! He subscribed to that manifesto. Yes, the main issue was the conduct of the war. The main issue in the contest of 1911 was the Reciprocity Agreement, but surely the Government elected in 1911 was not forbidden to treat of other subjects besides the Reciprocity Agreement. The main issue in 1904 was the Grand Trunk Pacific deal, of unhappy memory, but surely the Government elected on that issue was not forbidden to manage the affairs of the country up to 1908. The Government elected in 1917 had a mandate to govern Canada, and there were no restrictions or limitations, express or implied, or referred to in speech or in written programme, more than appertained to any government that ever ascended to power. Then why this cry for an immediate election? Because the Prime Minister is ill, and we have an acting Minister of Public Works; there is I now find no other acting minister. But the hon. gentleman says we have to have a general election in Canada right away because he wants to be Prime Minister. He has been saying that things are uncertain, that there is terrible stagnation, and all the other disasters of the universe in Canada. He has been saying that for months. What are the disasters? What is the matter? What is it that is waiting for treatment by the Government? Does he expect a tariff programme in a speech from the Throne?

He has no time at all to deal with opium, but he had time as the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) said, to go to China about it and miss a whole session himself, the first year he was in this House, and have someone, I suppose, act in his stead. What is it that is waiting for treatment by the Government? What is the subject we are evading? What is the piece of legislation that is so badly needed, and about which there is such great uncertainty and such turmoil?

What else does he say we are suffering from? Instability; that is another disease of the body politic. What is the legislation he is pining for now? Has this Government been afraid to tackle subjects? He says we are a Government by commissions; he told us last Monday that we are governing the the country by commissions. Well, I know the last big problem that was before this Parliament. Was it not the acquisition of the Grand Trunk Railway? Was it not the determination of a big thing, something that had to be done to really solve the railway problem in Canada? Who was the party of commissions then? Who then was shifting, and wanting to evade and delay? Was it the Government? It was the hon. gentleman himself. He wanted another commission appointed to handle the biggest question that was before this country at that time. He moved an amendment for the appointment of a commission. No, the amendment was moved by the other leader. At all events, he had a part in the formation of that amendment, and I know he supported it, and I know he won't say it has not his sympathy now. Does he not think we should have appointed a commission? Has he changed his mind on that subject? A commission, he said, was the right thing. He could not make up his mind himself what in the world ought to be done, so he wanted a commission appointed to solve the great railway problem of Canada. But the Government of the day brought down a policy which was supported by this House, and the Government has carried out that policy, has carried out the mandate of this Parliament, and ever since my hon. friend supported that resolution for a com-

mission he has been calling this a government by commission and a government of drift, alleging that we relegate subjects to commissions instead of discharging the work ourselves. Does he want an election on that subject? Does he want to appeal to the country to decide whether we should have had another Grand Trunk commission. I think not. Why does he go up and down this country talking about a drifting government and a government by commissions, when he in the last and greatest offender?—when he knows this government refused to drift, and refused to appoint a commission even though demanded by himself and his party? A commission may have been appointed since that time to deal with some particular subject, but with nothing of the nature or the magnitude of the Grand Trunk problem, I do not know of a single commission appointed since. Can hon. gentlemen opposite think of one? Not one of them can. They are the last commission people themselves, so why do they stand and talk about more and more commissions?

That is the position they assume. It has the support of the hon. member for Marquette, a Western member, who wants an appeal to the country just before a census—an appeal which would result in Western Canada being under-represented in this House for nearly four years.

The leader of the Opposition cannot stand to have a seat vacant in Parliament now. There has to be a representative in Parliament for every constituency. He can hardly wait until a deceased and honoured member of this House is in his grave before he appeals to Parliament for an election in that constituency. He wants an election right off in East Elgin, and he thinks we are doing a grave injustice to that constituency because the writ has not been issued already, although the revered member for that constituency has been dead little more than two weeks. When he was talking in that strain he should have remembered that his late leader sat in this House through a whole Parliament representing two constituencies, or affecting to do so, when the whole principle of representation means that in such a case one constituency is unrepresented—and during that Parliament he himself sat as a colleague of his leader. The hon. member who sits to his right, or who should sit to his right at the present time (Mr. Lemieux) was elected two years ago last December for two counties, and he has refused to resign from either of them yet. Does the hon. gentleman think he is going to impress the House with his earnestness when he appeals for an election in East Elgin two weeks after the decease of the member for that constituency, and thinks it is all right for the hon. member for Gaspe (Mr. Lemieux) to allow Maisonneuve to be unrepresented in this Parliament for two and a half years?

The hon. member for Marquette goes back to his county and the West having proclaimed that, on the grounds set out in this amendment,—because the Prime Minister is ill, because there is an Acting Minister of Public Works, and because of other things of which no one is cognizant, but which he says combine to produce a condition of uncertainty—he thinks Western Canada should do without ten to twenty representatives to whom it is in all justice entitled for three years in the Parliament of Canada. Let not the hon. member think he can separate the reasons given from the conclusion when he votes for a specific amendment. He votes to disfranchise Western Canada to the extent of ten to twenty per cent, if not more, and he votes to do so because the Prime Minister is ill and cannot be here, and because there is an Acting Minister of Public Works.

Now, I have sought to examine the resolution that hon. members are asked to vote upon to-night, and to examine the reasons adduced in support of it by hon. gentlemen opposite, and hon. gentlemen angularly opposite as well; and I appeal to all hon. gentlemen everywhere to allow Western Canada to get its representation, which it assuredly will; because there is no intention to have an election until an opportunity is provided to give Western Canada its full share of representation after the census is taken. I appeal to all to repudiate the preamble and repudiate the conclusion, and to stand by stable, firm and honest government.

On motion of Mr. Michael Clark (Red Deer) the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Sir George Foster the House adjourned at 11.15 p.m.

Friday, March 5, 1920.

The House met at Three o'clock.

RAILWAY ACT, 1919, AMENDMENT.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 3, to amend the Railway Act, 1919.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: This Bill is similar to the one I introduced last year. It is for the purpose of bringing the boats on our inland waters and in our coastwise trade under the control of the Railway Commission in the matter of rates, tolls, tariff agreements and arrangements, time of call, duration of stay, and so forth. The last clause of the Bill I am introducing seeks to amend clause 358 of the Consolidated Railway Act in order that it may harmonize with the principles of this Bill, which is for the purpose of amending clause 33 of the Consolidated Railway Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Consideration of the motion of Mr. Hume Cronyn for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the proposed amendment of the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie King thereto, resumed from Thursday, March 4.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, it is a very sincere pleasure to be able to congratulate the Government upon the excellence of their choice of the mover of the address (Mr. Cronyn) and the seconder (Mr. McGregor) in this debate. They chose two splendid specimens of different kinds of stalwart Canadian manhood. I did not agree with all they said, but it is all the greater pleasure to one to congratulate both of these gentlemen on the ability, the modesty, and the good taste with which they said what they had to say.

The speech from the Throne gives quite proper prominence to the League of Nations, and to the establishment of an international labour office. It may be truthfully said, I think, that the very endeavour to establish a League of Nations sounds for the first time the note of internationalism in human affairs, and I am sure there is no one in this House who does not re-echo in the shape of a prayer the sentiment of the speech from the Throne which expresses the hope that these arrangements will insure to us the blessings of continual peace. Lord Robert Cecil, who takes a great interest in the League of Nations in Great Britain has foreshadowed what must have occurred to large numbers of thoughtful people at any rate on this question, that if the League of Nations grows into a mature, stable, and effective organization there would naturally follow in time a very large measure of disarmament. I refer to that to point out that that consideration should have an important bearing upon Canadian policy. I think that due weight given to that consideration would help to put a restraining hand upon the activities or possible activities of the First Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Ballantyne) and the Minister of Militia and Defence. I say no more on that subject, but point the obvious moral to be drawn from this particular paragraph of the address and the important matter it brings before this House and the country.

The address repeats what I remember specially the leader of the House has brought before the Canadian people in various public meetings which he has addressed in recent times. May I, Sir, in mentioning my right hon. friend, offer to him and to the Parliament and country my very hearty congratulations on the fact that accident has placed so great a parliamentary veteran (Rt. Hon. Sir George Foster) in the position he at present occupies at the time when we are entering our new parliamentary home. I listened, as I am sure every hon. member in the House did, with the greatest pleasure and admiration, to the lengthy speech which he delivered the other evening with all his old-time vivacity and virility. Long may he be spared to grace the halls of Parliament and to teach the "young ideas" how to shoot.

I draw in my mind, Sir, a very clear distinction between the duty of individual economy and the duty of national economy, and I am not so sure that we cannot carry individual economy too far. As a small producer of beef, for example, I should conceive it a great misfortune to myself, and probably to others, if there were too much economy displayed in the eating of good roast beef and good steak; and the same thought occurs to me in connection with other lines of production. I wish some speaker on the Government side of the House would make it clear to the people just whom they expect to economize, and in what. They are not thinking of the veterans, I should think. The veterans did not have too much to spend when they were in the line, and I have it on good authority that some of them in our cities this winter have barely had enough to eat. This has arisen from a perfectly natural cause. The best jobs in the early period of reconstruction were held by men who did not avail themselves of the glorious privilege of going over the top, and the veterans, in too many cases, had to come home and take jobs in

the city at sixty and sixty-five dollars a month. Does the Government wish to teach economy to the working men of the country? I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that the working men of Canada and their wives have a bit of very careful calculation to do every week of their lives in order to make ends meet. The farmers are a little better off, with present prices, than they used to be in this country; but even farmers are not extravagant people. With the exception of an automobile, which is often as useful to them in their business as it is for their pleasure, I do not know that there is any luxury to speak of going into the farm houses of the country. The farmers have no expensive carpets on their floors, nor have they any antique furniture. They are a very frugal and careful people, and they need to be, with their income.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when one has dealt with these several classes in the population what is there left? There are none but the profiteers left; and I would suggest to the Government, as I have done before, that in dealing with the profiteers it is not their duty simply to teach economy but to enforce it as well. They ought to enforce economy on the wealthy people in the country, and they have right at their hand a means of doing so. If the wealthy people are spending more money than they should, then I trust no hon. gentleman opposite me will ask that question, which has been so often directed at the head of my hon. friend from Marquette (Hon. Mr. Crerar): "Where shall we get the revenue?" Get the revenue that the rich are wasting, if you are sincere in preaching economy.

Production is of course important. President Wilson, in a message he sent to Congress lately, put a whole volume of politico-economic wisdom into two little sentences. He called the attention of his own people to the fact that the war had taught the United States that in order to sell you must buy. I commend that piece of political economy to my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Meighen): In order to sell you must buy. International trade was never conducted, and never will be conducted, upon any other principle. You do not always buy directly from the nation to which you sell, but there is always a certain relationship between the amount you buy and the amount you sell. The other piece of politico-economic wisdom which Mr. Wilson gave the American people was this. He said: "Restriction of trade always means restriction of production." So that when public men in this Government tell the people to produce, and yet keep up restrictions upon the commerce of the people, they are following a course of absolute contradiction in economic principle.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as somewhat of an old parliamentary hand, and at the same time a politician without any personal ambition, I have been interested, as I am sure large numbers of Canadian people have been, in watching the clash that has been going on in the country and that has been brought into this House, between the aspirations of political youth, and the grim, I might almost say, barnacle-like, tenacity of political veterans. And in watching this fight I must say that I was very proud last night of the leader of what, for want of a better term, I venture to call the National Progressive Party of this country. It must have been noticeable to every one that, with the advent of the member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) upon the floor of the House, the discussion livened up and the debate in regard to the discussion of political principles was lifted to a plane a little higher, I venture to think, than that on which it had been before his intervention.

The very fact that the leader of this party has been able to interest the House in its principles and policies is the best evidence we can have that the party and its policies are interesting the country and that the by-elections which resulted in the return of my friends to this House were by no means accidents.

The Minister of the Interior followed the example of, I think, the seconder of the Address (Mr. McGregor), the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt), and others, in what appeared to be an endeavour to fasten the title of "class" to this little party. With what has fallen from these gentlemen about the impossibility of any one class permanently ruling in this country, I am in absolute agreement. I believe that the only logical, effective method for men who enter into the activities and the public life of the country is for them to combine upon a common policy in which they sincerely believe as being a policy which will redound to the public good, in which good all ought to participate, and that they ought to so combine absolutely irrespective of the accidents of class. I am in absolute agreement in that with what I understood to be the attitude of the hon. gentlemen to whom I have referred.

I do not quite agree, however, with the Minister of the Interior in tracing class policies to the origin of a given policy. I think it is largely an accident that for the moment those who support the platform of

the Dominion Council of Agriculture are, so many of them, farmers. Farmers hold these views because in Canada they have been hit so hard by the tariff that they have had to study economics, and the result of a study of economics would be precisely the same amongst the workmen of the country, amongst the women of the country and amongst those on both front benches in Parliament, if they had the same promptings to study that the farmers have had. They adopted these same views because they were hard hit by the tariff, and they studied economics.

But what is it that is wrong in a class entering politics? It is not only class and class consciousness, but when it becomes the epitome of class selfishness, that is the real evil, and that is the danger which will always arise when men do go into the public life of the country because they belong to a certain class. But the farmers of all men—and particularly the Western farmers—are certainly free from any charge of selfishness in so far as their policy goes, because the first thing they ask Parliament and the Government to do is to take off all duties on the things they produce, in order that the general consumers of Canada may have the benefit of wholesome and cheap food. That is not class selfishness, surely. It is a sample of unselfishness and patriotism that would soon solve the tariff question if certain other members of the community would follow the example of the farmers in that respect.

Let me make an appeal on this point, which I have made before, to the people who do not see their way to stand on their own feet industrially. Let me make an appeal to these gentlemen to use all their endeavours to grow into the same stalwart type of Canadians that stood in the trenches and asked for no protection and the farmers of the West who ask for no protection. I would respectfully invite men engaged in other forms of industry to consider whether they really would not like to belong to the first-rate type of Canadian manhood that you will find in these two other classes of Canadians.

Mr. BRIEN: Would you advocate taking the duty off raw leaf tobacco and early tomatoes coming into this country?

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I had thought that my opinion in regard to the tariff was so well known that no one would need to ask me about it again. As far as my opinion goes, I do not believe in tariffs at all. They are an iniquity, and the sooner we get rid of them the better. But there has been a great deal of misrepresentation of our views in that respect, as these views have been presented by my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar). I have been twelve years in this House, Mr. Speaker, under both the old parties, and I never was scared about free trade coming by return of post. I have seen duties go on but I have seen precious little of them coming off. If we do not make any faster progress along these lines in the years that lie ahead of us than we have done during the twelve years I have been in this House, it is going to require quite a considerable portion of eternity to bring about free trade in this country. In regard to the particular articles that are mentioned by my hon. friend (Mr. Brien), that is not a question which should be addressed to me, and it is not a question I can give my hon. friend a special answer upon. I have given him the answer as to my attitude on the tariff generally. In my speech in the Budget debate last year I told the House very fully, and I think with a fair degree of lucidity, exactly how the tariff should be handled, exactly how the tariff should be taken off, pointing out that I was only asking the Finance Minister of Canada to follow the excellent example of Sir Robert Peel in Great Britain and of President Wilson in the United States. President Wilson followed almost slavishly, when he came into office, the methods of Sir Robert Peel in dealing with the tariff in England.

When I asked this question I was going on to say that while I absolutely agree that class representation and class activity in politics would be a curse to the country, I am surprised that these protests should only come at this particular time when for perhaps the first time in the history of the country certain classes are showing a little class consciousness. One would have thought that there never had been any class legislation in this world before, nor any attempt at class legislation.

Hon. gentlemen hold up their hands in holy horror the moment the farmers begin to take hold of public platforms. Why, Mr. Speaker, the history of progressive reform has been a history of the fight of the common people against class domination on both sides of the Atlantic. What was the Family Compact? Was it not a pretty narrow class in its day? What was the House of Lords in Britain but a class occupying the second chamber of that country, and using their position in it continually to look after their own interests. Has there been no class legislation in Canada at later periods than the Family Compact?

What is the Canadian Manufacturers' Association? Is it not the union of men in a class? And I venture to say that so far as I have been able to watch their operations, nine-tenths of the activities of that body are political activities—but not always in the open and on the platform where the farmers go.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: Would my hon. friend justify the Canadian Manufacturers Association, as such, nominating and electing representatives to this House?

Mr. CLARK: The Canadian Manufacturers Association has always had candidates in the field and always had members in the House.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: The hon. gentleman has missed the point in my question. I asked my hon. friend would he justify the Canadian Manufacturers Association nominating and electing members to this Parliament as representing that body?

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Certainly not. My hon. friend scarcely needed to put that question; he could have answered it from what I have said on the general principle. What I assert is that the Canadian Manufacturers Association, and other interests, have been in politics—can my hon. friend deny it? As to having candidates in the field I very much fear that the candidates of all political parties have been much closer to those interests than my hon. friend would like to admit on the floor of this House. What I am objecting to is that hon. members should raise this hullabaloo about class representation the moment farmers and working men begin to make their voices heard as to the political principles which should govern the country. As a matter of fact, and we know it well, these other classes have been in politics and are continually in politics, and no one on either side of the House will deny it. If he did he would produce nothing but laughter and contempt both in the House and outside of it. My point is that the activities that are at present showing themselves for the first time in this country have been provoked by that which is wrong in the body politic and in the public life of Canada; these activities have been provoked by what is wrong in our public life. The fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is this: We have only been a nominal democratic country in Canada. We have had many of the marks of autocracy under the forms of democracy; and what I think I see in the public life of Canada to-day, as I see it all over the world, is the evolution of democracy. Did people expect that this little country would send 500,000 of her sons, 60,000 of them to die, to fight for democracy without attempting to get some of it in Canada? If it is a good thing for Europe it is also a splendid thing for the North American continent. We have so much of freedom that we shed the blood and gave the lives of 60,000 of our sons to fight for it in Europe. What shams we are if we go back to our own country and go on as if nothing had happened, bowing the knee to Baal, as we did in the past.

I do not concur in the view of the Minister of the Interior that the debate on the Address is an occasion when fiscal matters should not be mentioned. I have always understood that the debate on the Address constitutes a wide-open door, and that it is a tradition of Parliamentary Government that on the Address members of this House may talk about anything. There is a special reason, if I may say so, Mr. Speaker, why individual members should discuss fiscal questions during the debate on the Address, or make fiscal suggestions. What is the use of making any suggestions when the Budget is brought down? No Government ever alters its Budget if it has a majority behind it. In the very nature of the case suggestions are too late in coming when they come on the Budget. This is particularly true at the present moment, because we of the rank and file of the House hail the opportunity of endeavouring to guide the inexperienced feet of my good friend the new Minister of Finance in the path which he has lately had to try to tread. I condone with him on the burden he has had to take up, and I am sure I am sincere in expressing the hope that he will distinguish himself in the post to which the leader of the Government has called him. If he cares for a little piece of advice—I may try and enforce it later on—I will tell him in a sentence how he will make a very good Minister of Finance. If he will fail by just one hundred per cent to follow the three principal courses followed by his predecessor in the Department. If he will carefully forget all that his predecessor did and do exactly the opposite, or go as far in the opposite direction as he can, he will be a splendid Minister of Finance.

Now while my hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) seemed to favour that view he went on himself, as he was merely bound to do in the course of the debate, to reply to some of the points that were raised by my hon.

friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar). The Minister of the Interior seemed to get great satisfaction out of the thought that protection was one hundred and twenty-five years old in the United States. Well, that is a splendid Tory argument, although I never before heard one hundred and twenty-five years put down as the exact date at which institutions became at once venerable and invulnerable. Of course it appeared to me while this point was being made, that cannibalism is much older than that in the Fiji Islands, and yet the last man that I would expect to say anything in praise of cannibalism would be my friend the Minister of the Interior. Some one has put on record a great thought, to the effect that wisdom has been the general accuser of mankind, and I repeat the thought for the benefit of my hon. friend. I might add, off my own bat, that while wisdom has been the general accuser of mankind, error has never failed to advance its hoary head as the reason for its continued acceptance.

My hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) went on to mention the names of some big men who in their day supported the principle of protection in the United States. I want to be perfectly fair with him. I do not know whether he was simply basing his belief in protection on authority, or whether he was only enforcing the point that these men would not have supported a policy which was not a truly national policy. I think there was a little of both designs in my hon. friend's mind. He is a consummate and astute debater, and he would be very glad, I fancy, if a certain number of our people would draw the inference that these authorities gave such sanction to protection that it would be almost an act of sacrilege to say anything against it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I would rather take for my pattern the United States of to-day than the United States of one hundred and twenty-five years ago. And I must repeat, Sir, until hon. gentlemen get a true grasp of the fact, that when eight years ago President Wilson came into power he introduced what was really a very large measure of free trade. Our tariff was a monstrosity compared with the tariff of the United States. Only thirty per cent of all the articles imported into the United States bear any tariff at all. I am weary of repeating this statement, but I must continue to repeat it until hon. gentlemen fully grasp it. No one who knows anything about the conditions of life in the two countries will compare the tariff of the States with the tariff of this country. I need only mention boots and shoes and agricultural machinery—these are admitted into the United States absolutely free of duty, while in this country they still carry a considerable duty; indeed, in the case of boots and shoes a very heavy one.

I would like to give my hon. friend a little information about the great Scotchman who became a great American—the late Andrew Carnegie. If he thinks that the so-called National Policy of Protection is a benefit to all classes, and wants to persuade intelligent workmen on this continent of that fact much longer, he will have to tackle just such a case as that of Mr. Carnegie. A poor young Scotchman, he came to the United States, and with the help of a protective tariff he amassed a fortune of $500,000,000--I think that is about the sum at which he sold out his interest in the Pittsburg Steel Works. He has given away $300,000,000 in charitable bequests. He who at the end of his life espoused free trade doctrines—having taken full advantage of protection, as any man is entitled to do, even if he does not believe in it—gave evidence before the Tariff Committee of the United States Senate to this effect:

> When I sold out I had forty-three partners, and every one of them was a millionaire.

Now, if my hon. friend, with all his ability, will go down to the workmen at Pittsburg and tell them those two facts and say that nevertheless he believes that protection is equally good for the rich and for the poor, I imagine he will require even more than his ability to carry very much conviction among those people.

Why, Sir, just before President Wilson came into power there was a strike of the woollen workers at Lawrence, in Massachusetts. And what did they strike for, Mr. Speaker? They struck for a living wage. The woollen workers of Massachusetts struck because they could not maintain their wives and families on the wages they were getting in the same country which built up the Pittsburg Iron Works to such a degree of wealth that Carnegie and his forty-three partners were all millionaires. If I were a workingman I would need be greener than the green Englishman I am before I could believe that such a condition of things was equally good for me as for the millionaires.

Now, the hon. minister had something to say about exchange. I should just like to be permitted to give a little warning to the Government on this subject. I have never been able to get the Government to

pay much attention to my advice, although I have been most disinterested in giving it to them. I told them when they established the Board of Commerce that they were stirring up a nest of hornets for themselves, but then that board had been called for by my hon. friend the member for Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie). He takes peculiar pleasure in the fact that he was the joint parent or the grandfather of that particular board. He said, "We have been calling for this board in this House;" and the Government listened to the hon. member instead of to me, and so brought all that trouble upon themselves. I do not mention this for the sake of raking up ancient history, but I do want to warn them most seriously against listening to my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) on this question of exchange. His remedy for the exchange situation would be to rub out about a billion dollars of our foreign trade. Well, that would remedy the trouble with a vengeance, no doubt, but it would be making a desert and calling it peace. I do not think there is another hon. member who would have the temerity to tender such advice. I hope not. However, I want to warn the Government not to take any immediate steps to rub out the whole of our commerce with the United States of America. And I issue that warning the more emphatically because I am very doubtful indeed if the exchange situation is at all connected with the so-called adverse balance of trade. During the whole of my natural life before the war Britain had a so-called adverse balance of trade. Year after year her imports exceeded her exports, while we used to say that the British sovereign spoke all languages—English credit was the highest in the world, as it will be again before we are very much older, in spite of that "so-called" adverse balance of trade. I borrow the phrase from Adam Smith, who did not believe in its being adverse at all.

With very great modesty I venture to assert my opinion that the exchange situation is the result of lowered credit in Canada as compared with the United States at the moment, and I have to go a little further and say that that lowering of credit has been the direct and immediate result of faulty action on the part of our Finance Department. Mr. Speaker, how does a man lower his credit? In the first place, he lowers it if he does not make enough income; in the second place, he lowers it still further if, in spite of not making enough income, he goes on spending; and the result of the two processes will be that he falls into the hands of the money lenders—and when a man takes those three courses his credit will become very bad and his exchange will be bad also. That is precisely the history of the Finance Department of this country since the beginning of the war. I have strong personal grounds for pressing these matters upon my hon. friend who now holds that portfolio (Sir Henry Drayton). It is not yesterday that I began to express these views. I told his predecessor in office that if I were in his shoes in the war session of August, 1914, I would then and there put on an income tax and graduate it up to a very large degree on the large incomes. The Government did that, but they waited until 1917 to do it, and during the years in which they did not do it they spent with a lavish hand,—as, of course, they were compelled to do in the war although there was a great deal of expense that they might have saved—they spent with a lavish hand, and they borrowed what they spent. When my hon. friend who held lately the portfolio of Finance (Sir Thomas White) introduced his loan of $70,000,000 from the United States, I took occasion to express my views to this House—and my hon. friend confirmed my teaching; he agreed with me. I said that I did not oppose the loan; we could not. If the Government had not the courage to put on direct taxation to get the money with which to prosecute the war, we had to get it from somewhere; the war had to be won. I took the opportunity of pointing out to the House and to the country what we were doing in borrowing that money. I pointed out that we were building up American industry, as the whole of that borrowed money would come from the United States in the shape of goods; and my hon. friend the then Minister of Finance agreed that that was so. So that the Government, by pursuing this course, have been largely instrumental in producing the exchange situation which we have to deal with to-day.

Inflated currency, borrowing, squandering, are not new things in this world, and they were never practiced by Governments without bringing financial ruin upon the country, or some approach to it. Mr. Lloyd George recently called attention to the fact that the French revolution was perhaps brought about more by the financial condition of France than by any other single circumstance. Of course the causes were complex, but when Mr. Lloyd George expresses an opinion of that sort, he is well, I think, within the historic facts. One remembers

3.55 p.m.

the frequency with which the directors of finance in the old country of France were changed in the years immediately preceding the French revolution. I was interested in looking up Mr. Carlyle's book on the subject the other day and seeing what he had to say about Calonne, who was a famous director of finance in France for two or three years before the revolution broke out. Mr. Carlyle was not only a great prose writer; he had some thoughts on economy which would be very useful to this country if my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) would only take Carlyle for a teacher. In summing up his comments on Calonne and his policy of that day, Carlyle said:

> Nay, in seriousness, let no man say that Calonne had not genius; genius for persuading; before all things, for borrowing. With the skilfulest judicious appliances of underhand money, he keeps the stock exchanges flourishing; so that loan after loan is filled up as soon as opened. . . . The misery is, such a time cannot last! Squandering, and payment by loan is no way to choke a deficit.

Now, there is a splendid picture drawn by the great master of English prose of the condition of France about the year 1789, and every word of it is true, in a degree, of the condition of the finances of this country. No wonder we have class movement and class revolution and people doing things when this is the way the finances of the country are being handled.

The supreme condemnation of the Finance Department of this and of the previous Government—I exclude the present Finance Minister from anything that I may say; we do not yet know whether he is a protectionist or a free trader, and sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof—the supreme condemnation of the Finance Department is to be found in the success of the Victory Loan of this year. For years we were told by that department that you could not raise a Victory Loan if you taxed it. But the Government had to go back upon that opinion; they taxed the loan, and the money of the people was forthcoming just as it had been in previous years. Surely, too, the Victory Loan condemns the Finance Department inasmuch as it shows that there is plenty of wealth in the country to furnish a large amount of the revenue if the Government had the backbone to impose taxes directly on those whose backs are well able to bear them.

I notice in this connection that the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) made no attempt whatsoever, at least I cannot recall that he made any attempt—to answer the member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) on this particular head when he compared what has been done in New Zealand with what has been done in Canada in the way of direct taxation. Mr. Speaker, I am a Canadian. I have been in this country for eighteen years; everything I have and everything I hold dear is in this country. I should like to be proud of being a Canadian, but in this matter of direct taxation my Government has given me no cause for pride. New Zealand has, roughly, a million people; we have eight millions. In the year 1917-18, New Zealand raised $25,000,000 by an income tax. If Canada had raised the same amount in proportion to her population we would have obtained a revenue of $200,000,000 a year under that head, and if we had obtained that amount each year of the war, our national debt would be one billion instead of two billions and we should not have heard so much about the adverse exchange situation.

Mr. JAMES ARTHURS (Parry Sound): If the hon. gentleman has observed the newspaper reports, he must have seen it stated that the national debt of New Zealand amounts to about $850 per capita, while in Canada it is only about $300 per capita.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I would like something better than newspaper reports from any one who speaks about the per capita debt of any country. I am not going to migrate to New Zealand; my hon friend need not be frightened. I am only comparing what the two countries have been doing along one specific line of national endeavour. If my hon. friend likes the fact, why he can roll it under his tongue as a sweet morsel; but I do not—I would like to think that Canadians had done as well as New Zealand. And we were under a pledge to do it, especially after the last election, because the formula upon which we fought the last election was: "We are in this war to the last man and to the last dollar." Well, some supporters of this Government have a good many dollars standing between them and their last one.

These remarks upon the financial situation which have been raised in the course of this debate are not without their bearing upon the amendment before the House. They have in my mind a very strong bearing upon the amendment, and on the duty that men who hold the views I have just expressed have to perform in connection with that amendment. Let me say that I agree absolutely with every word that fell from the lips of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) as to the unfortunate

nature of what I venture to call the preamble of the amendment. I should have liked the amendment much better if it had called for its result upon grounds of policy rather than upon grounds of personnel. I can scarcely speak with patience of that portion of the amendment which brings the illness of Sir Robert Borden before this House. Sir Robert Borden is as much a victim of the war in his illness as if he had been in a front line trench in France. I have again and again expressed what I consider the indebtedness of this country to the leader of the Government and to all the members of this Government, but in case there is any doubt about where I stand on that matter, I want to say once more that I think the men who formed Union Government discharged a patriotic duty regardless of consequences.

I do not quite see the force of all the speech of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) in supporting this amendment. Naturally, the speech partook of the nature of what I have ventured to call a preamble. Amongst other things he charged the Government with having no policy. Well, I think there is justice in that charge along certain lines. When you form a Government partly of protectionists and partly of free traders or very-low tariff men it is clear they will not very easily formulate a policy on the tariff, and what is likely to happen to the tariff under those circumstances is that it will be left alone, unless indeed the tariff mongers prove the heavier lot and pull their Liberal brethren with them in raising it. I did not, however, quite understand how my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition could be so light-hearted in charging the Government with having no policy, unless indeed he had gone on to tell what his own policy was. I know that there was a convention, and that a platform was drawn up at that convention, the tariff portion of which was lifted bodily and without apology from the programme of the Dominion Council of Agriculture, with the exception that the western farmers proclaimed themselves free traders in principle at least to the extent of having free trade with Great Britain in five years. So far as I know, that part of the tariff policy of the Dominion Council of Agriculture was not adopted by the official Opposition in this House. That leads me to repeat a statement, which I have no pleasure in making, that the official Opposition has gone back on pre-'96 days in this matter of the tariff, because at that time they were looking towards free trade as they have it in Great Britain. I should like some speakers on the Opposition side to tell us exactly where they stand in this matter of free trade and protection. If it is just a case of tinkering and pottering with the tariff, one side is no better than the other, unless there is some principle asserted, some goal to which they are aiming. When my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Gould) was fighting for his seat in this House on the principle of free trade practically, or near free trade, two of the most energetic followers of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition went out to prevent him if possible from getting into this House.

Mr. A. R. McMASTER (Brome): Would my hon. friend suggest that the Hon. W. R. Motherwell is not just as sound a low tariff man as he who now represents Assiniboia in this House?

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I do not think either the country or I have kept very close track of Mr. Motherwell lately. He was lost in the early snowstorm of the fall. There is one thing, however—and that is that—my hon. friend (Mr. Gould) who represents that constituency is in a vastly better position for carrying out that policy.

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Vercheres): That is no answer.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I do not know what Mr. Motherwell's views are on the tariff; I hope they are all right. The fact is, Mr. Motherwell's opinions have nothing to do with it. I am simply trying to find out where the leader of the Opposition stands on this question, and I hope some of his followers will tell us, for the country has a right to know. I say that if I vote for this amendment I would rather have voted for it on some ground of policy and principle than on the mere matter of personnel which is raised so prominently in it. I was saying I do not know exactly where the leader of the Opposition stands on this question, and if I were to get my information from some of his doings I should think he had changed his attitude on more than one question since the last general election. Why, he sent a cablegram of congratulation to Mr. Asquith on his election the other day. I think this House would almost need to be told whether that was an act of penance on the part of my hon. friend, because he must recall that Mr. Asquith was the father of compulsory military service in Great Britain, and that

he is the outstanding and greatest living exponent of free trade. If my hon. friend approves of Mr. Asquith and his policies to the extent of cabling congratulations to him on his election, I think we ought to know whether it was done merely on personal grounds, or whether he really does approve of Mr. Asquith's policy.

I shall vote for this amendment, little as I like its preamble, on grounds of broad public policy. A coalition government has much to say for itself, and there is much to be said for it in time of war, because in time of war you are dealing with an external foe, and a coalition government is frequently the best means of concentrating the whole powers of the nation on defeating the foe. After the war is reasonably over the same argument for the existence of the coalition no longer exists. Indeed, there are many grounds, one of which I just touched upon, why the argument is the other way. The moment the war is over domestic politics become more important. Take the vexed question of the tariff. How can hon. gentlemen in the same Cabinet, holding almost diametrically opposite views on tariff questions, possibly touch the tariff in a coherent and effective manner? The thing is an impossibility. And so along many other lines of policy.

I want to say that in this Cabinet, even now, notwithstanding the withdrawals from it, there is any amount of high political ability. This was still truer before the various withdrawals from the Cabinet. But ability gives no guarantee of Cabinet cohesion. My hon. friend the leader of the House (Sir George Foster) said the other night that the Government had never produced a policy upon which the Cabinet was not absolutely united. That, however, may carry with it, I think, the legitimate inference that policies upon which they could not unite were not produced, which would go far to justify some of us in voting for this amendment. Now, doubt has been cast upon the sincerity of the amendment. I do not take the amendment as indicating merely a personal wish. So far as the desire for an election is concerned, Mr. Speaker, I should say that at the present moment any hon. member who is pining for an election is fonder of adventure than I am. The field of elections is a splendid one for any man who has a fancy for adventures, but I imagine that politics at the present time would impress with great emphasis upon any one of us, who was looking at this matter from a personal point of view, the old doctrine that self-preservation is the first law of nature. But I do not conceive that this amendment is the expression of a personal desire or even of a personal belief so far as the mere holding of an election is concerned. The people have rights as well as the members of this House, and I think that the conclusion of the amendment is an expression of the opinion that the people voted for this Government on certain specific understandings and that the majority of them now think that the time has come when they should have an opportunity of forming another kind of Government if they so desire.

Now, I listened, as I always do, with the greatest pleasure and attention to the speech of the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Meighen) last night. He took up ground which had previously been covered well by my hon. friend the President of the Privy Council (Hon. Mr. Rowell), and stated that there was a considerable programme laid down in the year 1917 besides the winning of the war. Well, after all, that point can be strained rather far. What I would put to my hon. friend, honestly and with a desire that he should get my point of view at least, is this: Were the people in 1917 sufficiently interested in domestic politics ever to have read the programme? I addressed meetings in my own riding every night for six weeks, and I said: "I appear before you as a win-the-war candidate, supporting a win-the-war Government; the winning of the war is the only issue at stake, and I support the steps that the Government believe to be necessary for that purpose." And I venture to think that all over Canada that was the attitude of the candidates on the Government side, and that was the understanding of the people. What did they understand, and what did they vote on? What did they care about patronage when the Kaiser's troops were threatening to take Paris and overrun the channel ports? The only matter in the minds of the people was the winning of the war.

Now, my hon. friend raised another point which is of very great importance to Western Canada, and that is in regard to the question of redistribution being carried out after the census of 1921. This Government cannot give us any guarantee that they will deal with the question of redistribution. If retirements from the Government continue at the rate at which they have been occurring, before redistribution comes about the Government will have become entirely disintegrated. We cannot possibly, in the

present state of affairs, expect this Government to give us a guarantee that they will introduce redistribution. As a matter of fact, if an election were held now, my own opinion is that there would be at least sufficient men of truly progressive views returned to enforce a considerable portion of their policy upon the House of Commons or to force a fight on it.

We of this party are in earnest, Mr. Speaker. In saying this I do not suggest that others are not also in earnest. But, I repeat, we are in deadly earnest. We believe that the economic views we hold are vital to the well-being, the progress, and the prosperity of this country. We agree with Mr. Asquith, who has just won an extraordinary by-election, fighting almost exclusively on his economic and fiscal views as being necessary to save the Old Land at this time. We hold our views with equal tenacity and strength, and we believe they will prevail. If there were an unbalanced state of opinion in this Chamber, then we might be on the eve of another election before a redistribution Bill was carried. Many people think we are in for a series of short governments and short parliaments in this country. Now, I mention these matters only to make myself clear, that if we could have a guarantee that redistribution would come before an election it might alter our attitude on this question. I have not the least doubt that the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen), my hon. friend the Secretary of State (Mr. Sifton), and my hon. friend the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) will fight hard in the Cabinet for that view. It is both their interest and their duty to do it in the Cabinet provided this amendment is not carried. But we can have no guarantee that they will be able to pull the Cabinet their way. As a matter of fact, what has happened in the past in that respect? I am speaking from memory, but I think I am correct in saying that in the early years of Confederation redistribution was twice at any rate carried on the eve of an election. But since that time the East has had the pull. Political considerations have prevailed, and it has rather been the tendency to have an election before redistribution. Human nature is human nature, whether East or West, and I have no confidence that my hon. friends, pull as hard as they may, will be able to keep their colleagues right on this question. As I say, I shall vote for the amendment on grounds of public policy. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior was very emphatic last night in directing to my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, the question, What is wrong with this country? I have tried to answer that question in so far as the finances of the country are concerned as my leader answered it before the minister spoke along that and many other lines last evening. But if the question is put seriously —and I say this not along the line of cheap party warfare—should it be directed to the leader of the Opposition; or could my hon. friend not direct it more properly elsewhere? I do not think the Government have any conception from their utterances of the extent to which public opinion is moved on political questions in this country. What is wrong? What was wrong in Assiniboia? There was no Government candidate, but does anybody for a moment conceive that the presence of a Government, or an Opposition, candidate would have made any difference as to who would win that seat? What was wrong in Carleton, N.B.? These are the places to which to direct this question.

What is stirring in the minds of the people? What are the people thinking? Are their thoughts all complimentary to Unionist Government or do they not follow the thought that was so earnestly and eloquently urged by my hon. friend from Marquette last evening when he said that great questions are stirring the minds of the people of this country and will continue to stir them until they are settled along the lines of democracy, freedom and justice.

My hon. friend should ask the veterans what is wrong with this country. The speech from the Throne takes note of the fact that unrest and disquiet prevail all over the world while claiming, it is true, that Canada is more exempt than other countries from disturbance. Why is it that this class have been heard in this House; or why is it that the farmers are rising in a way they have never risen before and are combining with other men of progressive views? What is moving them? It is a world movement. The movement is bigger than any group and it is bigger than any party in this country has any idea of or any man may guess. It would have been strange if it had been otherwise.

What is wrong with this country?—my hon. friend asks. What is wrong with the workmen, what is wrong with the farmers, what is wrong with the veterans? I will tell my hon. friend—it is the sense of injustice. That is what is wrong. Let him go to the rank and file of the veterans and

ask them what is the most disturbing factor in their lives and five out of six of these men will tell him that what disturbs them is the thought that they went overseas, fought and risked their lives—60,000 of them died—for $1.10 a day, the honour of their native land and the progress and safety of civilization and of humanity, only to come back and find that men who did not have two dollar bills to rub against one another at the beginning of the war were speaking of their wealth in millions now. The veterans feel that this is an injustice and especially when it is permitted by a Government that has not the courage to take a fair amount of wealth in the way of taxes. The same feeling exists among other classes that are making themselves heard and felt. We are witnessing the evolution of a new democracy. Men everywhere in this country, consciously or unconsciously, are asking the question: "What did the men fight for?" They have had the answer in stereotyped shape a hundred times that they fought for democracy, freedom and justice. That is what they fought for in Europe and a little bit of that sort of thing would not go badly in Canada. I have seen no tendency on the part of the Government to grasp this situation in the light of what after all is the vital matter of the handling of the finances of the country. It is on that ground that on this occasion I cannot vote confidence in this administration and it is on that ground that I shall vote for the amendment.

Mr. GEORGE WILLIAM ANDREWS (Centre Winnipeg): Mr. Speaker, like the members of this House who have preceded me, I desire to pay my humble tribute to the honourable gentlemen who moved and seconded the address. I particularly desire to congratulate the hon. the mover of the address (Mr. Cronyn) on the high note he struck. It reflected in this House the true spirit for the defence of which a million men lie dead in France and it was worthy of the occasion and of the man. He hinted that in the days to come we must put our hand to the plough and that there must be no looking back. Yet, at page 39 of Hansard I find there attributed to my right hon. friend the leader of the Government (Sir George Foster) a sort of pious hope, "that we may restore ourselves, our country, and the world to the basis upon which we stood when the war commenced." If this were possible, Mr. Speaker, which it is not, thanks be to God, we would be on the edge of the biggest and bloodiest war in history and where in all Canada could you find men, outside perhaps of a few ghouls of war profiteers, who would desire to face that condition again? I regret that my right hon. friend (Sir George Foster) is not in his seat at the moment. I am sure he never intended that his words should bear that interpretation and I would ask him, with all his great experience and splendid ability, to tell us, before the session is over, what he did mean? Undoubtedly he meant us to go back to the good things of the past and not to those things that mean war. There was something about the years 1914, 1913, 1912, 1911 and 1910, that contained the germs of war—possible, probable, actual. We do not want to go back to those days and we are not going back.

At page 43 of Hansard—this made a great impression on my mind—I find a reference to a squawking bird. The hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) seemed to have some difficulty in taking up the allusion made by the leader of the Government. Personally, I have none at all. I do not think that any man—particularly any western man—could miss the point if he lived in the neighbourhood of Deloraine in 1896. That squawking bird was a free-trade bird. He was hooked out of the nest on the return of the Liberal Government. But my right hon. friend the leader of the Government will be interested to know that he did not die. He went West, grew up with the country, and to-day is "some bird." I sometimes think he is an eagle. He certainly has bright eyes which look deep into the future, has a strong economic beak, strong talons which grip and hold; and, Mr. Speaker, like the stone that was rejected and afterwards became the corner stone, I have a strong hunch that that squawking bird which was hooked out of its nest in 1896 will yet come back to be master in his own house, and the head of the Liberal party. But I do not wish to talk free trade, although I have my own ideas about it. I believe in free trade absolutely in the same way as I believe in Christianity, but you cannot throw pearls before swine; you cannot tackle a tiger with any Christian tenets so far as I have ever noticed—or a Hun either, for that matter. A little common sense is a very good thing. I think the people of this country have common sense and can be depended on to use it no matter who comes back after the next election. And that is one point. As I have sat in this beautiful Chamber, with member after member getting up and speaking I cannot help wondering how many

of us are coming back after the next election. I want you to pay particular attention to that point because I am going to refer to it a few minutes later.

My real reason, Mr. Speaker, for taking my stand to-day is to register my deep regret that no mention has been made in the speech from the Throne of further measures for the re-establishment of our returned soldiers other than those measures already in operation. After all the work that was done and all the evidence that was produced last year, and after we had been told that the door was not closed upon the returned soldiers, I had hoped to find something constructive along the lines of further re-establishment forecasted in the speech from the Throne this session. It does appear, and becomes more strongly manifest every day, that if the returned man wants anything he must fight, fight, fight the whole time. From an eight-dollar allowance for his clothing up to thirty-five dollars, for pensions, it is fight, fight. That should not be, and I desire particularly to register my protest that mention of re-establishment has again been omitted from the speech from the Throne. Neither is there any mention of insurance nor anything for students, nor any comprehensive plan, and this despite the existing unrest. With your permission I shall read an extract from an editorial which appeared in a paper called The Link published in Edmonton by the Rev. H. A. Edwards. I do not know the gentleman but he covers rather well the situation amongst the great body of veterans with whom I am particularly associated. The editorial is headed "The Discontented Element," and it starts as follows:

> The following extract from the Ottawa Ford despatch to the Edmonton Journal illustrates the kind of attitude towards returned men and their problems, with which we dealt at some length in these columns last month:
>
> "It is generally understood that the discontented element of the returned men will renew the agitation for an increased gratuity at the coming session, although there is no probability of any change in the attitude of the Government in the matter. Positions have been found for nearly all those who desire them, and the total amount spent out of the forty million dollars appropriated has been less than one-tenth that amount."

Upon this paragraph the article comments in these terms:

> As usual, the very wording of the reference to the soldiers' re-establishment proposals is purposely calculated to present both them and their suggestions in an unfavourable light. In a single contemptuous phrase are grouped together, without distinction, both the statesman-like members of the advisory committee on re-establishment, whose carefully considered proposals were so summarily dismissed; and the extreme and unrepresentative Harry Flynn section; all are equally bad, entirely undeserving of any serious consideration; so they are quickly kicked into a fitting chamber of oblivion, the door slammed, and the epitaph written on the outside: Beware the Discontented Element!
>
> It would almost seem as if, in the minds of those who "inspire" these sort of despatches discontent were a vice. Dissatisfaction with things as-they-are must, according to these gentlemen, always come from below, never from above.
>
> Such a position is untenable. It denies all reform and inhibits all progress. It would brand as undesirables most of the greatest names in history. All down the ages thousands of men and women have been "discontented" with conditions affecting the lives of those about them, and have sought to relieve those conditions. Always there were those who scoffed, and those who opposed, abusing and impugning their motives, though later generations erected monuments in gratitude to their memory.
>
> It is the same to-day, abuse is cheap, and misrepresentation easy. Readers of the Link, however, will not be misled by this kind of thing. In these districts at any rate, we are in too close touch with the returned boys to feel anything but intense indignation at the persistent propaganda so sedulously intent on discrediting their position, and alienating sympathy from them. We resent it, and we believe that this resentment is widespread and general, and may unpleasantly astonish the party politician when the time comes for the next vote to be taken.

The foregoing are the comments of an outsider who covers fairly well my own view on the subject.

I may say that I have a letter here from a man who had the honour to serve in the regiment so splendidly commanded by the member for Skeena (Mr. Peck). He went overseas as a private and by good luck and good service, after being wounded twice, eventually became Captain and Adjutant of his battalion. Before the war this man was a railway mail clerk and enlisted in 1914 in another three months his examination fell due—which would have given him civil service pay during his entire military service which lasted over five years—but he did not wait to take that examination before going overseas. If he had been a good business man, a cautious man, if he had waited and protected his own interests before the interests of the country, he would not have been at Ypres in 1915 with his comrades, and if that division had not been there we would not have been here to-day—or if we had been here we would have been saluting his nibs the Kaiser. That is the universal opinion of the military men to-day. But this man did not wait, he jumped into the fight.

He comes back and he finds that he is still a temporary employee of the Civil Service, he has lost five years seniority and he still has to pass his examination. The rotten part of it is that during the strike in Winnipeg civilians who performed one week's service were given permanent appointments. It looks to this man—who is one of the finest possible types—that he has got a raw deal, for apparently one week's strike service is rated higher than five years' service in the field. That is one of the things causing unrest. It is something that can be fixed, and it has got to be fixed. That is the case of a man who has come back with his full health and strength, thank God! We have other cases in thousands.

I do not know any better way of bringing their cases before the notice of the people than by bringing the matter up in this House. We have tried almost every method we can think of, without success so far, but so long as I am a member of Parliament these cases will be brought on the floor of the House one by one if necessary until we get a square deal for those men. That is all I intend to say on the subject to-day, as I understand that the House will be given an opportunity at an early date to debate further the question of re-establishment.

I desire to say just a word as to the amendment. I am going to vote for it, for the following reasons. In the first place, I believe that my constituents desire an election as soon as possible. During the recess I have spent almost every night amongst my constituents, I have seen them by ones and by twos, by tens and by fifties, and once by a group of four thousand, and always I found a majority of them desirous of a change. The old-line Liberal is firmly convinced that we are camouflaged Conservatives, and the old Conservative wanted to get back to the party game immediately after the war. He said that was the arrangement under which he came into the Unionist party. At every meeting which I have attended this confounding subject of taxing wealth has cropped up. It has already been referred to very ably by my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark). There is a distinct feeling amongst all classes that this Government has failed to do what was possible with regard to the taxation of war profits. I know well the difficulty the Finance Minister will have in imposing such taxation squarely and equally. I was once asked at a meeting whom I considered a profiteer. My answer was that any man who during the war made ten cents was a profiteer, and that if profiteering had to be taxed every man must pay his shot. I still am of that opinion. Whether the money so secured would amount to anything I do not know and have no means of knowing; but I am satisfied of this, Mr. Speaker, that something along this line has got to be done before we get very much satisfaction or settlement in the country. Undoubtedly that is one of the causes of unrest to-day; and to my mind, judging from my own constituency and from what other members have stated, a good deal of unrest is also caused by the fact that a majority of the people have largely lost confidence in the government and probably would have lost confidence in any government under these conditions. But it is a fact and we must face it. So far I have not been able to educate my people to the contrary. Possibly if we could have had the able Minister of the Interior at all the meetings I attended conditions might be different. This education has got to be done somewhere and somehow. The hon. minister pointed out how desirable it was to have the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould) here so he could get a little further light. If that is true of a man selected by fifteen hundred people, how much more necessary is it that the fifteen hundred who selected him be brought here? That, I know, is impossible, but Mr. Speaker, if the mountain won't come to Mahommet, Mahommet must go to the mountain,—the Government must go to the country. I know of no other way in which you can educate the people unless you spend millions of dollars in sending out personal letters to the electorate, because I regret to say that, like the leader of the Government, a great many Canadians do not now pay much attention to the headlines in the papers.

Just one other point struck me during the debate, Mr. Speaker. I was astounded to hear three hon. members, one of them being a minister, give as a reason for not holding an election that the West would be short twenty seats if an appeal were made to the country this year. What can it mean but that those members doubt that the West could get a square deal unless represented by numbers? If it is true that a man from any part of this country cannot get a just and square deal without a large representation to back his desire by force if necessary, then I say, God help Canada, and the sooner we get a bunch of fresh representatives here the better.

I desire to briefly explain my personal views on the matter of a man voting against his party. I did this once before last ses-

sion. I have been trained in the old school —I believe in loyalty to leaders and discipline in the party, no matter what party it is. I believe that Sir Robert Borden was entrusted with the affairs of this country at a very critical time, that he "carried on," that he did his utmost level best with the men he was associated with, and although it was a dirty, rotten job he handled it successfully. I felt so keenly on the subject that I wrote to my constituents and told them that I had voted against the Government, and that they might have my resignation. They did not accept it. I have a copy of the letter which was written to me at the time; I showed it to one of the Cabinet ministers. I may tell the House that my constituents gave me an absolutely free hand. I am, therefore, now going over to the cross benches; I shall feel freer there. I do not like to vote against the Government; it goes against the grain. If a man gets a chance in caucus and in the lobbies and finds himself in a minority, he should stay with his party; I cannot see how the business of the country is going to be carried on if he jumps the fence every time he fails to get his own way.

Mr. THOMAS MacNUTT (Saltcoats): Mr. Speaker, I have found it rather difficult to come to a decision with regard to my vote on the amendment proposed by the leader of the Opposition (Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King). I am not one of those who contend that the Union Government was a failure; despite all obstacles that were thrown in the way it did the work that it was created to do, and did it well. I have no regrets, therefore, for having been a supporter of the Union Government during the war, when we were supposed to put aside all purely domestic issues in the face of the great danger which confronted us. But now the time has come when we should deal with these questions, and I do not think that the Union Government as at present constituted will deal with them in the way that many of us think they should be dealt with.

I believe that an election should be held before long, but if one is held in the immediate future it will be based upon the census of 1911. We are now approaching the end of a decennial period and another census will shortly be taken. There is no doubt that conditions have changed very much since 1911; the population of Canada has largely increased, especially in the West. If any definite statement from the Government was forthcoming to the effect that an election would be held as soon as possible after the next census was taken. I certainly would oppose the amendment, because I think it is worth while waiting a reasonable length of time in order that the people may have their proper representation in Parliament. I was very much pleased to hear the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) make the following statement at the conclusion of his address last night:

> I appeal to all hon. gentlemen everywhere to allow Western Canada to get its representation, which it assuredly will; because there is no intention to have an election until an opportunity is provided to give Western Canada its full share of representation after the census is taken.

However, there is nothing definite in that; an election might not be held until 1923. I would feel inclined to oppose the amendment if there was a possibility of some member of the Government making a definite announcement that immediately following an early census a redistribution would be effected and an appeal promptly made to the people. But I do not know that any member of the Government is in a position to make such a statement; therefore I am disposed to support the amendment.

With regard to the probable result of the next census, I have obtained a few figures from the Bureau of Statistics. They are, of course, only estimates, but they are probably very near the mark. The compilation was made as of March 31, 1919.

5 p.m.

The following are the estimated increases in the various provinces: Alberta, 213,337; British Columbia, 325,520; Manitoba, 163,386; New Brunswick, 17,111; Nova Scotia, 26,662; Ontario, 397,626; Prince Edward Island, 272; Quebec, 312,768; Saskatchewan, 261,568; Yukon, 488; total increase, 1,718,738. The estimate for the whole Dominion is 8,835,000.

Taking the estimated population of Quebec as 2,326,000 and dividing it by 65, we arrive at a basis for estimating the number of representatives which each province will have. If this estimate is correct, Alberta will have 16 members, an increase of 4; British Columbia 20, an increase of 7; Manitoba 17, an increase of 2; New Brunswick 10, a decrease of 1; Nova Scotia 14, a decrease of 2; Ontario 79, a decrease of 3; Prince Edward Island 4; Quebec, 65; Saskatchewan 21, an increase of 5. The estimated total increase of members is 18 and the estimated decrease 6, a net increase of 12. The estimated total membership is 247, instead of, as now, 235.

No one knows what the political complexion of the new Parliament may be; that is a matter for the people themselves to determine through their majorities. But I am convinced that from the West, at all events, a great majority will be in favour of a low tariff. A great change has taken place in the West. Men who were very strong partisans have ceased to adhere strictly to party lines. Many prominent men have told me that in a way they were very glad that the break in the old party system did come, because they had been supporting their party at times when they felt that the party was wrong. With these men that will not happen again. Although there are, no doubt, some protectionists left in the West, their numbers are not very great.

If the Government will make a pronouncement along the lines I have indicated I should be willing to wait eighteen months so that we could have a redistribution measure put through the House.

I want to say a few words with regard to the income tax. I certainly am not going to knock the income tax, because I believe in direct taxation. I think that the greater part of the revenues of this country should be obtained proportionately from the people by direct taxation. It seems to me that customs taxation is primarily protection, and incidentally a revenue producer. It benefits mostly the manufacturers of this country. We all wish them well, but certainly they are not entitled to anything more than legitimate profits, unless they are going to make some return for protection, of which I fail to see any signs at present. I do not think the income tax can very well be applied to the farming community. Farmers, of course, must pay their share of the public expenditure, just the same as any other class of the community, but very few farmers keep track of their finances, and it is consequently very difficult for them to know just what their taxable balance is. I therefore think it would be far better to tax farmers upon land values. I have a little book here called the Farmer's Account Book, issued by the Commission of Conservation free to any one who applies for it. I have been instrumental in getting copies into the hands of a number of farmers in my constituency. The book, which is designed entirely for farmers, is in simple form. It was not intended to be an aid in the collection of the income tax, but was issued solely in the interests of the farmers. It will, however, be of assistance to farmers in preparing their income tax returns. I think a book of this sort should be used as a text book in every country school, so that the farmer's children will get into the habit of keeping accounts. Some facts regarding farm bookkeeping are given in a note on the cover, as follows:

> During the summer of 1915, one hundred farms in each of four counties in Ontario were visited by a representative of the Commission of Conservation. In 1916, four hundred farmers were visited in Dundas county. It was found, among other things, that farmers took too little interest in farm accounting. Less than one per cent of the total of eight hundred farmers visited were following a really complete method of book-keeping, and less than thirty per cent were following any form whatever of farm accounting. Those who keep no accounts have, at best, only an estimate of their business and cannot consider one phase of the farm operations distinctly enough to know whether it pays or not.

It is no crime not to be a book-keeper, but it certainly would be helpful to the farmers to have a methodical system of keeping their accounts. Many farmers in the West and even in Ontario are not in the habit of keeping a very strict account of their incomings and outgoings, and consequently it is very difficult for them to tell just where they stand with regard to the income tax. The income tax forms sent out are very complicated, and it takes almost an expert accountant to fill them in properly. For these reasons I think a direct tax on land values, instead of an income tax, should be levied in the case of farmers.

My principal object in rising was to try and get some pronouncement from the Government on the lines I have indicated, to assist me in determining how to vote on this amendment. Before closing, I wish to say a few words on this "contemptible little army," as it has been jocularly called. If, in a much smaller way, and in a different direction, this "contemptible little army" carries out its work in as satisfactory a way as the "contemptible little army" of Great Britain did in the early days of the war, we shall achieve notable results. The real intention was that men, not necessarily farmers, who feel alike on certain great questions, should get together and consult with one another, and perhaps vote with one another, though it does not absolutely follow that we shall always vote together. One of our members is designated with the rather pugnacious term of Whip, but I do not think any of us are much afraid of him or of the whip he is supposed to crack. I do not think he will crack it very often over our heads. He is a gentleman whom we all

respect very highly, and for that reason he was given this appointment. His duties will simply be to notify us when some one of us think we should get together and talk things over. Our group is entirely independent, both individually and collectively. It may be that on this amendment we shall not all vote the same way. I do not know; we have not discussed it with one another. Then there will be times, no doubt, when we shall vote as a body, sometimes perhaps with this side of the House, and sometimes with the other. Our object is to derive strength by forming this group of men who think alike on certain great questions.

One of these questions is the tariff. I think we can all in this group say that we are low tariff men. Some people advocate no tariff at all, and I do not know that this principle has not strong merits to recommend it. However, I do not believe that the tariff should be wiped out immediately. Years ago, when a member of the Liberal party, I frequently stated my views in this House on this question and I have had no reason to change them. In fact, I think they are stronger than ever they were. I believe there is greater necessity to-day for production than at any previous time in our history, and it is vitally important that every obstacle should be removed that stands in the way of increased agricultural production. The question may be asked us: "If you are low-tariff men why do you not associate yourselves with the Liberal party?" Although I am perfectly satisfied that many of us are on the best possible terms personally with many members both of the Liberal and of the Union parties, I for one—and I have reason to believe that my colleagues are at one with me in this—do not feel myself justified in being allied with the present Liberal party. I have had some experience of eastern Liberals, and I know that they are not unanimous with regard to the tariff; and although they may have a platform which seems to indicate unanimity, I am not satisfied that they could go as far as we should like in this direction. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Levi Thomson) will remember that some years ago the western Liberals decided to bring before the House a real low-tariff proposition. We got together on various occasions, once at Regina, once at Winnipeg, and frequently here, and framed a resolution which we called the "Oliver Resolution," as it was to be moved by the Hon. Frank Oliver, and which was almost identical with the platform of the Council of Agriculture. In canvassing the eastern Liberals I found that several of them, at all events, were satisfied with the resolution except for the fact that it interfered with some particular industry in their constituencies. They seemed to me to be free traders outside of their constituencies, but protectionists within. I do not say that this is true of them all; no doubt there were some who were sincere. I am of the opinion that a great many eastern Liberals still hold the same views they held then, and are protectionists to a large extent, particularly so far as any industry in which their constituencies are interested are concerned.

Mr. COPP: Judge not.

Mr. MacNUTT: The opposite is the case in the West. The western farmers, I think, are generally in favour of a real low tariff.

Mr. MORPHY: They favour the farm instead of the factory.

Mr. MacNUTT: We ask for no special privileges for the farm, but the manufacturers seek privileges for themselves. They say: "Give us protection; build a wall around us to keep competition from us and enable us to get more money out of the consumer." The farmer, on the other hand, says: "We do not want protection and we ask for none. We simply ask, however, that the obstacles which are in our path and which have no right whatever to be there shall be removed." Eastern men, at least many of them, seem to cherish the notion that they have a right to protection. It is something they have so long enjoyed that they evidently think they have some sort of established right to it. I do not think, however, that they have the slightest right to any special favour, and I personally, with the best will in the world for the manufacturers, whom I should like to see succeed in their enterprises in this country, am strongly of opinion that there should be no legislation which enables them to get something for which they give nothing in return. I think that many former Conservatives who always favoured low tariff, but would not oppose their party, now feel absolved, as it were, and will vote independently.

Mr. Speaker, I think we are fully alive to the fact that we are faced with a very heavy expenditure, and in every part of the Dominion, whether it is in the East or in the West, every man, be he farmer, lawyer or doctor, must as a citizen pay his share towards meeting that expenditure and reducing the debt of the country. This taxation should be levied in a fair way, and

it cannot be said that it is so done at the present time. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that our little group—which I am confident will not long be as small as it is at present—will render all the assistance it possibly can to the end that the debt of the Dominion may be reduced and satisfactory conditions brought about.

Mr. MORPHY: In regard to direct taxation, may I ask the hon. member whether he would tax improved or unimproved lands?

Mr. MacNUTT: My idea is that the land should be valued without taking into consideration the improvements upon it. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have said about all I intended to say. Probably at a later date, when the Budget is before the House, I may go further into details. I rose, however, more particularly to say that in the absence of some assurance that we may expect an election following the census I shall have no other resource than to vote for the amendment.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON (Qu'Appelle) Mr. Speaker, the word "class" has been used somewhat freely in this debate. We have heard such expressions as, "class legislation," "class representation," and "class movement," and last evening the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Meighen) spoke about "class origin." I am no advocate of class legislation or class representation. I am not at this moment condemning the principle, which may be necessary in some cases, as for instance in the case of labour groups. As I say, however, I am neither advocating nor condemning it. As far as the supporters of the platform of the Canadian Council of Agriculture are concerned, there is no desire for class legislation. Distinctly, we are opposed to class legislation of any kind. Class legislation is not approved of by our group in this House, nor is it approved of by our platform or its supporters. Class representation is not asked for by our platform or by this group in the House; nor is it asked for by the majority of the supporters of this platform. It is true that in some places and communities even leaders have come out in favour of class representation; that is that they, being farmers, should elect farmers to represent them. That view, however, is not general. In so far as Saskatchewan is concerned, we have come out very pronouncedly in opposition to class representation as well as class legislation. I think that in speaking of this group, or, in any criticism that may be offered with reference to this group, that matter should be considered. It must be remembered that while there are twelve seats held by the group of which I speak, seven of the members in the group represent Saskatchewan constituencies where the policy has been distinctly laid down and agreed to that there must be no class representation or class legislation. Every person is free to come in and take part in our nominations or in any convention that is going on. Every one is free, no matter what his occupation is, to be a candidate or a delegate or to take part in a convention or in the work of the organization. I have said that it is possible that some group may find it wise to ask for class representation and may perhaps be justified in doing so; I am not saying whether they are or not; but I want to repeat that the movement which has been spoken of here—the movement of those who are supporters of the platform of the Canadian Council of Agriculture—makes no distinction whatever as between classes and does not ask for class representation or class legislation. Our platform is big and broad enough for every man who desires to promote the welfare of the country. That is all that is required. Every one who is desirous that all should have equal rights is welcomed by our organization and our platform is certainly broad enough to accommodate all who take that view.

This matter has become somewhat mixed in the utterances of public men and some of the papers. Some people have got the question of class representation and class legislation mixed up. There was a very earnest effort on the part of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) last evening to mix up the question of class origin with class representation and legislation. He claimed that because this movement had been started by a certain class it must therefore be a class movement. I have much respect for my hon. friend's arguments and his ability, as I think every member of this House has, but when he attempts to tell us that because a movement is started by some class, or some person of some class, it must therefore be a class movement and must be a movement of that class, with all respect to my hon. friend, I think his proposition is absurd. If there were anything in it, then because Carey was a cobbler, the missionary movement must be a class movement and a cobbler class movement at that. I do not know what the occupation in life of Cob-

den was but he is generally given the credit for being the originator of the free trade movement. If he had been a newspaper man, according to my hon. friend's argument, it would be a newspaper movement—a class movement among newspaper men. A group of clergymen might start some movement, but surely it does not follow that it is a clerical movement if the movement is for the benefit of the people as a whole. I do not know that movements started by clergymen as a rule are supposed to be for their own benefit; they are generally for the benefit of the people at large.

If the farmers of Canada have started this movement I think it is entirely to their credit because I believe that it is a movement which will not be for the benefit of any particular class merely but for the benefit of the people of the country generally.

I do not think that the friends of free trade can be consistently charged with a desire for class legislation. Protective legislation is necessarily class legislation. It is the protection of a certain class against outside competition to enable them to charge more for their products than they would be able to charge but for that legislation. That is certainly the reason for protective legislation. Therefore it is class legislation while free trade cannot be class legislation because free traders only ask that there shall be no class privileges. The main point about the doctrine of free trade is that there shall be no class privileges to any one but that there shall be a fair field and no favours.

We have heard something about the adverse rate of exchange from both sides of the House. The remarks of the hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) have been several times referred to, and while I do not wish to dwell at any length upon them I would like to read an extract from Hansard. The hon. member says:

> I would not trade to the extent of one five-cent piece with any country which will not recognize my Canadian dollar to the full face value of that dollar. If this country is loyal to itself, loyal to its principles, loyal to its institutions, it will stand by Canadianism in the matter of having any trade with any country that will not recognize the Canadian dollar at its full face value as international currency. I am not in favour of any restriction of trade, but I am in favour of Canada's trading where there is fair trade where she is properly treated. If there is any reason why any country is willing to sell goods to us and yet will not recognize the face value of the dollars with which we pay for them, that reason should be clearly stated.

[Mr. Thomson.]

I do not propose to go into the question of the balance of trade but I think that my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Gould) referred to the fact that after the Civil War the American dollar was only worth 37 cents; we would only give 37 cents for the American dollar. I do not think the Americans ever thought of applying to us the doctrine enunciated by the hon. member for North Cape Breton or of saying that because we would not give them one hundred cents on the dollar, they would not trade with us. The Americans at that time were a little broader minded. Let me refer to a comment contained in a Canadian press despatch published by the Ottawa Citizen under the date of March 2:

> Toronto, March 2—The Canadian Reconstruction Association—

We have heard of that before--

> has issued a long statement pointing out that in spite of the present adverse rate of exchange, Canadian imports from the United States are still increasing according to latest available figures, and drawing attention to the absolute necessity of Canadians purchasing Canadian-made goods in Canada, and lessening national dependence upon foreign industries.

Well, that sounds like old doctrine; we have heard that occasionally before. Our Canadian manufacturing friends are very desirous that we should purchase no American-made goods. They say we should not do so, and they make us responsible because certain American goods are being sold in Canada. What is the result of this adverse rate of exchange between Canada and the United States? Surely it is that the protection of the Canadian manufacturer is increased by the amount of that adverse exchange. But this increase of protection is not sufficient to satisfy the Canadian manufacturers. They want something further, they want more relief, they want Canada to do something more for them. The double protection which they now enjoy is not satisfactory; they want it trebled instead of merely doubled. It seems to me that their demand for relief in order to enable them to supply Canadian-made goods to the home market is not well founded. In my opinion the remedy lies entirely in their own hands. They are the parties who should apply the remedy if any remedy needs to be applied, not the long-suffering public. Surely the double protection to which I have alluded ought to be sufficient to enable the Canadian manufacturers to furnish us with goods at a lower rate than the American manufacturers are receiving for the goods imported

into this country. Let the Canadian manufacturers satisfy our people that they are able to supply them with such goods as they need at a lower rate than the American manufacturers, or even at a rate as low. The Canadian consumer is not altogether a fool. He knows what goods he is buying; he is going to buy in the cheapest market he can; and if the double protection which the Canadian manufacturers are enjoying at present is not sufficient to enable them to produce the goods that Canadians require, or to sell them at such a rate as will exclude all outside competition, then surely protection is a miserable failure. How much protection is necessary in order to make the protective system a success? In ordinary everyday affairs, as in political life, when we are dealing with any particular plan we want to adopt the plan that we can carry out successfully. Apparently it is impossible to afford sufficient protection to our Canadian manufacturing concerns to enable them to do the thing which they think ought to be done—that is to have Canadian-made goods bought in Canada. I am quite willing to buy everything that I can from Canadian manufacturers, but I still claim the privilege, if American manufacturers can sell to me more cheaply than Canadian manufacturers notwithstanding the tremendous protection enjoyed by the latter—of buying in the cheapest market. That is apparently what our manufacturers —the Re-construction Association as they call themselves—are anxious that we shall not do. Evidently they wish us to pay still more, to give them still more protection and to pay still higher prices for what they produce. There is no reason that I can see why Canadian manufacturers cannot manufacture the articles produced in this country generally as cheaply as the American manufacturers, leaving outside altogether the matter of the tariff. At any rate, surely the existing tariff and the present adverse exchange rate which makes still further for protection, should enable them to supply us with what we need at a reasonable price and do away with the condition which they are now lamenting when they say that notwithstanding that adverse exchange rate our imports from the United States are increasing instead of decreasing. If such is the case that is the fault of the Canadian manufacturer and not ours. I do not now wish to enter into a discussion of fiscal matters. There will be ample time for that later on, when we in this corner will probably have something to say about the tariff and about kindred questions.

I desire, however, to offer a few observations with regard to the amendment which is now before the House. We have heard a great deal about it, and the Minister of the Interior seems to think that if we cannot agree to every single word in the amendment, if we cannot agree to the dotting of every "i" and the crossing of every "t" we must vote against it. Sir, I must confess that I cannot grasp the reasoning embodied in that sort of argument. To my mind the amendment, stripped of its verbiage, merely calls for an election after the present session has run its course. I think perhaps that if some of the verbiage of the amendment had been omitted it would have been better. Personally I do not like so many preambles, because they sometimes weaken the effect of a proposition. I do not wish to criticize the leader of the Opposition, but I think the object aimed at could have been better accomplished with fewer words. It would be more satisfactory to ourselves in the long run and the public would be better pleased. In my opinion the gist of what we are voting on is merely whether or not there should be a general election after a full session of the present Parliament. That is a question which each of us must settle for himself. Each member must decide whether he believes in and should vote for that principle. Now I realize there is something to be said on both sides of this question, and perhaps we are a little too slow in this House to realize that fact when dealing with matters which come before us. This Parliament was elected on a war franchise, on one issue—to win the war. I have no desire to criticize the Government; I am not here for that purpose at all. I am prepared to support the Government whenever I feel that I can properly do so. I believe it to be the duty of every hon. member who is taking an independent stand to support the Government whenever he feels that its acts warrant that course. We should realize that the Government has onerous duties to perform and so long as it is in power I am rather inclined to get away from the merely party idea. No matter who is at its head we should support the Government as far as possible whenever we believe it to be doing right. Personally I am prepared to do that. I am willing to give the Government credit for everything it has done, especially during the war, and am not inclined to condemn it for all its acts since the war terminated, because I recognize it has had to deal with exceedingly complex problems. The Government

is now treading new and unbroken ground and its position is very difficult, very much more difficult than any previous Government in Canada has had to face. On the whole I am not prepared to say that it has not in almost all matters done fairly well. Therefore, although I intend to vote for the amendment, it is not with a view of showing any disregard to what the Government has done or of manifesting any particular dissatisfaction with it. Although I must admit that I am not satisfied with all that the Government has done, still dissatisfaction with its course will not be my reason for the vote I shall give on this question. I have always maintained that there should be no general election until our soldiers had returned and been a sufficient time in Canada to thoroughly grasp or to reasonably well understand the political situation. However, the war is over, our soldiers have returned, and I believe they have been back in this country a sufficient time to enable them to grasp the political situation if they are ever going to do so. We were told last evening—or at least the Minister of the Interior and the member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) seemed to argue —that the last general election was like any other general election: That there was the one big issue before us, as there is upon almost all other like occasions, but that in addition the general political issues as at other general elections were fought out. With that view I cannot for one moment agree. There was no contest in my own constituency, but I did my share in trying to support my hon. friend from Saltcoats (Mr. MacNutt) in his constituency.

I took the ground taken by him and which I heard taken everywhere. We threw aside everything else for the time being and we said: "This is a war election; we are supporting and are prepared to support the Government during the war and for any time thereafter necesary for demobilization."

While the hon. Minister of the Interior took the ground that he did last night, I want to read an extract from a speech he made September 6, 1917, when introducing the War-time Elections Act. It will be found at page 5415 of Hansard for that year. He said:

> As the title would indicate, the scope of the Bill,— that is the War-time Elections Bill— so far as the period of its operation is concerned, is limited indeed. Its provisions are to operate only during the period of the present war and of demobilization thereafter.

Hon. Mr. W. L. MACKENZIE KING: Hear, hear.

[Mr. Thomson.]

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: That was distinctly laid down in the introduction of the Bill. That is a little different from what we heard last night.

> The necessity for the Bill arises out of the precipitation of an election in time of war. But for that becoming inevitable, there would be no justification for the measure;

There would have been no justification for the measure which was introduced but for the fact that we had to have an election in war time.

My hon. friend stated that the provisions of that Act were to operate only during that period. As a matter of fact, the provisions of the War-time Elections Act are still operating; that is, we represent our constituencies in this House by virtue of the elections held under that Act. I do not think for a moment that had that Act never been passed it would have made any material difference in the returns. Perhaps some of my hon. friends may not agree with me, but I believe the results would have been practically the same, and I am confident that there would be a much more satisfied feeling throughout the country had it never been introduced. You are aware what the hon. member for Frontenac said last evening on this subject. I have not his exact words, but I give you the gist of what he said as reported at page 5572 of Hansard of 1917:

> That the pending election will be entirely different from any other election ever held in this country.

That is not what I heard from him last night; on the contrary, he said they were just the same. In 1917 he said clearly:

> The only issue is the conduct of the war.

Those two hon. gentlemen were quite clear in 1917 as they were quite clear last night, but their utterances are remarkably different; in fact, there is not much resemblance between the utterances of two and a half years ago and those of last night. I believe they were right in the statements they made in regard to that measure, I believe they expressed their own intentions at that time; but their intentions are entirely different now, and I believe my hon. friends are wrong in the contradictory statements which they made last night.

In view of this, while, as I say, there are two sides to this as to every question, it seems to me that the only proper course for us to take is to support the amendment. I realize that there is something in what has been said in regard to re-distribution, and I would be very glad to see a re-distribution

which would give equal justice to the population of all parts of Canada. I believe that even if we have an election now we should have another election within a reasonably early period thereafter so that the whole country may be fairly represented.

My hon. friend from Saltcoats (Mr. MacNutt) showed a disposition to vote against this amendment provided he got some assurance as to the intention of the Government, but he failed to get any. Personally, I do not think he should have expected anything else.

Hon. Mr. W. L. MACKENZIE KING: Quite right.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: I do not see how any minister could go further than the hon. Minister of the Interior went last night. No ministry knows how long they may remain in power,—and certainly this ministry does not. Therefore I think they are quite right in refusing to give any further assurance than the hon. Minister of the Interior gave last night. In view of this fact, I feel that the only course I am justified in taking is to vote for the amendment.

On motion of Mr. A. L. Davidson (Digby and Annapolis) the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Sir George Foster the House adjourned at 5.55 p.m.

Monday, March 8, 1920.

The House met at Three o'clock.

THE LATE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL G. H. BAKER, M.P.

MEMORIAL IN PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS TO BE ERECTED.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that a Message has been received from the Senate acquainting this House that the Honourable Messieurs Bradbury, Casgrain, Foster and Pope have been appointed a special committee to determine the form of the memorial to be erected in the Parliament Buildings to the late Lieutenant-Colonel George Harold Baker, M.P for Brome, he being the only member of Parliament who lost his life on the field of battle, and inviting this House to appoint a like committee to act jointly with a committee of the Senate.

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Acting Prime Minister) moved:

That the following Members of Parliament, to wit: Sir Sam Hughes, Messrs. Boivin, Kay and Griesbach, be appointed a Special Committee to confer and act with a like Committee of the Senate in determining the form of the Memorial to be erected in the Parliament Buildings to the late Lieutenant-Colonel Baker, M.P. for Brome, who lost his life on the field of battle; and that a Message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honours therewith.

Mr. SPEAKER: This motion can only be entertained by unanimous consent.

Motion agreed to.

GOLD SHIPMENT FROM OTTAWA TO NEW YORK.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JEAN J. DENIS (Joliette): I would call the attention of the Government to a press despatch of March 5 to the effect that gold coin valued at approximately $3,000,000 has been shipped to New York from Canada for the account of the Canadian Government, and that this is understood to be the forerunner of further shipments. I should like to know if this report is correct, and whether, if further shipments are contemplated, they are to be made for the purpose of relieving the exchange situation between Canada and the United States.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (Minister of Finance): It is quite correct that there is a movement of some gold from Ottawa to New York. It is being shipped in payment of some Canadian obligations payable in New York. This method of meeting our obligations was adopted for the reason that otherwise, in view of the exchange situation, there would have been a serious expense to the country. When shipping in gold, the expense is only one-tenth of one per cent; being our actual cost of transport. As against, therefore, an exchange ranging from 13 to 17, which on a large payment would constitute a very serious loss, we are getting rid of our obligations in New York for one-tenth of one per cent and at the same time keeping within our statutory gold reserve. The movement is not made for the purpose of correcting the exchange but simply for the purpose of discharging our obligations in that market.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Consideration of the motion of Mr. Hume Cronyn for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the proposed amendment of the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie King thereto, resumed from Friday, March 5.

Right Hon. Sir THOMAS WHITE (Ex-Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, when I retired from the Government in August last it was my intention for the reasons given in my letter of resignation, to resign my seat in this House. I refrained from doing so at the request of the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden), and also of many prominent citizens of my constituency of both political parties. I am glad that I followed that course, because the retention of my seat affords me the opportunity of making answer to questions which may arise touching the fiscal policy of the Government and the administration of the public finances during my period of office.

To those who have referred in terms of commendation to the part I took in the Administration I am deeply grateful. Some criticisms which have been passed in the course of this debate I shall deal with, I hope effectually, before I take my seat. While I am upon my feet I should like to speak, and I hope at not too great length, to the amendment which has been proposed by the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King).

May I be permitted a personal digression? I was not in the House at the close of the last session, and consequently did not have the opportunity, which I now most earnestly embrace, of extending my congratulations to my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mackenzie King) upon his appointment to the eminent position of head of the Liberal party and its leader in this House. I do so with the greater pleasure because he and I have been old personal friends. Our friendship is of such long standing that I do not like to refer to it for fear it should appear that he and I are growing old. He is a graduate of the same university as I, and I think of the same year. His father was my preceptor in law, a man for whom in his lifetime I always cherished the highest esteem and regard, and whom I bear now in most affectionate remembrance. While our political differences arising from the views which we hold, and doubtless will continue to hold on public questions are not likely to be few or narrow, I assure the hon. leader of the Opposition of a goodly measure of my goodwill and interest in his future career.

Being solicitous as I am for his making a reasonable success in public life, I do not like to see him make initial mistakes. As age is reckoned in politics, my hon. friend is young—not too young. I consider it an advantage in a public man, in no matter what position, or how high that position may be, to be comparatively young because young men profit by their mistakes and old men never do. My hon. friend will recall the criticism which was passed upon the right hon. Mr. Gladstone, I think by Lord Salisbury. Lord Salisbury said that Mr. Gladstone was an old man in a hurry. There is some excuse for an old man being in a hurry because he is near the end of his years politically and physically, but there is not the same excuse for a young man being in a hurry, and that brings me to the amendment which has been moved by the leader of the Opposition, and which seems to me upon the face of it to indicate that my hon. friend is in a hurry. He says he wants an election. He says to the Government, in so many words: You are incompetent; you are disorganized; your mandate has expired; your Prime Minister is sick and absent from his duties; this is not a representative Parliament; I challenge the Government to an election.

That is a bold defy on the face of it. My hon. friend says he is in earnest about it. But when he uses the word "earnest" I think he must use it in the Pickwickian sense. If I believed that my hon. friend was in earnest in moving this amendment, and that he really desired an election, I should be filled with admiration for his temerity because as I estimate public opinion in this country there is nothing in an election for the hon. gentleman or his followers. But the hon. gentleman says he wants an election.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: An hon. gentleman says "hear, hear,"—well, there is a great difference between asking for an election which you know the Government is going to deny you and asking for an election which you are sure to get. There is as much difference as there is between a make-believe lion and a real lion. There is a great deal more danger and risk, Mr. Speaker, in confronting a real lion than there is facing a make-believe lion. And, as a result of this amendment, my hon. friend and his followers in this House get all the exhilaration of courage without any of its attendant risks.

Now that my hon. friend has put forward the amendment, and it has become the subject of debate, I purpose briefly to examine the case for an election at this time. Is there any duty or obligation resting upon the Government to ask for a dissolution of Parliament? What is the position? A little over two years ago there was an election

in Canada and this Government was returned by one of the most decisive and overwhelming majorities in the history of the Dominion. There are three years of the Constitutional term yet unexpired. What has occurred, what is the condition either in this House or in the country, that makes it an obligation upon this Government or upon the Prime Minister to ask His Excellency the Governor General to dissolve this Parliament and appeal to the country?

This Government was elected, constitutionally speaking, in precisely the same manner as any other Government that has ever held power in Canada and no criticism can be directed at the Prime Minister if he continues to carry on, as I think it his bounden duty to carry on, so long as he can control a majority in this House,—and I hope it will be shown decisively to-morrow night when the vote is taken that the Government is able, and will continue to be able, to command a majority of this House. I go farther, Mr. Speaker, and I say that if there were any danger that the vote of this House would bring about a dissolution, I would anticipate that some members of His Majesty's Loyal Opposition would absent themselves in order that it might not occur. That is the difference between a make-believe lion of an amendment calling for a dissolution and a real lion of enforced dissolution.

It has been put forward that the Government has no mandate. I never was one of those who attached much importance to the question of a mandate, nor has much importance been attached to that subject by those who have been in charge of the Governments of this country since Confederation. In every election, or nearly every election, there is a national issue upon which the public pronounce at the polls. Legislation dealing with the subject matter of the issue is usually introduced immediately by the new Government but after such legislation has been dealt with, does any one seriously put forward the contention that, the Government having exhausted its mandate, has again to appeal to the country in order to deal with the problems which arise during the balance of the period for which the Parliament was elected?

In 1878 the issue was the National Policy. Legislation was introduced early in 1879, and carried through Parliament, implementing the policy which had been approved by the people and Sir John A. Macdonald and his Government continued to carry on. He did not consider that because the National Policy question had been dealt with by a revision of the tariff, the mandate of the Government was exhausted and that he must go to the country for a fresh mandate.

In 1896 the two issues before the people were the Manitoba School Question and the Tariff, the first being the more important. Did the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier—after the Manitoba School Question was adjusted and after the Tariff had been revised, as it was by the then Minister of Finance, take the view, or would he have accepted the contention, that his mandate was exhausted, and that he was not to continue during the balance of the term of the Parliament to deal with the national problems as they presented themselves. No, he continued to carry on till 1900. Similarly in the election of 1904 the issue was the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway. But after that was disposed of by the legislation of the first session of the Parliament that was then elected, the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his Government continued to carry on until 1908 as they had a perfect right to do, and more than that, as, in my opinion, it was their bounden duty to do.

One reason for a five year parliamentary term, a fairly lengthy period, is that the country may not continually experience the turmoil of general elections. There is nothing more disturbing to the trade, and industry, and tranquility of the country than general elections at too frequent intervals.

Yet the claim is made by some hon. gentlemen that this Parliament is not representative. I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that never was there in Canada a more representative Parliament than the present one. Was there ever a general election in Canada in which the majorities were larger, or in which public opinion was more unmistakably behind the policies which were placed before the people by the Prime Minister, the members of his Government, and those on this side of the House? So far, therefore, as the constitutional question is concerned we may dismiss it; there is no constitutional question involved. It is the duty of the Prime Minister and his Government to carry on in accordance with their mandate until such time as in the discretion and judgment of the Prime Minister, he feels it proper to advise His Excellency that there should be a dissolution, or, until the Government sustains a defeat in this House.

It has been said that the Franchise Act was not fair legislation. I do not agree with that, but let us give that contention some

weight. Then, remember that supposing that not a single vote of the soldiers overseas had been polled the result would not have been essentially different. The individual majorities were too large to make a difference, they ran into the thousands where in ordinary times they would run into hundreds only. And even if you eliminate every woman's vote the result would have been the same. The fact is that at the last general election public opinion in Canada was overwhelming behind the determination of the Prime Minister, and the members of his Government, and the candidates throughout the country, to command the entire resources of the Dominion and place them behind our military effort overseas.

There never was a more decisive result, and there never was a clearer mandate, and in that connection let me say this: That if any one will take the trouble to read the manifesto of the Prime Minister at the time of that election he will find that the mandate was not only for the war, but it was also to deal with the problems arising out of the war. We have many of those problems with us to-day and we shall have them for years to come. I should consider that the Government had entirely misinterpreted the verdict of the people at the last election if they considered for one moment, and I know they are not, a dissolution and an appeal to the country at this time.

Then the contention is advanced that the Government has been incompetent. Well, if I had not been used to political debates during the past eight years, if I thought that that charge was put forward seriously and not as a mere partisan contention, I would feel like dismissing it with contempt. The old Conservative Government under Sir Robert Borden, the Union Government that succeeded that Government under Sir Robert incompetent! Mr. Speaker, we are too close to this war and its events to realize policies and measures in their true light; but I say that when the history of the war is written and when the bearing of policies and actions are seen in truer proportion than they are to-day, it will be the verdict that no Prime Minister ever deserved more of Canada than did Sir Robert Borden, and that no Government has been more efficient or anything like as efficient, as the Government under him. And, Sir, when I say that I do not except even the Fathers of Confederation.

Why, Mr. Speaker, looking back over the five years and the tempest through which the world has passed and through which we have passed, and considering the mighty effort that we in this country put forth under the direction and supervision and on the initiative of the Government, was there ever a more glorious tradition upon which to found the enduring edifice of a political party than the work of the last five years? Take the old Conservatives, and the Liberals who joined them at the crisis of the war—I do not believe there ever was a group of men who could look back to a greater or nobler tradition of patriotic and efficient service.

I do not intend to speak of the achievements of the Government during the war. That has been most admirably done in this debate by a much more competent and eloquent man than I—I allude to the Acting Prime Minister (Sir George Foster) and I congratulate him upon his occupying that elevated position. The Government in this House is not lacking in able leadership anyway. Why, gentlemen, the Acting Prime Minister was eloquent before some of us could speak at all.

I purpose, Mr. Speaker, to say a word, but only in general terms, with regard to what the Government has accomplished since the Armistice, because the criticism is directed against the Government as it is to-day and not so much against the Government as it was during the war. Well, look back to the Armistice of 1918, and consider the measures that have been taken since to promote prosperity and to stabilize industry,—and consider also the successful loans which have been made. Do you know of any country, Mr. Speaker, that is in better case than Canada to-day? Social unrest, industrial unrest—how do we compare with the other countries of the world; how do we compare with Great Britain, with France,—even with the United States, which, having regard to her population and resources put forth only a tithe of the effort of Canada and where to-day the relations between Capital and Labour, between rich and poor, are such as to cause the gravest apprehension among thinking men of the Republic?

What do we find in Canada? A certain amount of unrest undoubtedly—a considerable part of it psychological. Does anybody suppose that a nation can go through the mighty strain of a war, with all its tragic incidents, bereavements and poignant suffering without a nervous reaction? But take the situation in Canada and contrast it with that which exists in any other belligerant country—I care not which you select—and we have the best position in the world to-day. Mr. Speaker, we all re-

member Bairnsfather's cartoon, and I say that if any one in this House or in this country thinks that he knows of a "a better 'ole" than Canada, why, let him go to it;—he will soon be disillusionized.

Now, is the Government to get no credit for all this? Supposing instead of this situation which I have pictured—and not overstated—supposing that you had commercial depression, unemployment, and civil disorders, what attitude would my good friends opposite be taking with regard to the Government? Why, they would visit all the blame upon the Government, rightly or wrongly; there is no doubt about that. Well, is the Government to get no credit for the opposite condition of things? I say that this Government is "carrying on" most capably at the present time, and I say further that no Government in any self-governing country has a more creditable record than the Government of the Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden, not only during the war but since the Armistice, and down to the present moment.

What weighty question is there, Mr. Speaker, that cannot be dealt with by the Government of to-day and by this House? Are there problems more weighty, more intricate, more difficult of solution, than those which arose during the war? There could not be. There are difficult problems, but they are not as difficult and they are not as many as those which were dealt with successfully during the war. It is said that the Government is disorganized, that some of its members have retired. Well, that is not an extraordinary thing. Mr. Speaker, in how many countries have ministers holding important portfolios retained them through the entire war? How many have broken down with the responsibility—continuous, obsessive, the immense responsibility of war which puts a man always to the test for there is no side-stepping; questions must be faced and dealt with, and there is no relief or relaxation. Survey the Governments of the Overseas Dominions and of Great Britain and of France, and how many ministers do you find in office now who were in office when the war broke out in 1914? I shall not labour the point; the House knows the situation as well as I.

But if the Government is "carrying on" capably to-day, and has carried on capably since the Armistice, and has lost so many members, then, Mr. Speaker, what must we say of the excellence of the Government of the Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden when it could lose so many capable members and still be as efficient as it is to day? You all remember the story of Abraham Lincoln. He had great confidence in General Grant, who was the most successful General of the Northern armies, and who finally brought the Civil War to a conclusion. But General Grant had enemies and they informed the president that General Grant was a heavy drinker. The slow, wise Lincoln said: "What brand of whiskey does he drink; I want it for the rest of my Generals." What brand of men had the Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden during the war if he can afford to lose so many and still put up such a front bench as we see to-day?

Now, Mr. Speaker, in my view the great need in this country to-day, politically speaking, is stability of administration. The people do not want an election. What they want is to be assured that this Administration will carry on the affairs of Government and leave them to give attention to their own private and business affairs. Our people do not want an election that will throw the entire country into turmoil. My hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, says—and I put forward his contention; it is not mine—"Let us have an election." Now, my hon. friend knows perfectly well that neither he nor those who follow him would have any chance whatever on an appeal to the country. He does not want the Government or those on this side of the House to be returned. Then what does he want? He must desire to have introduced the "group" system in this House.

There is always a national objection, and a serious one, to an election held after a great war and while the public mind is disturbed, and I will tell you why. In the first place, a war makes great demands upon classes as such and upon groups as such. You call upon the farmers; you call upon the manufacturers; you call upon labour; you call upon all the classes of the community by name, and it makes them self-conscious. There is a class-consciousness developed in time of war that is not developed in time of peace. More than that, every class and every group has its problems, its difficulties its grievances; and the result is that if you have an election immediately following a war you do not get what you ought to get in a general election—you do not get a verdict upon a question from the national standpoint; you get a verdict from the standpoint of the classes voting in their own interests. Now, that is precisely the thing that is to be avoided. I

cannot imagine anything worse for Canada or for any other country than that groups throughout the country should think in terms of their own group interests and not in terms of the national interest, which should be the supreme interest at all times.

What advantage would a group system be in this House, as compared with the present system? If Government were to be carried on there would have to be continuous coalitions. Even if they did not carry on, you would have further group representation as the result of the next election. In other words, you would have precisely the situation that existed in the old province of Canada, when successive coalitions resulted in so much turmoil that Confederation became absolutely necessary to the life of the country.

No election should be held until the public mind has steadied down; and it is steadying down nicely. One can see a reaction from the extreme views of a year ago. The people of this country are sound in head and at heart. They want to go about their daily avocations. They want security for their persons and their property. They do not care two straws for individual political ambitions; they want stability of Government to enable them to go about their business and work in their own and in the national interest. Why, the result of a series of coalition Governments brought about by a group system of representation in this House would result in chaos in the administraion of the country's affairs. That is the reason why at the last election, as I have pointed out, the Prime Minister's manifesto was not only for the war; if any one will take the trouble to read it he will see that it was also for the period necessary to deal with the problems arising out of the war. The mandate that the Government has from the people, rather than its being exhausted, is unfulfilled. If the Government is to live up to its obligations to the people and to the trust reposed in it at the last election, the Government must, as I know it will, carry on.

Speaking of the reaction that has taken place, the member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) said the other day that what Canada needed was a "National Progressive Party." Well, Mr. Speaker, we have hitherto had two historic parties in this country —I have never found that third parties were long-lived; they are not in keeping with our constitutional system. I say this to the Government and to members on this side of the House: if Sir Robert Borden will form a National Liberal-Conservative Party, consisting of the old Conservative party and the members of the Liberal party who joined him in the great issue which was before us in 1917, and who think alike on national, including fiscal, questions, he will sweep the country.

How long have third parties lasted, in Canada, in the United States, or in any other country? They are creatures only of the moment; they are bound to coalesce in time with one or other of the parties. You cannot work out the British constitution unless you have a bi-party system in which there is continuing responsibility on the part of the two great parties. You may have three parties for a time, but you will not have them permanently. There is this difference between a system of government under two great parties and a system in which there is a third party—and this has been the case in Canada—the two great parties have considered always the national interest as opposed to class or group interest.

Now, I desire to say a word or two with regard to an important and very widespread movement which has attracted a great deal of attention in this country—the "Farmers' Movement," so-called. I desire to refer to it only to the extent of making a complaint—and it is a complaint which might be put forward just as well by hon. gentlemen opposite as by hon. gentlemen on this side. The complaint is that there has been misrepresentation addressed to the farming population of Canada as to the attitude of the two historic parties in this country towards the farmers. I have read literature and I have heard speeches in which it was affirmed that both political parties had betrayed the farmers of Canada. I say that is not true. It is not true of the Liberals; it is not true of the Conservatives? Why should it be true? Putting it on the narrowest possible ground, that of political expediency, why should either Liberals or Conservatives betray the farmers, who comprise over fifty per cent of our population? Putting it on that lowest possible ground, would it be in their interest to do so? On the contrary, no interests have been held in higher regard or importance by both political parties than the interests of the farmers of Canada. This side of the case has never been put before the farmers; we have all been too busy during the war. But I hope that in any political discussions which take place throughout the country that point will be cleared up and the farmers told the true facts. While I say that neither Liberals

nor Conservatives betrayed the farmers, I say also—and so far as this Government is concerned I speak with some knowledge, having been a member of it for eight years—that no Government since Confederation has done so much for the farming community as the Government which has been in power since 1911. I can prove it by figures which I have in my possession, and which I hope the Government will place before the House when the agricultural Estimates are being considered. Before the war, from 1911 to 1914, the old Conservative Government bestowed far greater attention and spent yearly upon agriculture double or treble the amount—as a matter of fact, the figures are between the two—which was spent in the years preceding the time we took office. I go further than that and say that the figures show that since 1911, including the period of the war and not taking into account agricultural credits, more money has been spent for the purpose of promoting and aiding agriculture than was spent by all Governments from the period of Confederation down to 1911.

Have we neglected the farmers? Why should we? Theirs is the basic industry, as has always been recognized on both sides of this House, and parties have actually vied with each other in measures taken to promote and encourage agriculture in this country. It is a slander to say that the farming industry of Canada has been betrayed by either political party.

The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark) said on Friday: I am going to vote for the amendment, as it means a vote of want of confidence in the Government; and I have no confidence in the Government. Well, that is entirely within his rights. He mentioned tariff and he mentioned finance. I shall deal with both of those subjects later on, but I desire to say to him—and I hope he will look the matter up—that the Government which has been in power since 1911 has, even with respect to the tariff—and hon. members know the criticism which has been visited upon us with respect to the tariff—made material and even great reductions in regard to all the implements of agricultural production as compared with what was done by the Government which he supported in 1911. He was loyal to that Government, and none of us find any objection in that; but from the tariff standpoint, he could refrain from voting for any want of confidence motion with regard to them, but with regard to us who have paid more attention to the special part of the tariff in which the West is particularly interested, he votes in favour of a want of confidence motion.

Let us consider the question of credits during the war. How much do you think, Sir, we raised and were glad to raise for the purpose of finding the money with which Great Britain and the Allies could buy the farm products of Canada? $300,000,000 was raised for the purpose of enabling them to buy our cheese, our wheat, our agricultural products of all kinds. Armchair critics like, after the event, to talk about the ease with which we raised money. Those who went through the war, those who bore the burden and heat of the day, who worked by day and who did not always sleep by night—those men know something of the difficulties of financing the war, or, for that matter, of carrying on during the war, the activities of any great department. I have said in this House many times that I stand for the National Policy. As Minister of Finance, subscribing to the National Policy which was adopted in its principles by the Liberal Party when they came into power in 1896, I was able to make these reductions in the tariff, because the National Policy is not a matter of fixed tariff schedules; it is a vital principle adapting itself to the necessities of the nation from
4 p.m. time to time and capable of such modification as is necessary or desirable in the national interest. I am not going to go into the tariff at this time. I hope I shall have an opportunity of speaking upon it in the Budget debate; but I say this—and it should be said all through the Dominion of Canada—you cannot intelligently consider or deal with the tariff of this country unless you have regard to the national interest as well as to the economic interest.

I was sorry when the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) left the Government—he was such a good fellow. I was sorry to see him, like a bull moose, as it were, taking to the tall timber, and I could not help thinking at the time, with a pang almost of sorrow, that the life of a bull moose in a state of nature or in the realm of politics, is almost sure to end in tragedy—I mean, of course, political tragedy in the case of the hon. member. But I was sorry to see him go, because I liked all the members of the Union Government. I never worked with any group of men with greater satisfaction in my life, and I certainly did not like to see any of them, so to speak, get away. I do not, as I have said, purpose discussing the tariff at this

time; but the hon. member for Marquette has touched upon it, and I am somewhat surprised to find that his position has apparently been considerably modified since he made his political tour through Canada. I read some of his speeches, and as I understood him, the tariff was the most iniquitous thing in the world, and he purposed abolishing it root and branch. His policy was thorough. Why, I have read economics, and Adam Smith, John Stuart Mill, and Cobden, were mild in their statements as compared with those which I read in the press as being the opinions of the hon. member for Marquette. Now, he says in this House: No, I do not intend completely to root out the tariff; I do not purpose doing that by "one fell stroke"—that is his expression. He is going to prolong the agony. He did not say that he believed in any gradual decrease in the tariff, but he said that he did not purpose abolishing it all at once. I am sure the House and the country will be thankful for small mercies; and if my hon. friend becomes Prime Minister of this country, I hope he will not, as he says, abolish the tariff all at one fell stroke. I am glad, however, that he has somewhat modified his views, although I should like to know which set of views he really holds. because there does appear to me to be something inconsistent between holding one set of views when speaking to the people of Canada outside this House and another set of views when speaking to the members in this House. Let me say this to my hon. friend: The people of this country will not tolerate any Government with a fiscal policy that regards the tariff only as a means of raising revenue, and disregards the tariff as an instrument, as it has been and will continue to be, for the development of the resources of this country, and the maintenance and stability of our industries in Canada. Let the matter be debated, as I hope it will be debated, before the farmers of this country. I know the farmers of my own province and of my constituency at all events, and I say that the farmers will be the first to subscribe to the doctrine I have enunciated. They have been misled; they have heard only one side of this question, and I shall be greatly disappointed if they do not hear the other side in the course of the next few months. If they do not hear it within the near future, they will hear it at all events on the occasion of the next election. Is the farmer of Ontario going to vote for a policy that will deprive him of his markets immediately at hand in Toronto, and in Hamilton, and in our other great industrial centres which we have built up? Is he by his vote going to deprive himself of those certain markets in favour of the precarious markets of the United States, which can be closed to him at any time by the capricious action of Congress at any of its sessions? Why, Mr. Speaker, it was for the farmer—and I remember it distinctly, although I was but a boy at the time—it was for the farmer as well as for the manufacturer that the National Policy of Canada was established, and the principle was recognized and acted upon by the Liberals when they came into power in 1896. I know it, because I supported the Liberals at that time.

[Sir Thomas White.]

Let me ask my hon. friend from Marquette this question: Does he think that the workmen of this country by their votes are going to deprive themselves of employment and expatriate themselves and their families? If we come to any such conclusion as that, I think we are putting a low estimate upon the intelligence of the industrial classes of this country. There may be a few exceptions, but I see no reason why the principle I have mentioned cannot be maintained in our tariff, and that tariff be made acceptable to almost all hon. gentlemen on this side of the House.

Now I come to my hon. friend the member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) for whom I have always had, as he knows, a warm spot in my Irish heart, although he made a rather violent attack upon me the other day. Well, I have been so long in public life, and have been a member of the Government here when we had real politics and good old-time partisan fighting that I do not mind that a bit; but I want to set him right, and I hope he will permit me to take up the arguments which he put forward and which are entitled to weight, and to the respect of all in this House, and then to put the other side before the House and the country for their consideration, for there is always the other side. My hon. friend made one sweeping statement. He said to my friend the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton): "Let me give you some advice. Do just the opposite to what your predecessor did, and you will come along all right." Whether the Minister of Finance will take that advice or not, I do not know. He is an intelligent man, and no doubt he will think over it and appraise it at its true value. My hon. friend from Red Deer in that one sentence arraigned my entire financial administra-

tion. Mr. Speaker, I believe the financial administration of the Dominion of Canada during the war and that administration was not singular or unique among the activities of the Government, for all my colleagues did admirable work—was such, and the condition in which Canada found itself at the end of the war has been such as to stir the admiration of Great Britain and the United States and prove acceptable to the great majority of the people of this country. So if the Minister of Finance takes the advice of my hon. friend, he may run the risk of incurring the opposite of the admiration of which I have spoken. The hon. member for Red Deer says: The ex-Minister of Finance did not take my advice. So far as I know, the members of no Government, Liberal or Conservative, have taken his advice. He was giving advice to the Liberal Government prior to 1911, but they never acted upon it. He was putting forward precisely the same arguments then, and he was not voting want of confidence in that Administration as he is to-day in this Government.

My hon. friend's criticism of my Administration runs along three main lines. First, he said, your financial policy was unsound. Well, I believe in a verdict founded on results, and I purpose briefly to take up with the House the question of the aims of Canadian finance during the war, and to consider how successful or unsuccessful we were. I shall deal with the subject only in a general way. We had to find money for the conduct of the war, and our finance was so directed that we also found the money which furnished the necessary credits for the purchase in this country of our agricultural and manufactured products. In other words, the finance of this country was absolutely basic to its prosperity during the war. Without successful finance we could not have maintained our men overseas; we could not have the country in that condition of prosperity which was essential if our war effort was to be adequately supported at home, and which would leave Canada in a position to meet whatever vicissitudes in the way of depression that might come in the aftermath of the war.

One policy which I endeavoured to follow during the war was to maintain confidence. Were there any panics in Canada during the war? As a result of the action which we took from the first day of the war there was supreme confidence as to our financial institutions, and as the war went on and our business increased and prosperity came to the people, the results of our war finance were apparent, and there never was a time during the entire war when there was the slightest sign of lack of confidence in this country, financially speaking.

We appealed to the people, to the farmers, to produce all they could; we appealed to manufacturers to produce all they could and we appealed to those who made munitions to produce all they could. It was all for the purpose of the war. But some one says to me: "Why did you not take away all the money that the farmers made, all the money that the manufacturers made and all the money that the munition manufacturers made?" We had a voluntary system up to 1917. Supposing we had appealed to the farmers to produce all they could for the armies overseas and the civilian population behind them, supposing we had asked the manufacturers to produce all they could and had asked the munition manufacturers to turn out all the munitions they could and, at the same time, suppose we had told them that we were going to take away all their profits? They are a pretty patriotic lot of men. I ask this House—you are all sensible business men—would you have got the same production in the country and in the factory that you did get? You would not.

Further than that if you took away all the money that the producing classes had made, or the greater part of it, what position would those classes be in should there come the depression which always follows war? It was part of my policy as Finance Minister to so supervise the business of this country and to adopt such measures that the prosperity of the country would be maintained during the war and that our farmers and our other producers should be left in a position in which they could face whatever depression might confront them in the period succeeding the war.

Does anybody mean to tell me that the soldiers would be any better off, or the industrial population of Canada any better off, if the employers of labour throughout the country had been stripped of their resources and were unable to take risks at this time when men have to take risks in view of the keen competition which must be experienced once the war is at an end? We maintained confidence and we promoted the prosperity of the country. We desired, as I said in a dozen speeches, to have the business of the agricultural, industrial and commercial community in such a position that they could meet a

period of depression if it should come,—and periods of depression always come after war, not immediately, but some time after. Would the situation be any better to-day if the farmers of Canada had not paid off so many mortgages, or if they had all their old mortgages and were putting on more?

There are many questions in war finance that do not appear on the surface. What was Pitt's war finance? Pitt's war finance was to support the war and promote prosperity at home. A monument was erected to him by the merchants of London because he did it. I am quite content to be charged with having so promoted the finances of this country as to maintain stability and confidence, to leave our financial institutions sound and our business industries and agricultural interests in such a condition that they can face whatever the future has to offer.

My hon. friend says: "You made loans in New York." Of course I made loans in New York. What was the effect of making loans in New York? In the first place, my hon. friend is entirely wrong in his statement—at least in the spirit of his statement—that it increased the industrial activity of the United States, that we imported in goods what we borrowed there. Practically that is the case but all the loans which we made in New York were only a fraction of our imports of necessities from the United States. Where does my hon. friend think the proceeds of the New York loans went in so far as we are concerned? I will tell him. The proceeds of these New York loans went, among other things, to assist the British Government to buy goods in Canada. If we had not been able to finance in the United States, if we had not had this alternative market until the United States entered the war, we should not have been able to have provided credits to the extent which we did for the sale of Canada's produce and manufactured goods.

Not only this, but these New York loans stabilized finance as between the two countries. If it were practicable for the Minister of Finance to-day to make a loan in New York, what would be the effect on the exchange situation? We pegged exchange during the war. The Minister of Finance cannot do that to-day. He is at a disadvantage. But we pegged exchange in New York during the war at a point and a half or two points. Yet my hon. friend blames me for having made loans in New York. What has he to say of Great Britain whom he admires so greatly and justly? Did they make any loans in New York? They sent $1,300,000,000 of gold through my office, the greatest transaction in gold in the history of the world, to New York. They sold $3,000,000,000 worth of securities in New York and they made loan after loan amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars secured by collateral which they gathered up in London and which was acceptable to American investors. They poured out their treasure in New York for the supreme purpose of winning the war by levying upon the material resources of the United States. Up to the time the United States entered the war the British Government used hundreds of millions of dollars of the money I have spoken of, raised by loan or sale in New York, and spent it in this country for our products.

Then, take it from the exchange standpoint. I have said to the House that our financing in New York stabilized our exchange. It was a good thing to do. We did not permit extravagance at that time because we had an embargo against luxuries, because we had a food controller, and because the people of this country were denying themselves in order that more food might go overseas. It was not a period in which we had great importations of luxuries as compared with the present time; the loans were sound if for no other purpose than to stabilize exchange. Does my hon. friend controvert that? Then let me tell him what Great Britain did, because I worked in the closest harmony and co-operation with the Mother Country during the war. In one year, 1916, the year before the United States entered the war, Great Britain used one thousand million dollars of American exchange to peg sterling exchange and keep it up. If Great Britain had not supported sterling exchange where would it have been during the war? It would have been lower than it is to-day My hon. friend is on bad ground when he talks about our borrowing in New York. My hon. friend says: Your currency is inflated. It is less inflated than the currency of any country in the world; less inflated than that of the United States now—which, as I stated, if regard be had to her population and resources, did not put a tenth of Canada's effort into the war—she had not the opportunity, she was not in long enough. Will my hon. friend look at our gold reserves. Let him look at the gold reserve of the Federal Reserve Bank; let him look at the gold reserve of the Bank of England

—there is not much to look at—and then criticize the Government of Canada for inflating the currency. We have got one of the best currency situations in the world to-day, and there is not a financial man in Canada, in the United States, or in England that does not know it.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Can the hon. gentleman give the House any idea of what the percentage increase of our currency is over what it was the year before the war?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I cannot offhand but the Minister of Finance can give that information without any difficulty. I placed it on Hansard last year in my Budget speech.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Surely my hon. friend has some idea of that most elementary question in his own department.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend will get the details in due course but the statement that I have made is correct. My recollection is that it was forty per cent of the gold reserve in Canada.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: My question is: What was the percentage of the increase of the currency of Canada over what it was the year before the war?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It does not compare with the circulation of either the British Government or the Bank of England. My hon. friend should look up the facts when he speaks upon this question.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I am looking.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Now my hon. friend (Mr. Clark) also touched upon the tariff. I am not sure whether it was he, or the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) who referred to the fact which has been put forward on more than one occasion to the farmers of this country, that on account of our policy the farmers have moved from Canada. I ask the hon. gentleman where are the farmers who would have been in Canada but for our policy? I ask the hon. gentleman did those who left the farms of Canada to go to the United States engage in agriculture, and if so how many of them? You will find the cities over there full of Canadians who went seeking industrial, commercial and financial opportunities, where they have done exceptionally well; but it seems to me it would be a wise policy on the part of this country to bring about such a development of the industries and the commerce and finances of Canada, as to keep those men at home in the work in which they desire to engage. Because men have varied talents. How many men in this country are farmers? A large percentage, it is true. But farmers' sons have various talents. One is a skilled mechanic, another will make a soldier, another a professional man, and so on. How are you going to prevent the farmers of this country from giving their sons that opportunity if they so desire? All that is involved in this question.

Now my hon. friend says: Oh, but your domestic loans. He shakes his head over our domestic loans and says there is plenty of money in the country. So there is. But does the hon. gentleman think that the loan which was floated last Fall could have been floated in 1914? Will he look at the bank credits of Canada now and compare them with the situation before the war, and will he tell me we could have floated a Victory Loan in 1914? No, we could not; the money was not in the country. What was the result of the floating of our Victory Loans, broadly speaking? Every loan a success. But for that our banks would have had to take the securities as they did in New York. That is one of the difficulties down there at the present time. Those banks had to take too many of the securities because the interest rate was too low. Three thousand million dollars the financial institutions in New York took that they did not want. It is the function of a bank not to buy securities but to loan on securities. We finished the war with a perfectly clean financial situation. None of the banks owned bonds that they did not desire to own and the amount owned was very small. It was a perfectly healthy situation because our loans had been distributed all over Canada among probably two or three millions of people. They are the bond holders of Canada; they have got that stake as well as other stakes in the community. What about our securities, and from a market standpoint? No country in the world—including Great Britain that my hon. friend so properly holds up as an example—where the Victory Loan securities stood at par, or above, at the end of the war except Canada—not one. In the United States, 90-92. How did the bond owners feel all over the country? I would like to have all the bond holders of Canada here that took Victory Loans but you could not gather them in Ottawa, the place is too small—one million and a half and two millions of them. Yet my hon. friend gets up and contends we should have put the loans out at such a figure they would be down to 90

now, instead of par where my tax-free bonds are. That is not good politics even. The public in this country that have bought Government bonds like to see those bonds stand up in the market. Because they need money from time to time they want to realize, and they do not want to realize at a loss. Take the insurance companies that represent the interest not only of stockholders but policy holders. Supposing in the United States they wrote down their securities to the market value? In this country they can show them the market value and there is no loss to policy holders of insurance companies who took tens of millions of dollars of our securities. At the close of the war Canada was in a position to say: The public of this country subscribed enough money to send 500,000 soldiers overseas and to fight thousands of miles from their base; to provide the necessary credits for the purchase of our agricultural and other products; and at the end of the war our banks had no securities, had made loans upon securities to only a limited amount, and our securities stood above par on our stock exchange. I will rest my reputation upon that statement before this House and before posterity.

Why, Mr. Speaker, we appealed to the public to save. By a publicity campaign, by direct personal appeal, by every proper method we asked our people, rich and poor, to save their money and give it to the Government in return for our securities; we took possession of the securities marketed in Canada and would not allow issues to be made except for essential purposes; we shut luxuries out of Canada by Order in Council; through our bond houses and our banks we discouraged the purchase of Anglo-French and other securities in New York in order that all the money of Canada might be available for the purposes of our loan; and we appealed through our Victory Loan organization— the greatest organization ever put together by any country during the war —from the Atlantic to the Pacific for subscriptions to our loan. No Minister of Finance ever had such an instrument as that Victory Loan organization, which, with the patriotism of our people, made those great loans a success.

Now, my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) says, "You made the bonds tax-free." Unhappily for him he has taken a particularly unfortunate time to put that argument forward. It would have seemed more weighty last year than this. Last Fall we put out a taxable loan, whereas before our loans had been tax-free. The responsibility for that is upon the Government, and the credit, if any, for it, is due to the Government. In July of last year, before leaving office, I called together the leading members of the Victory Loan organization and the best bond experts in Canada and asked them to determine, among other things, whether we should put out a taxable or a tax-free loan, telling them that if it could be done, I would prefer the taxable issue. The situation had cleared a great deal since the war, our securities were all selling on a better basis, and we came to the conclusion that we should try the taxable issue. There was some dissent on the part of a few of the ablest bond experts. They said, "You will get the loan out, but we are a little doubtful as to whether you can hold it out, because it is a little out of scale with the price of securities to-day, and those which we expect will prevail." My successor, Sir Henry Drayton, who threw himself with great energy and enthusiasm and ability into the campaign, was able, I am glad to say, to make a great success of that Victory Loan. To-day the securities of the taxable loan are 96 and 97; the securities of the tax-free loan are at or slightly above par. In other words, the advantage of the tax-free privilege is a real market factor, which brings about a constant buying power in the country, which in turn tends to keep your market right.

Now, I say further to the hon. member for Red Deer that on his assumption—in which I do not agree, and I will state the reason later—that on his assumption if we had put out all the loans—$2,000,000,000 of securities—on a taxable basis, instead as we did most of them on a tax-free basis, all the Victory Loan securities to-day would be at 90 or lower, for there is no market situation to sustain them. What has happened the last few months is this, and it throws a little light on the question of exchange—which I am coming to a little later—spoken of by the hon. member for Red Deer in terms rather derogatory to myself: Our exchange has gone down compared with the United States'; but Great Britain's exchange is lower. Unless my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) had taken the steps which he recently took, Great Britain would sell back to us or would offer in our markets the securities of our municipalities,—of our provinces, the securities guaranteed by the Dominion and by the provinces that we sold to her years ago and which have been years overseas—she would have sold and continued to sell those here until our exchange

dropped to the level of sterling exchange; that is what would have happened.

I told my hon. friend what would have happened on his theory that we put out 5½% taxable bonds during the war. Now I will tell him that we could not have done it even if we desired to do so. There are two essentials, Mr. Speaker, which a Finance Minister must consider when he is putting out a loan, and he makes a great mistake if he overlooks either. In the first place, he must get his money—the offering must be a success; and, in the second place, he must consider the market situation after the loan, especially if he is going back for another loan. You have got to look a little further than the end of your nose in public finance where you are offering large loans which, to a certain extent, are taken on the inspiration of patriotism. I might at the start have put out a 5½% Victory Loan taxable, and the public would have taken, not as much as I got, but a very substantial amount,—although I know we could not have got anything like the amount we did get because those skilled in investments could have bought scores of securities of the highest quality in New York to yield as high as 7, 8 and 9%, among others the Anglo-French loan backed by the credit of Great Britain and France.

Supposing I had put the first loan out taxable at 5½%, the trouble is it would not stay out, it would keep coming back, and if I desired to stabilize the market I should have had to pay out tens of millions of dollars to keep that loan up, so that when I went back to the public my loans would get the reception which our subsequent loans were accorded, because my loans were as a matter of fact stabilized. I say to my hon. friend from Red Deer, and that there is not a financial man in this country of high standing who will contradict me, that if we had put out taxable loans during the war we would have finished the war on a 6½ instead of a 5½% basis. What would have been the result? My successor would have his interest charges increased in respect to the debt of from $10,000,000 to $15,000,000, and he would not have got one fraction of that amount back from the comparatively few people in the country who derive a substantial advantage from purchasing the tax-free bonds. My hon. friend might say, "Well, I would rather that the Dominion Government should have to pay $10,000,000 or $15,000,000 more annually rather than A, B and C, wealthy men, should be able to buy tax-free bonds and not pay the full amount of taxation called for by the legislation of this Parliament." Well, I would not. You have got to look at this thing as a whole. Any Finance Minister looks at his balance sheet, he wants to get his best result there; and that is what we got.

It is often put forward that a man with an income of say, $11,000 derived from $200,000 of tax-free bonds, does not pay any income tax. Neither does he. But what could he do? He could do what men are doing to-day, buy municipal and provincial and Dominion guaranteed 6½ and 7% securities, and pay his tax and still have more than $11,000 income. I admit that when the income derived is above $25,000, $30,000 or $40,000 a year there is a considerable advantage to those who buy tax-free bonds. But that advantage is negligible as compared with the saving of from $10,000,000 to $15,000,000 a year which I contend has been effected in the balance sheet of this Dominion by reason of our having floated loans at 5½ instead of 6½ per cent.

My hon. friend says that the lowering of the credit of Canada is due to faulty administration of finances. Now, that is a very sweeping statement. Is the lowering of the pound sterling due to faulty action of the British Treasury? What is the world situation in exchange to-day, brought about by the war? The Italian lira, corresponding with the French franc, at 6 cents; the French franc at eight cents; the German mark at one cent; the pound sterling was as low as 3.30 as compared with $4.86⅔, the par of exchange. One third of the pound sterling wiped off—the pound sterling, to which before the war all the currencies of the world touched their hats. Is the British Treasury to blame because its exchange is at a discount with that of the United States? My hon. friend failed to observe that the British pound is at a discount with the Canadian dollar. The Canadian dollar is down 15 per cent; the pound sterling is down 30 per cent. My hon. friend says that it is the free trade policy of England that has brought about the exchange situation which confronts her to-day.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): My hon. friend cannot produce an extract from my speech showing that I said that. I did not make any such remark.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Well, I accept my hon. friend's correction. That, undoubtedly, was the impression he gave. He did say that the lowering of our credit—I think I am quoting his precise words—is due to

faulty action of the Finance Department. Why is not the lowering of the British exchange to a greater degree due to faulty action of the free trade Government of England? Now, let me say this for my hon. friend's comfort—

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Is that a question?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: No, it is a rhetorical question? Let me say this for his comfort; free trade has nothing whatever to do with it, one way or the other. It is the war that has brought about a lowering in the value of the British pound sterling, just as it has brought about a fall in the Canadian exchange. If we had free trade here to-day it could not improve our exchange situation; it could only aggregate it. Would our exchange be any better than it is to-day if there were no tariff in this country; if goods were coming in from the United States under a free trade policy?

An hon. MEMBER: No.

An hon. MEMBER: Worse.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Worse,—I should say it would be worse. Economic laws show clearly that it would be worse, because on top of our tariff with United States you have another tariff of 17 per cent by the reason of the fall in our exchange. This discussion of the respective merits of tax-free and taxable bonds is not new. In fact, there is hardly anything new in the world. If my hon. friend will look up the Democratic platform laid down in the Civil War he will find a plank against tax free bonds. The Republicans adopted tax-free bonds, because they carried on the war; they were the people who had to face the financial situation and get the money. The Democrats could criticise; they did not have to act; and they put a plank in their platform after the war condemning the Republican party. History simply repeats itself. Why, Mr. Speaker, when war breaks out and nobody knows whether it will last one year, or two years, five years or ten years, or whether the country is going to come through bankrupt, or what the taxation is going to be, is it not advisable that there should be some certainty in the amount which a man may rely upon getting for his money, at a time when he can otherwise obtain the highest possible rates for it? The Republicans were confronted with that condition in the Civil War, and we were confronted with it here.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to offer the Government any advice. I have worked with them; I know their zeal; I know their ability. I have entire confidence in them to meet any problem that is likely to arise during the further term of this Parliament. I believe it is the settled opinion of this country that the Government should carry on.

The Prime Minister is ill. I have been pleased with the remarks of hon. gentlemen opposite with regard to the Prime Minister; there is always a chivalry in this House for men under disability. Nobody knows the extent of the work carried on and the burden of the responsibility borne by Sir Robert Borden during the war and in the period since the war. Nobody knows the weight carried by the ministers. After all, men are only flesh and blood, not steel and iron. Sir Robert Borden is not the first Prime Minister of Canada who has been ill. Sir John A. Macdonald was seriously ill on various occasions. Sir Wilfrid Laurier was seriously ill in 1900. He told me about it once; so serious was his illness that it was looked upon as remarkable that he recovered. Prime Ministers are like other men, subject to human infirmity. The Prime Minister should have all the time he desires in which to recover his health. The Government is in good hands; at its head is one of the ablest parliamentarians in this House, if not the ablest. Carry on—that is what the people of Canada desire this Government to do—carry on, always dealing with questions from the standpoint of the national interest as opposed to the sectional interest. Unless I am much mistaken, the public will make short work at the next election of extremists of this kind. I have every confidence in the ability of the Government to deal with the weighty problems that may come before it,—the problem of promoting immigration; the problem of maintaining our trade and industry; the problem of dealing with soldiers' pensions and the Civil Re-establishment and rehabilitation of the soldier; the railway problem.

An election at this time? The leader of the Opposition surely would not want an election unless he had some hope of coming back as leader of the House and of the Government. We have taken over one of the greatest railway systems in the world, if not the greatest. The Government and those on this side of the House have committed themselves to the largest project of public ownership that has ever been attempted. What is the problem? The problem is to organize and administer that system and its finances through competent men, who will not be influenced by nor ex-

posed to partisan interference, so as to get the best results for Canada out of that great railway system. Who is most likely to do that well—the Government that risked its political life on the great experiment, or hon. gentlemen opposite? I must say that if Liberalism be a vital principle, as is so often put forward in this House, I am amazed that when it comes to concrete cases, such as taking over those railways, it does not exhibit something of that principle. This Government, the people of Canada will believe, can take over those railways and provide for their operation much more capably than hon. gentlemen opposite who do not believe in nationalization at all. There is no doubt about that. A great deal can be done in developing all our national resources, such as our fuel resources and our power resources, through the development of our canals. These are great and weighty problems, but not beyond the capabilities of this Government as it exists to-day. I say to the Government: Continue, as I know you have been doing, look at every question from the national standpoint; rely upon the excellence of your administration, and carry on.

Mr. ARTHUR BLISS COPP (Westmorland): Mr. Speaker, I am sure we are all gratified again to hear the voice of the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) who has entertained the House this afternoon with a very long and interesting discourse. It must also be gratifying to hon. members, at least on this side of the House, when they see the hon. gentleman in his place, because it apparently is only when the Government feel themselves in somewhat of a tight corner that the hon. gentleman is hurried down from Toronto to take part in the debate and to whip his followers into line. It must also be gratifying to hon. members on this side when we realize that the amendment moved by my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie King) is having its weight in the country and in this House, seeing that the services of the hon. gentleman (Sir Thomas White) are required for this particular occasion. This is not the first occasion, I would remind my hon. friend, that he has been brought from his home hurriedly to take part in the discussions in this House. I think it was last session, when the Grand Trunk railway question was before Parliament and when the newspapers from one end of Canada to the other were denouncing the Government for attempting to commit the country to taking over and operating the Grand Trunk railway, that my hon. friend was brought down from Toronto in a great hurry, and he told this House and the country that, because of the prosperity of the Dominion of Canada, we were perfectly able to assume the vast obligations necessary to finance this road; that we could do that without at all injuring the credit of the Dominion. To assume an obligation of some seven or eight hundred million dollars was a mere bagatelle in the mind of my hon. friend, and he so impressed his views upon his supporters that they voted almost as a unit to take over the Grand Trunk railway system, and the Bill was carried through this Parliament. Nor was this the only time that my hon. friend was brought hurriedly to Ottawa to give some information to this Parliament. In the same session and only a few days afterwards, we were discussing the question of giving aid to the returned soldiers. My hon. friend's influence was again sought by his party and he was again brought from Toronto, and he told us that it would be practically impossible to give aid to the returned soldiers and their dependents because it would bankrupt the country. Now for the third time, we have my hon. friend here telling this House what we should do in regard to different matters coming before Parliament. We are glad to have him with us, and I congratulate my hon. friend that he thinks he is still winning the war.

He made some objections to the acceptance of the amendment moved by my hon. friend, an amendment which, he says, means an election in this country. That is exactly what it means. He throws the challenge across the floor of this House to hon. members on this side, that we are not in earnest. Let me tell my hon. friend, that hon. members on this side are absolutely in earnest in their request for an election in this country. We believe that the people are demanding an election; we believe that they are entitled to an election. It does not matter to me what the result of the election may be; the people have a right to say who shall be their representative in the future and whether or not this present aggregation shall carry on as a Government. If my hon. friend thinks that we are not in earnest, instead of expecting us to absent ourselves from this House on this vote, let him and some of his followers absent themselves, and instead of cracking the party whip, let them say to their supporters: Vote the way you please on this question and we shall be satisfied. Then we would find out whether or not the

5 p.m.

people wanted an election and wanted to keep this Government in office. Another excuse which he gives for not having an election is that Union Government will be returned to power. That, however, is the very best reason, speaking from his viewpoint, for having an election. As a third reason, he says that group systems are dangerous, and he criticizes the farmers of this country because they assumed the responsibility of taking some part in political warfare. For myself, I congratulate the National Progressive party, if that is the proper name, as given by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark), for taking the stand they have. I congratulate them for coming around to my view, because I have followed that policy for the past fifteen years. I sincerely believe that the interest taken by our farmers in the government of Canada will have a splendid influence upon our politics. I believe they are taking a step in the right direction in taking part in the political life of Canada and that they will make their influence felt to the benefit of this country. My hon. friend says that Union Government would sweep the country. I do not know where he gets any evidence of that. What about the recent by-elections? Has he sufficient evidence from those by-elections that the people of Canada are straining eagerly at the leash to vote for Union Government? That is not the conclusion I draw from the result of the by-elections that have already been held.

My hon. friend also spoke of the leader of the Opposition as being somewhat young in the game and of rushing matters too much. I do not know if advice in that regard comes with very good grace from the ex-Minister of Finance. He pretends to have a great deal of confidence in this Government and tells them to carry on, but he also told us that he had intended to resign his seat in this House, and was very glad he had kept so that he could support the Government on this occasion. If the Union Government had a mandate from the people and it was their duty still to carry on, surely it was the duty of the ex-Minister of Finance to stay at the head of his department and assist the Government to carry on, but soon after the resignation of the ex-Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Crerar), he left the Government to drift along as best they could. Now he tells them it is their duty to carry on. The hon. gentleman himself was in somewhat of a hurry to get away from the sinking ship and plant his feet upon solid ground. My hon. friend's political career has taken a somewhat zigzag course. It has not always been as straight and circumspect as that of the right hon. gentleman who leads this House. He tells us himself that in 1896 he supported the Liberal party, and he continued to support it, I am told, until 1911. He now holds up his hands in holy horror and says: We must not have a group system of Government, we must not have our farmer friends coming here and having a say as to the policies of this country. Why not? Who is more responsible for the Farmers' Movement in Canada than the ex-Minister of Finance himself? In 1911 the Liberal party led by the late lamented Sir Wilfrid Laurier entered into an agreement with the United States for reciprocity, and who were the men who helped defeat reciprocity when it was submitted to the country? The Noble Eighteen, of whom my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance was one. He withdrew his support from the Liberal party, and along with his capitalistic and manufacturing friends helped to defeat the reciprocity agreement which was entered into by the Liberal Government for the purpose of assisting the agriculturists of this country. Now my hon. friend complains because the agriculturists are organizing and demanding something from this Government. I say that the ex-Minister of Finance is one of the few who are responsible for forcing this movement upon the country. The result is that we have now in this House a third party. I am satisfied that they will give a very good account of themselves and take a great part in our future political history.

I do not propose to follow the ex-Minister of Finance in all his meanderings on the tariff, the conduct of the war, the exchange situation, and the other matters he discussed. I am absolutely in accord with the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) in moving his resolution that the time has arrived when this Government should submit themselves to the people at a general election. You might ask, why should there be a general election? The ex-Minister of Finance says that there should not be one now, that the Government has a mandate from the people to carry on. I contend that the Union Government, as formed in 1917, had a mandate from the people to carry on during the war, and possibly for a short period thereafter until demobilization was completed. That time has expired, and what better evidence of the fact do we want than to see one member of the Government after another resigning and giving as their reason that their contract

had expired. The ex-Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Crerar) joined the Union Government for a certain purpose, and gave it his support for a certain length of time because he thought that was his patriotic duty, but he resigned last year and gave as his reason that his contract had expired. Shortly afterwards the ex-Minister of Finance resigned from the Government, and so did the ex-Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell), now Chairman of the Railway Commission, and who also gave as his reason that his contract had expired. His resignation was followed by that of the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Mewburn), and only a few days ago by the resignation from the Cabinet of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean). And thus it goes on. Will any one say after all these important and influential members of the Cabinet have withdrawn their support from the Government, that we have a full representative and constitutional government in this country?

I want to say on behalf of the province from which I come, that it is the first time in the history of Canada that New Brunswick has not had a representative in the Federal Cabinet. What do we find as a result of this non-representation? Neglect along every line. The transportation question, for instance, is being neglected by this Government. The great national port of St. John is being neglected because New Brunswick has no representative in the Cabinet. There is not a man in the Cabinet who takes the least interest in Maritime Province matters, and who will speak for New Brunswick when questions affecting it are under consideration. We should have a representative in the Cabinet. That the Government realizes this is proven beyond peradventure because they have been flirting with two or three different names in the province for the last five or six months. One day the newspapers heralded all over the country that the hon. J. D. Hazen, ex-Minister of Marine and Fisheries, was to come back to assume office. Another time a different name was mentioned, and later on a different name still. The Government has not yet succeeded in getting into the Cabinet a representative from the province of New Brunswick, because they are not prepared to risk the chances of an election. I believe that it was practically all arranged that we should have a representative in the Cabinet from New Brunswick just about the time the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell) was contesting the by-election in that county, but after the Government's candidate lost his deposit, although he had three Cabinet ministers helping him in his campaign, the gentleman the Government had in mind who was to be provided with a seat in the county of York began to think: I had better leave well enough alone; what I have I will hold, and forget about this Cabinet position. That is the reason the gentleman whose name was mentioned at that time is not now sitting in the Cabinet.

Much has been said in this debate about lowering the tariff and about free trade. In theory we are all practically free traders but it is a question as to what would happen if we should have free trade. I am not an expert on this question. I was brought up to be pretty free-minded and to believe that as free an interchange of trade between nations as possible would be a good thing for everybody. That is naturally the view I take and I think that practically everybody realizes its soundness.

When my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) was speaking the other day, some one threw the question across the House: "Where would you get your revenue?" The question, "where would you get your revenue" is not what is bothering the hon. gentleman who asked it: What is bothering him is: "Where am I going to get my excessive profits if we have a lower tariff?" That was the question that was in his mind; it was not the question of revenue. He realized that if we had a lower tariff he would not make the excessive profits as a manufacturer that he now makes. That is the question that is uppermost in the minds of all those gentlemen who are opposed to a lower tariff.

I would be the last one to attempt to in any way interfere with the manufacturing interests of our country but I have yet to be convinced that if our tariff walls were lowered to a certain degree, so as to give a certain advantage to our farmers who are using agricultural implements, it would not be very greatly to the disadvantage of this country. The ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) a few minutes ago asked: "What would the working men do; would they vote to do away with the manufacturers of this country?" No, decidedly not. The question only shows that the hon. gentleman is trying to draw a red herring across the track. If the tariff wall were taken down absolutely in regard to certain articles that are manufactured in this country as well as in the United States, it would not close down our factories. The manu-

facturers would not be obliged to close up their shops. There is no danger of it. The workingmen will do the work just the same but the manufacturer will not make as much money. The work will go on. Why cannot the manufacturers of this country compete with the manufacturers of the United States and other countries in this market as well as they can in a foreign market? Go to Australia, or go to England, and you will find our manufactured goods there being sold as cheaply as the manufactured goods from the United States. If they can compete in foreign markets they can compete in the home market, and we should have the advantage of the lower tariff. The people should be given the opportunity of cheaper machinery and, indirectly, as you go down the line, there should be cheaper production and a lessened cost of living.

The speech from the Throne contains twelve paragraphs, ten of which constitute a sort of pleasant essay telling us what the Government have been doing during the past year. They tell us that they have been looking after the soldiers' re-establishment and demobilization, and that they have been doing wonderful things along that line. I would rather have the evidence of the demobilized soldier himself as to what the Government have been doing for our returned soldiers. The next two paragraphs give the whole bill of fare which the Government proposes to place before Parliament at the present session. One paragraph says:

> Bill to provide for a Dominion Franchise will be introduced, dealing with the qualifications of voters and the procedure necessary to enable all persons legally qualified to register their votes.

We require a franchise Act if we are to have an election. It is to be hoped that we are to have an election some day unless some means are devised of perpetually continuing this Government in power. If an election does come we must have a franchise Act and the voters must be enrolled so that they can poll their votes. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) referred to this matter the other day. I want to say that I sincerely trust that the Government will realize that there is only one way to frame a franchise Act and that is to draft an honest and just law under which the people will be in a position to independently cast their ballots and that all the people who have taken part in the politics of this country for many years will have the same opportunity of voting whenever the election may be brought about. I am not going to discuss that in detail or what may happen when the Bill is introduced into the House. We will have another opportunity of dealing with the question and I sincerely trust we will be able to get on common ground and have a Bill that will be satisfactory to the House and the country. Another paragraph of the speech from the Throne says:

> Other Bills will be presented for your consideration including a Bill respecting Copyrights and Bills providing for the amendment of the Patent Act, of the Loan and Trust Companies Acts, the Indian Act, and the Exchequer Courts Act.

That is the bill of fare that has been laid down by the Government for the present session. It seems to me that some information might have been given to the men and women of this country who are looking for some relief from the burden imposed upon them by the high cost of living.

We have had a Board of Commerce working for some months but it has been disorganized. As far as I have been able to see there has been nothing done. Nothing has been attempted by this Board of Commerce, representing the Government, or by the Government itself, or by any member of the Government, to contribute in the slightest degree to a reduction of the high cost of living. For a time they forced the newsprint manufacturers to supply the newspapers but I see that they even withdrew from that the other day on the ground that they had no authority to deal with the matter. I do not know why they should have any more right to control the price of newsprint than they have to control the price of any other article or commodity that the people use, but if they have they have not attempted to exercise that power. We find day after day the cost of living climbing higher and not the slightest effort being made by the Government in any way, shape or form to keep the necessaries of life from mounting beyond the reach of a very large number of our people.

The amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition will, I will say, have my hearty support because I believe he is taking the right course in submitting that proposition to the House. In my opinion it is the duty of the Opposition to bring before Parliament, and through it before the country, the views they have on the public questions of the day. I believe, and such is the view of hon. gentlemen generally on this side, that the time is opportune for an election in Canada. Hon. gentlemen opposite say: Oh, but you will not have any chance of being returned. That is not the question at all. Regardless of

what party will be returned, the Canadian people have the right to express their opinion on the policy of the Government and they have not had such an opportunity since 1911. In that year an election took place on the Reciprocity Agreement, and the Government of the day was defeated. It was succeeded by a new Administration, and in 1917 a general election was brought on when the policy of the present Government was not an issue at all. The questions fought out had reference solely to the conduct by the Government of the war. My hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark) was a supporter, and one of the candidates, of the Union Government in that election, and he has told us that the only question he spoke on during the contest was the conduct of the Union Government during the prosecution of the war. Now that issue is gone, and I maintain the time has arrived when the people of Canada should have an opportunity of expressing their views upon the Government's course and the issues involved. That is what the amendment aims at and for that reason I support it.

The ex-Minister of Finance, pleading with his supporters opposite, has claimed that we ought to have a Union Government—that Union Government should carry on and that we should have a Liberal-Conservative Party not only in name but in substance. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether a continuance of Union Government is possible? That is a matter as to which other parties have something to say. The hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat), who is not in his seat to-day, also suggested that we should have a continuance of Union Government. I wonder where the hon. gentleman would fit in under those circumstances? The hon. gentleman's observations recall to my mind the report, published I think in the Toronto Globe, of a meeting in that city at which he was nominated some two years ago. Speaking from memory, because I have not the report at present before me, the meeting was a joint one of Liberals and Conservatives in the riding of Parkdale. This very question of the continuance of Union Government came up for discussion, and there appeared to be some doubt as to who should be the candidate for the riding. The hon. gentleman's name was advanced as a candidate, but in view of the hon. gentleman's political antecedents, there was apparently some misgiving. Finally an old Conservative spoke up and said: We will accept him, (Mr. Mowat), but let it be understood we are only borrowing him for the occasion. When the election is over, and when we revert to party lines again we do not want to keep him any longer, and we will return him to the Liberal Party again. I wonder what our good Conservatives friends in the constituency of Parkdale will say if Union Government is continued and what they will do with their borrowed friend. In this matter, I am not here to speak for the Liberal Party, and although we are a democratic party and even though in the case of a man who has sinned, it is sometimes possible to wipe away those sins and make him white once more. What, let me ask, is going to happen to my hon. friend provided the Conservatives who took the stand to which I have alluded, declare they are going to have nothing more to do with the hon. gentleman, and they return him from whence he came?

I did not rise with any idea of speaking at great length or of discussing such questions as the tariff and the rate of exchange. But when my hon. friend (Sir Thomas White) offered advice as to what would be the proper course to pursue in future with respect to Union Government I did not feel like letting the opportunity pass without drawing attention to the fact that the hon. gentleman's own political course has not always been one of marked steadiness all along the line. We are told in one breath that the country is prosperous and that we have great financial resources at our disposal and in the very next breath when it comes to adequately recognizing the claims of our returned soldiers and maintaining soldiers' widows and dependents the statement is made that it is absolutely impossible. The hon. gentleman also tells us that Union Government must carry on but he shakes himself clear of any and every responsibility in regard to it. He declares that it is the duty of the Prime Minister to carry on and to assume great responsibilities, but the ex-Finance Minister himself refuses to shoulder his share of the burdens to be borne. Along with all other members of the House I deeply regret the condition of health of the Prime Minister. We all have a very high regard for that Rt. hon. gentleman; we deplore the reasons for his absence from the House, and we sincerely trust that the reassuring statement with respect to his health made a few days ago may turn out to be well founded. We all want to see the Rt. hon. gentleman remain in good health but would he not be endangering that health by again assuming the responsibilities of office. Personally I would like to prevent any pos-

sibility of the right hon. gentleman's health being further endangered by remaining in office and continuing to shoulder heavy responsibilities, and with that object in view I shall gladly vote for the amendment.

Mr. R. L. RICHARDSON (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to participate, especially, in the discussion of any of the questions alluded to in the speech from the Throne but to refer to a matter that did not find a place there—I refer to the question of the proposed increase in railway freight rates. My intention is to make a few observations on that question at the present time so that the members of the Government and the members of the House may familiarize themselves with existing conditions with respect to the subject and be able to intelligently deal with the proposal for the increase when it is brought forward. A year or two ago the railway freight and passenger rates were increased to a very considerable extent, I think something like twenty-five per cent. It is now proposed, and I presume the matter is before the Railway Board to make another increase of from thirty to forty per cent. In my judgment the existing railway conditions, and especially the circumstances of the people, do not justify that increase. Before I sit down I think I shall be able to make out a case in that connection.

I am told that the increase in rates granted by the Railway Board some two years ago, on the understanding that all but ten per cent of that increase would be returned to the country in taxation in so far as the Canadian Pacific railway was concerned, has not resulted according to that understanding. I am informed, and I am satisfied that the information is correct, that up to the present time the Government has not been able to collect that amount of taxes from the Canadian Pacific railway. It may be in process of settlement, but I am credibly informed that nothing on that account has yet been paid over to the Government.

As you know, Sir, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was endowed by the people of Canada to an amount sufficient to build the entire railway. It was the understanding of Parliament when those vast subsidies were poured into the lap of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company that the company would be able to act as a good immigration agent in the Northwest and to carry freight and passengers at a very low rate. I have not the quotation at hand, but I think it was Sir John Macdonald who, when the contract was going through, said that owing to these vast subsidies the company ought to be able to carry freight and passengers for about one-quarter the rate that would be charged by a privately constructed railway. But instead of adhering to the policy which Parliament and the country understood would be followed when these subsidies were given, the company embarked upon a policy which it has followed closely up to the present time of charging "all that the traffic would bear."

In this connection I want to refer to a few figures, Mr. Speaker, and to demonstrate to the House, if I can, that any increase in rates at the present time would be entirely unjustifiable. I quote from an article which one of the best authorities on railway matters in Canada has contributed to a newspaper. In part he says:

> At the existing rates the net revenue has been ample, not only to meet the increased outlays, but to provide a dividend to its common shareholders at the rate of ten per cent per annum, and also to permit of an appreciable addition to its enormous accumulation of surplus assets and undivided profits, amounting, at December 31, 1918, to $233,999,617, as shown on the company's balance sheet. This colossal surplus is over and above the most generous reservations for replacements, taxes, etc., amounting to $44,742,837, and also such items as premium on ordinary capital stock, $45,000,000, and net proceeds of lands and securities, $84,079,084. Altogether the financial position of the Canadian Pacific corporation is so astonishingly strong, and its current earnings are so enormous, as to make the fears and presentments of its president look like consummate farce or consummate hypocrisy.
>
> The amazing financial position of the C.P.R. corporation is primarily due to the enormous and "insane subventions of which it was the beneficiary." These donations were made, as has been said with the ostensible purpose of enabling it to supply western transportation at low rates and to act as an effective colonization agency. From the first, it absolutely ignored these obligations and conducted its operations on the principle: All that the traffic will bear. It thus not only received the enormous subsidies, grants and privileges, but it also collected, without any effort at restraint by the Dominion Government, the excessive tolls which its position as an unrestricted monopoly enabled it to collect. It caught the people of Canada coming and going, so to speak.

That refers more particularly to the position of the company a little over a year ago. I will now quote more recent figures:

Week ending	1920	Increase	P.C.
Feb. 7.....	$3,288,000	$709,000	27.48
Feb. 14.....	3,546,000	663,000	22.99

This shows an average increase of 25 per cent in revenue over the corresponding period of 1919, and this showing is not unusual, but typical. The operating expenses are not shown in this return, but it is incredible that any increase in these could bear comparison with this revenue increase.

Under such conditions the suggestion of a huge increase in rates (30 or 40 per cent is the figure talked of) is not only ludicrous but criminal.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the value of Canadian Pacific shares on the New York exchange has been steadily falling. Once the stock was as high, I think, as 280, and it has recently dropped as low as 117. Lord Shaughnessy, in order to explain the situation and, I presume, come to the rescue of these shares, had a statement published to the effect that their intrinsic value was $250 on each $100 share. Now, if they are worth that amount, it is because of the excessive freight and passenger tolls which the company has been able to take from the public for the last thirty years. So the proposition will be admitted that the policy of the company has been to take "all that the traffic would bear."

I think I have demonstrated that so far as the Canadian Pacific railway is concerned any increase in rates would be entirely unwarranted—would, in fact, be a crime against our people—and I feel satisfied that this House and the country will agree with me that such an increase should not be permitted for one moment.

Let me now refer to what is known as the National railway system. As you know, Sir, the Government within the last two or three years has acquired, in addition to the Intercolonial and other lines in the Maritime Provinces, the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Transcontinental, and the Canadian Northern railways, and is about to take over the Grand Trunk system; so ultimately our national system will be larger than the railway system of the Canadian Pacific Company. As I have already stated, I think I have demonstrated that the circumstances do not warrant any increase in rates to the Canadian Pacific railway. Now, what about the National railway system? I notice with regret, Sir, that the president of that system, Mr. D. B. Hanna, is delivering addresses in various cities advocating an increase in rates on the system. Indeed, I see by this morning's papers that he has been addressing the Canadian Club in Ottawa. I was rather startled by the headlines over the report of his speech. One reads:

National Railways will soon be Factor in Paying Canada's War Debt, Declares President Hanna.

The report says:

Mr. D. B. Hanna, president of the Canadian National Railways, speaking to the Canadian Club Saturday afternoon, predicted that before long all government railways in Canada would be on a paying basis and that the strong probabilities were the returns would in a few years in a great measure help to pay Canada's war debt.

Just think, for a moment, Mr. Speaker, what that proposition means. According to Mr. Hanna, the President and moving spirit in the Canadian National Railway system, rates may be so increased as not only to pay interest on the vast capitalization involved in these railways acquired by the Government, but also to pay interest on the national debt, which now amounts to something over two billions of dollars. Hon. gentlemen must see the utter absurdity of a position of that kind. Even if it only required reasonable rates to pay the interest on that vast capitalization of a billion and a half to pay the interest on the national debt, just think what the suggestion involves. Are the users of freight on the Canadian National railway system, those who send their commodities over those lines, to be taxed not only for the carrying of that freight but also to pay the interest on the national debt? Why should the users of freight be asked to contribute one farthing towards the payment of the interest on the national debt? The national debt has been created for the supposed benefit of all the people. Freight rates, instead of being enhanced to the extend of one farthing, should be kept down to the lowest possible point; those who use the Government railways for freight and passenger purposes should have the benefit of the lowest possible rates. I think it is only necessary to state the proposition laid down by Mr. Hanna to demonstrate its utter absurdity.

While on this point, I want to say that under no circumstances could this Parliament or this country justify an increase in freight rates on the Canadian National railway system at the present time. We may just as well be frank about the situation. During the last twenty or twenty-five years the people of Canada, in order, as they thought, to build up a competing system for the Canadian Pacific railway, embarked upon blunders of most colossal magnitude in connection with our railways. For instance, they built what is known as the Transcontinental railway from Moncton to Winnipeg. I do not believe that that railway is earning much more than sufficient to pay for the axle grease which it uses; certainly it will be a long time before it pays operating expenses. It had been my view that the wisest policy would be to abandon the Transcontinental altogether. Yet it has cost this country

$250,000,000; and the argument against abandonment is that along its lines settlers have established themselves, towns have been built up and vested interests have been created, and that abandonment would do great injustice to those settlers and vested interests. Well, let us say that the best policy is that the Transcontinental shall not be abandoned, and that it shall be operated. Its construction was due to the inexplicable folly of the Canadian people. I am not blaming one party more than another, though I might say that these colossal blunders involving the Transcontinental and the Grand Trunk Pacific were the result of the administration of the so-called Liberal party.

Now, let us take the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, which has fallen into the hands of this country. The members of this House and the people of the country ought to have it clearly in their minds that the Administration has not embarked upon this national railway policy from preference. National ownership of railways is all right, but the national ownership that we are getting through being obliged to acquire these white elephants is not the kind of public ownership that any sane man would care to embark upon. But there was the Transcontinental; it was thrown on our lap, and if we do not operate it it goes into decay. The same with the Grand Trunk Pacific. Some of it is of value, but the portion from Edmonton to the Pacific coast is another line which will probably not earn its axle grease for some years. As the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) said this afternoon, the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Transcontinental was made an issue in the election of 1904. I remember how it was said that the people of the West were clamouring for this accommodation. They were not clamouring at all. It was the exploiters that were clamouring to get contracts and to institute a cry that would carry the country. Well, the proposal did carry the country, and we have the Grand Trunk Pacific constructed at a cost of two or three hundred millions of dollars. I think the total cost is something like $97,000 a mile. I recall that the Brandon section of the Manitoba system was built at a cost of $9,000 a mile. Of course, I do not institute a comparison, because one line goes through prairie country and the other is over the mountains. But we have the Transcontinental from Moncton to Winnipeg, the Grand Trunk Pacific from Winnipeg to the Pacific coast, the Canadian Northern—of which I shall only refer to the British Columbia section as unproductive and uneconomic—and we have that section of the Canadian Northern from Sudbury down to Toronto. These four vast stretches of railway which have been dumped upon our laps are included in the National railway system of Canada. Now, Mr. Speaker, while you may denounce the Laurier-Sifton regime that drove these enormities through Parliament, still, it must be remembered that the people voted upon the issue and that the people are responsible and must take the consequences. It must be perfectly evident to everybody that the Transcontinental and the other lines which I have named are uneconomic portions, white elephant portions, of the nationally-owned system of railways. Some time ago I had it in mind to suggest to this Parliament that those uneconomic portions of the railways ought to be grouped together and labelled "public ward system." They belong to the public, but they are just wards. We are losing immense amounts of money in their operation; they really should not be operated; but to charge rates on those uneconomic systems sufficient to pay operating expenses and to give a return to the public, is a most absurd proposition. The people must take their medicine with regard to those uneconomic portions of the nationally-owned system. I think no one will dissent from that view.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight oclock.

Mr. R. L. RICHARDSON (resuming): When the House rose for dinner I was discussing the undesirability of the Government and this Parliament allowing an increase in railway freight and passenger rates as has been proposed, and indeed advocated, both by the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway and by Mr. D. B. Hanna, president of our nationally-owned system. The House was rather slim when it rose at six o'clock, and is still fairly slim. Perhaps that is in a measure due to the heavy artillery that the members heard with such interest this afternoon. I should not like to attribute it to the speech of my hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Copp), and I certainly do not intend to attribute it to myself as the House was rather thin when I started. I think that for the benefit of members who were not present this afternoon I had better recapitulate briefly.

In opposing the granting of an increase in freight and passenger rates to the extent of thirty or forty per cent as has been proposed, I reviewed this afternoon the position of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I stated that the people of Canada had given to that company, in subsidies, exemptions and largess, an amount sufficient to build the entire railway, and I made the point that when these vast subsidies were given the people expected, as they had a right to expect, that this company would be able to furnish transportation to the people of this country at a very low rate. That at all events was the expectation of the late Sir John Macdonald who fathered the great project. I was able to show that the rates this company has charged for the last number of years have enabled it to accumulate an undistributed surplus to an amount of about $230,000,000 or $240,000,000. I was able to show that their earnings during the last few weeks, according to their own returns, were vastly in excess of their earnings for the corresponding period last year, the average increase in earnings being something like 20 or 25 per cent. I therefore felt, and I am sure every member of this House will feel, that no justification exists for an increase in railway rates so far as the Canadian Pacific is concerned. I criticised—and I reiterate my criticism now—the remarkable position that Mr. D. B. Hanna, president of the nationally-owned system, is taking at the present time, going about addressing Canadian Clubs and public bodies, advocating an increase in freight rates on the nationally-owned system. I quoted from a newspaper published in Ottawa to-day Mr. Hanna's statement to the effect that the nationally-owned system, if given proper rates, would soon have earnings enough to pay operating expenses and interest on an estimated cost of a billion and a half of dollars, and he added that if they got such a freight rate as was allowed in South Australia the nationally-owned railways might be expected to pay interest on the immense national debt of this Dominion. I pointed out the folly of Mr. Hanna, or indeed any public man taking the position that rates should be such as would more than pay operating expenses and interest on the cost involved in construction. I referred to the absolute absurdity of expecting those citizens of Canada who use these roads for transporting their goods to pay rates higher than sufficient to pay operating expenses and interest. How absolutely absurd it must appear to any member of this House that any railway, and particularly the nationally-owned roads, should have rates imposed upon them sufficient to pay operating expenses, interest on capital, and interest on our national debt! Just fancy the users of these roads being mulcted to an enormous extent in order to pay interest on our national debt! The national debt of Canada was created for the benefit of the entire population, and this entire population must contribute to the interest on that national debt instead of merely a very limited number of shippers of freight over the Government roads. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that when an increase of twenty-five or thirty per cent was granted in freight rates a couple of years ago, it was generally contended that the Canadian Pacific did not require any increase in rates, that their earnings were quite sufficient to take care of their operating expenses and pay a handsome interest on capital. As a matter of fact you, Sir, know that the Canadian Pacific under its charter is allowed to pay 10 per cent on its capital stock, but it was contended that the lame ducks—the Canadian Northern, the Grand Trunk Pacific, and other lines—were unable to earn sufficient on those rates to make a living, and consequently an increase in rates was granted to all lines including the Canadian Pacific to enable these roads to increase their earnings. You will recall, Sir, that it was provided that if the Canadian Pacific earned more than ten per cent under these new rates the balance was to be returned to the public treasury by way of taxation. Let us assume that the Canadian Pacific is a perfectly honourable and decent corporation; I am not here to say a word against the Canadian Pacific, or to impugn its honour; it is a magnificently managed organization, and has rendered splendid service to the Dominion. Its officers are high-class men. For its new president I have the highest possible esteem. But it can be readily understood how, in connection with a provision of that kind, accountants could juggle figures and charge up to capital account a very large amount, or how expenses for upkeep, replacement and other things might be deducted from the amount the company was able to earn by virtue of the increase in rates. I am afraid—I repeat what I said this afternoon, because there are more members listening to me now, and this is one of the most important questions that will come before the House this session—that although these increases went into effect two years ago or more the Canadian Pacific has not yet paid the amount which it should pay to the Government, as was

the expectation and understanding of Parliament when the increase was granted.

Having demonstrated that the Canadian Pacific should not under any circumstances be allowed an increase in freight and passenger rates, I went on to deal this afternoon with the case of the nationally-owned railways. I think it is absolutely absurd and highly improper for Mr. Hanna, the president of the nationally-owned system, to take the position he is taking before the public, of advocating that an increase be granted. I have always had, and still have, a very high regard for Mr. Hanna's integrity and ability as a railway operator, but I question his ethics and wisdom in following the course he is pursuing. The question I dealt with this afternoon was this: The Canadian National system of railways is the result of the most colossal folly and series of blunders ever perpetrated in any country by its public men. I am not going to place blame particularly here or there, but I did single out one Government this afternoon for special mention. We have the National Transcontinental railway, which is a piece of the greatest folly ever carried out in any country. I have given the matter considerable study, and it was my conclusion that the Transcontinental from Moncton to Winnipeg should be abandoned. The argument was presented to me that vested interests have been created, that a large population has gone in there, and perhaps it would be a hardship to these people if that portion of the road was abandoned. We may take it that that country will develop as the years go by, and it might be better under all the circumstances of the case that the road should be operated in the best possible manner and maintained in some reasonable degree of efficiency. The people of this country will understand that, inasmuch as the road was the result of the folly of public men, endorsed by the people itself, and inasmuch as it has been unloaded on the country and is now under the public ownership system, it ought not to be expected that rates should be charged upon it sufficient to pay operating expenses and interest on capital.

In addition to the Transcontinental and the Grand Trunk Pacific, the uneconomic portion of which extends from Edmonton to the Pacific coast, you have the British Columbia end of the Canadian Northern and you also have a considerable mileage in Ontario belonging to the Canadian Northern. All these uneconomic thousands of miles of road are included with the whole in our public ownership system. The economic end would be the old Grand Trunk, a portion of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and a portion of the Canadian Northern which runs through very good territory, and perhaps a portion of the Intercolonial.

In my judgment, this great system should be divided into the economic and uneconomic portions and separate accounts should be kept. It seems to me utter folly that an increase in rates should be granted in order to make up the deficit on the uneconomic portions. These uneconomic portions constitute a vast mileage. They are the inheritance of this country from the folly of those public men, endorsed by the country itself. That being so, let the country take its medicine, let the uneconomic portion be separated from the economic portion, and whatever the loss is let it be written off against profit and loss. That we should be asked at this stage to increase the freight and passenger rates on our railway system in order to pay operating expenses and interest on cost is, in my judgment, a proposition that should not for a minute be listened to.

I said this afternoon, and I repeat, that we have embarked upon the public ownership of railways. The idea of public ownership is all right in itself if we have the right kind of public ownership. If the people of Canada had built a smaller mileage than that which we now have—some 22,000 miles—and this system had been built upon economic lines, taking in those portions of the country where there was a reasonable expectation of revenue and accommodating large settlements, we would have had the right kind of public ownership. But almost half—at least one-third of our system is uneconomic and it is well that this country and Parliament, when we are starting out with this system, should know the conditions under which we are embarking. We may expect in two or three years the people to hold up their hands in horror and say: "Public ownership is a vast failure; we never should have embarked upon it."

It should be remembered that we have not embarked upon this system, but that public ownership has been forced upon by the folly of our public men and the folly of the people at large. Let us divide the economic from the uneconomic portions and let the country suffer the loss whatever the loss might be of the uneconomic system. Why should the people, living by the tens of thousands along the lines served by the economic system, be taxed to pay the deficit of the uneconomic system? The pro-

position is utter folly and should not be listened to for a moment. I have no apology to offer for repeating what I said this afternoon, because I believe this is a subject of vital importance to the people of Canada. We must start right if we are going to make a success of public ownership. We must not have it discredited at its inception. There is one other important reason that suggests itself to me here why we should not allow any increase of freight rates at the present time. The arbitration in connection with the Grand Trunk will soon sit. If you allow this increase in freight rates, the arbitrator on behalf of the Grand Trunk will put forward the claim that they are handing over a railway to the people of Canada which is making handsome earnings at the present time. That is a very great risk which we should not think of taking.

I am not sure what the functions or powers of the Railway Board are, or whether it is able to grant an increase without reference to the Government. If it is I think the Government should intervene and that some steps ought to be taken to save the country from this folly. It is not only the $100,000,000 or $150,000,000 that will be granted in increased rates to these two great railway systems that will present the real trouble. Large, colossal, vast as that amount is, and burdensome as it will be to the people, it may be borne, but the result will be that it will enable merchants from one end of the country to the other to increase the cost of their commodities. They will say: "Freight rates have gone up; therefore the cost of commodities must be increased," and the result will be, if these increased freight rates are permitted, that there will be further grave agitation in the matter of the high cost of living, and it will cost Canada $300,000,000 or $400,000,000 before she is through with it. It is too grave a matter to be embarked upon lightly. I repeat the warning to the Government that they should carefully consider this question and take every precaution to see that this proposed increase in freight rates is refused.

Just one other point, and it was brought out by my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) this afternoon in connection with the speech from the Throne. Suppose, Mr. Speaker, that if such an unlikely thing should happen as that the Government should accept the amendment proposed by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) and go to the country. Then, suppose that this so-called Liberal party came back with a majority behind them. Just think what would happen. You recall what happened in this House a few months ago in the Fall session, when this Government, backed by this party, undertook to acquire the Grand Trunk railway.

To operate the Canadian Northern, the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Transcontinental railway without the old Grand Trunk was a piece of folly, something impossible, because the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Transcontinental were built to co-ordinate and to co-operate with that system; and when the opportunity offered, this Government, in order to ensure, at least to some extent, the possibility of a measure of success in public ownership decided to acquire the old Grand Trunk railway. And how was this Government met when that proposition came down? Why, it was virulently opposed by the party that sits to your left, Sir, and they even proposed a commission of inquiry to sidetrack the project; they had recourse to every possible expedient in order to block the passage through Parliament of the Bill to acquire the Grand Trunk. Having been brought up in the Liberal party I thought that public ownership was one of its chief planks, and it was with amazement that I found them opposed to the acquisition of the Grand Trunk railway and that they were opposed generally to the principle of public ownership. Now, suppose the unlikely should happen? Suppose the Government should say, "All right we will go to the country," and by some fluke the party on the other side came back, what position would the country be in? Could it rely upon that party administering this public-owned system with honesty of purpose, efficiency or in any manner in the public interest? I am sure, Sir, all will agree that if you expect success in any undertaking those who manage that undertaking must believe in it and must throw their hearts into the management of it. With the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) I cordially agree that it would be most unfortunate if the administration of this public owned system of railways should pass out of the hands of the present administration before it has been thoroughly co-ordinated, thoroughly organized and placed in such a position that there is no likelihood of failure.

Before I sit down I wish to briefly refer to two or three matters that arose out of the debate on the Address. I share very cordially the sentiments expressed by my hon. friend from Parkdale (Mr. Mowat) who is an old Liberal, and comes of prime Liberal

stock. That hon. gentleman said that since his advent to this House as a supporter of the Union Government—a Government composed of the best elements of both of the old parties—he had found himself abundantly satisfied. I want to say as an old Liberal that I have never sat behind any Government, nor have I ever observed any Government—whether it called itself Liberal or Conservative—for the last thirty or thirty-five years that in my judgment was more progressive, or was even more radical, than this Government has been. It has—not only in my case but in the case of many others—deserved, but compelled my support. When it made an honest effort to deal with public ownership, and there was no other course it was able to pursue, I had no difficulty in agreeing with it and supporting it on that point.

Now let us look at the achievements of the Government—and I am not going to dwell upon the record in detail as the subject was thoroughly covered by the Acting Prime Minister. The Government, at least, dealt efficiently and satisfactorily with the war. That was the great issue when the Government was elected in 1917, and the war has been won. It is true the war cost a great deal of money, and involved the lives of 60,000 of the flower of our race, but even that was not too great a price to pay for liberty. But the war was won and the Government did all that could be expected of it in that direction. We have also had from the Government women's franchise. We have had the Civil Service, under a commission, removed entirely from the vicious system that prevailed under the old regime. So far as my observation goes there is no patronage in the Civil Service to-day. And there is no patronage in connection with the awarding of contracts as there used to be. Then prohibition was made effective in Canada by virtue of the conduct of the Government. Further, there has been control of prices and accompanying it the creation of a Board of Commerce, and while many may be ready to sneer, I want to say that a great deal has been accomplished in that connection. We have had, in connection with the adjustment of war problems, the demobilization of 500,000 troops, soldiers' civil reestablishment and vocational training, the granting of pensions and the care of returned soldiers. We have had the inauguration of a housing scheme, the establishment of a Health Department, the adoption of public ownership of railways, the consolidation of our Railway Act, and the passage of a bankruptcy law. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this was a very fair programme and a very fair record of accomplishment for the time that this Government has been in office.

There are many other questions that should, and doubtless will, be dealt with, but just why there should be a declaration in favour of a general election at the present time I for one cannot understand. I do not believe there is any public demand throughout the country for a general election. I believe with the ex-Minister of Finance, that the people who do the thinking, the people who have the interest of this country most deeply at heart, are anxious to see this Government carry on. I think with my hon. friend that if you were to have a general election you would not have stability of Government for five, ten or fifteen years. What you would likely have would be Government by groups and a disturbing succession of administrations. It is perfectly true that there is a good deal of unrest throughout the Dominion, but that is inevitable after war and it is inevitable during war time.

Sometimes I have stood by and listened to groups of people denouncing all governments—denouncing municipal, provincial and Dominion governments, denouncing everything that is—and the manner in which that denunciation was carried on was so insensate I could not help thinking of the experience of Samson who pulled down the pillars of the temple and in so doing perished himself in the catastrophe. These thousands of people throughout the land who indulge in general and wholesale criticism of everything that exists have no conception of what their influence is leading to. It might easily result as disastrously as did the act of Samson; it might pull down the constitution of our country. Those who rock the boat in perilous and dangerous times are a menace to the community. In my judgment nothing could occur that would be more likely to disturb the national craft and bring chaos in the country than a general election at the present time. It might be desirable in a year or two. I believe the country is progressing in the direction of settling down, and when that time comes then let us have a dissolution and let the best men, or the best group, or the best party, win.

I wish to offer an observation or two on the same lines as my hon. friend the member for Parkdale. He spoke of the desirability of a rapprochement with the province of Quebec, because it is charged that there are no representatives from the great province of Quebec in this Government. It is true there is one member of the Gov-

ernment from Quebec who sits in the Senate, but it is quite patent to all that that province is not represented as it should be in the country's administration.

I could not help reflecting as to whose fault it was. On the appeal to the country in 1917 the verdict was so overwhelming in favour of Union Government pledged to carry on the war, that I would think nobody, no matter from what province he comes, would care to criticize or question that verdict. If the province of Quebec is not represented in the Government, it is the fault of the representatives, or, perhaps, carrying it further, of the people of that province. But surely that is no fault of the overwhelming majority of the people who voted in favour of Union Government.

Now, I was rather surprised at the retort of my hon. friend the member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier) to the olive branch held out by the member for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat). He spoke vehemently of Quebec waiting for her "hour." One would almost fancy from his tone that Quebec was waiting for her revenge.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Then I would be the last one to attribute any such sentiment ot my hon. friend, because there is a special bond of friendship between him and me. He came out to Manitoba to assist me in an election contest upon one occasion, and I have always had a special regard for him. Consequently, I am delighted to hear from hon. gentlemen that his words had no such meaning. However, I noticed in the Montreal Gazette this morning that the Progressive Club of Montreal had by resolution repudiated the sentiment expressed by the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe.

In my judgment Quebec has proved a great bulwark in our national structure. She is sane, generous, chivalrous and courteous, and I do not believe that her people will ever countenance group government. Quebec, no matter what may be the sentiments of many of her representatives on the question of the Tariff, is in my judgment, in favour of fiscal stability, and I do not believe that she will ever stand by and see the industrial structure of the country ruined. I have always looked upon Quebec as one of the sanest members of Confederation, and I am satisfied that reason will prevail in that province, and if her good people do not in their wisdom see fit to take a hand in the Government at the present time, the occasion when she will cannot be distant. There will be no secession. These two races are joined together for weal or woe, and what God has joined together no man in this country will dare attempt to put asunder. I believe that wiser and more conciliatory counsels will prevail—in fact, I believe they are beginning to prevail in that province at the present time. The war is over. "Let the dead past bury its dead." We cannot make things different now, the only thing we can do is to accept what has happened. There is a great work ahead of this great nation, and the only way in which it can be properly accomplished is for all our people to unite and press forward to the goal of success. In that result, whether the co-operation of the good people of Quebec may be delayed for a longer or a shorter time, it is my conviction that Quebec will play her part, and it is gratifying to observe symptoms here and there that her people are themselves anxious that they should be represented in the administration of our national affairs.

I want to make a brief reference to my hon. friend the member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar). Like the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White), I have a warm personal regard for the hon. member. When Union Government was about to be formed I made it my business to see influential members of the old Administration and urged very strongly that the member for Marquette should be included in the Cabinet. Whether or not my advice had any weight with the powers that be, he was included, and I am not quite so sure but that my advice may have had some weight. I have followed the hon. gentleman's course of action very carefully both while in office and since his retirement therefrom. I have generally regarded him as a man of blunt honesty and integrity, trying to do the best he can according to his lights. I think, however, with the ex-Minister of Finance, that my hon. friend is not quite so sure just where he is getting to on this tariff question. I am an older man than he, and for his benefit I may tell him that I went through the same experience that he is now going through. I was brought up in the strict Liberal school at the feet of the Hon. George Brown, the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie and others, and I believed in free trade. I had the "bug" good and strong, Mr. Speaker. I thought the entire tariff was a curse to the country and should be wiped out. In fact, I had listened to my old friend Bob Watson and a lot of other so-called Liberal barnstormers through the country and come to the conclusion that the

Tory party was a pretty bad aggregation. Running a newspaper as I did, I had a busy time keeping out of gaol when speaking my mind about the members of that party. I thought when my good friends the "so-called" Liberals—I suppose I had better use that term—came to office we would have every vestige of protection wiped from the tariff. That was the promise. Consequently, as a young man, I stumped my riding on a coal-oil can, practically telling the farmers that they were being bled white, and that if we could just get our party into office it would be all smooth sailing, for there would be no more tariff, they would have their boots and clothing, their cotton and wool free of duty, and instead of trading a bushel of wheat for a dozen of bananas or a gallon of coal-oil, they would get their coal-oil for fifteen cents a gallon and their bananas for about twelve cents a dozen. Imagine my disappointment, Mr. Speaker, when I came down to Ottawa to find that some of the leaders whom I thought quite as sincere as my friend the present leader of the Opposition, had changed face on the tariff. The question was not whether the duty on agricultural implements should be wiped out altogether because it was bearing very heavily on the farmers. On the contrary an emissary—to be frank, it was L. M. Jones himself—stayed with me nearly all Sunday to get me to agree to an increase in that duty, representing that the Government was willing. That is really what I was up against. It was not a reduction, it was an increase. If we pass by the 33⅓ per cent British preferential reduction, much of which was afterwards recalled, the total reduction made by our friends was 77-100 of 1 per cent. I remember being in the House when the present Acting Prime Minister (Sir George Foster) analyzed the tariff and affirmed without contradiction that that was the total amount of the reduction.

Well, it set me thinking, and I had a pretty uneasy time. The late Dr. Landerkin and many of the rest of "the boys" would tap me on the back and say: "Young man, stand by your party." Well, I did try to, but it got too hot for me, and finally I differed from the party. I had a pretty hard time of it then, because I was told: "We have redeemed our tariff pledges; you are not a good Liberal and should resign; you have all that was promised you." I was expected not only to believe that, but to be pleased and to smile over it. To me it was a deep disappointment, because I had been up and down the country for years denouncing the tariff. I mention this particularly for the benefit of my good friend the member for Marquette (Hon. Mr. Crerar), who has started out to lead a party. I myself once started out to lead a party in the Northwest, but I did not get very far.

I noticed from my hon. friend's speech that it is beginning to dawn on him that the tariff cannot be—or, I should say, will not be—wiped out. I suppose it could, if you could elect a sufficient number of free traders, but the difficulty is that however sincere the member for Marquette may be in his desire to eliminate a great many evil things from the tariff—and I am heartily with him in that—he will find that the people generally will not follow.

Some of the members on the other side from the province of Quebec who applaud heartily when my hon. friend speaks about having the tariff lowered sat behind a Government that practised protection to the hilt, and if put to it to-day when their political existence was at stake, would do so again. That is the insincerity of the whole business. Of course, my hon. friend did say that he was not prepared to wipe it out at one fell swoop—I think that was his expression, if not, it was the substance of it. I am heartily in sympathy with my hon. friend's proposal that the duties should be removed from the implements of production. During the last twenty-five or thirty years I have not changed my views on this question. I would like to see the duties removed from the implements of production. I do not believe that it is possible at this time, owing to the condition of the country and to our international relations, to amend the tariff to the satisfaction of the strongest tariff reformer. So far as my influence and my judgment go, I am just as heartily in favour of a reduction of the tariff as is the member for Marquette. I have had a little more experience in connection with it than he has, and I know something about the tremendous difficulties that will meet him and will meet every strong tariff reformer at every turn of the road. But I repeat that so far as his campaign for having the duties removed from the implements of production goes, he has my heartiest sympathy and I will endeavour to assist in any reasonable way. The Government itself will probably so revise the tariff as to meet in a reasonable measure the aspirations of the West. I do not, however, like my hon. friend, look for such a revision at one fell swoop as will satisfy

all people. But I want to say that probably his entry into politics as the leader of a group will have a very good effect in this country, because it is an excellent thing for a number of people or a party to forge strongly ahead in the direction of lower tariffs; it cannot fail to have its effect upon those who are inclined to go the other way.

Mr. C. A. GAUVREAU (Temiscouata) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I should have abstained from joining in the debate on the Address, had not the Acting Prime Minister answered as he did to my question concerning Mr. Albert Sévigny.

I considered that the occasion was favourable for discussing that matter, and that the time had come to raise the question before its final settlement. But, Mr. Speaker, before broaching that subject, let me confess that the speech from the Throne at this session is a document quite in keeping with the Lenten season which is now on.

Never has anything so poor from the legislative viewpoint been submitted to the consideration of the House. It is true that this poor bill of fare comprises a joint of magnificent proportions: the Franchise Bill. However, while ignorant of its contents and judging solely from the record of its promoters I well foresee that only those members of Parliament favoured with the strongest constitution will be able to swallow that measure, while they must have the stomach of an ostrich to digest it.

In unison with my friend from Rimouski (Mr. d'Anjou), I raise my voice to protest in the name of the French race, against the forsaking of that admirable practice of calling on a French-speaking member to be the seconder of the Address in answer to the speech from the Throne.

From the earliest days, that ancient usage has always been held in honour in this House, and had it not been for the advent to power of a Union Government, the outcome of the wholesale theft of ballots, that practice would still hold good.

But, there is nothing to surprise us coming from an administration which has ignored the Constitution as well as old traditions and we would wonder how it is that they did not repeal that usage by Order in Council, as they have done for so many other things.

As a consolation we may reflect that in so doing they have saved our beautiful language the humiliating task of defending something which is indefensible—namely: the policy of this Government.

True, the Senate has been privileged as compared with the House of Commons, since the hon. gentlemen of that High Chamber were afforded the opportunity of listening to an eloquent speaker, the honourable Mr. Chapais. But there is satisfaction to be derived from the fact that the appointment of the Honourable Mr. Chapais to the Senate, is in itself an humiliation for the present Government. The Honourable Mr. Chapais was a recognized adversary of conscription; it is even stated that a year or two ago, he rejected indignantly an offer emanating from the then ministers of a seat in the Senate, as a protest against the almost devilish Bill of conscription which had been brought up before Parliament, not with a view to help win the war but for the purpose of stirring up in the English-speaking provinces an ill-feeling against Quebec.

The Government have thus partially confessed its blunder, by appointing to the Senate the very man who openly opposed conscription a few years ago.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is another aspect of this question to which I cannot refrain from calling the attention of this House. It is this: Mr. Chapais' appointment to the Senate consecrates a return as it were to the old practice of the double mandate, which we all believed to have been discarded forever.

I blame the Government for allowing Mr. Chapais, an accomplished and cultured scholar as he is, to occupy at the same time the position of legislative councillor for Quebec and that of Senator at Ottawa.

We heard the other day, the hon. member for Frontenac championing in this House the cause of the hon. Postmaster General. And involuntarily the well-known line penned by the poet occurred to my mind and I started exclaiming:

"How into pure gold was the vile metal transmuted?"

Comment en un or pur le vil métal s'est-il changé?

I shall not pick up a quarrel with the Postmaster General about that. It is the crowning honour for the hon. minister to have his cause championed by the member for Frontenac, the relentless slanderer of the French race in this House, and with such a certificate, the minister may give up his senatorship and have himself returned to the House in any constituency, but never in the province of Quebec.

In Ontario perhaps? We harbour strong doubts about it.

But referring to the Postmaster General puts me in mind of his former nationalist and unionist colleague, Mr. Albert Sévigny, who aims at supplanting Mr. A. D. De Celles, as librarian of the Parliamentary library. Mr. De Celles is in all the vigour of manhood, after running a brilliant career in which so many gifted writers of the younger generation like to follow him as a master and a leader of thought.

Wherefore should Mr. De Celles be shelved, the more so as he does not ask for superannuation? Why should the people's money be squandered to no purpose? For, should Mr. Sévigny be appointed librarian, he will be paid the same salary as is paid to Mr. De Celles, but moreover a pension must be paid to the latter, who is still able to discharge his duties, as he has done so far with such great credit to the country and to our literature.

Has Mr. Sévigny the requisite qualifications to fill the position of librarian? I do not think so, Mr. Speaker.

An obscure lawyer, a second rate politician, a spiritless Minister of the Crown, and a Speaker of this House, with all that is involved in the disgraceful scenes which are a matter of public notoriety, has Mr. Sévigny produced a single work which may show that he is entitled and qualified to fill the responsible position of librarian of this Parliament?

With all those who knew Mr. Sévigny, I answer: No; and the Government should look twice before making the proposed change.

At this stage of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I want to speak in English so that the ministers at their seat may understand what I want to say about Mr. Sévigny and the position of Librarian.

I warn the Government that if Mr. Sevigny is placed at the Library, when the Liberals come into power and after the next election, we would be at your right, Sir, I, for one, and many like me, will insist upon our leaders to cancel that nomination and have the position filled by one that deserves such a position and can show the record of a man and not the record of a Victrola.

Mr. Speaker, the Government is giving a trial to State ownership of railways. So far, the experiment has not proved a tremendous success, and if we are to believe the latest reports, we are going to face a deficit of twenty million dollars.

And no wonder, if we are to judge from the way the business is managed. We had in the city of Rivière-du-Loup splendid locomotive and car shops which had cost over half a million dollars and in which nearly two hundred men worked successfully.

With a view to accommodating the engine works and the employees, the city council of Rivière-du-Loup had municipalized electricity and the water-power, and shouldered a heavy debt.

But when the locomotive and engine works had to be accommodated at St. Malo, in the interest of the National Transcontinental and the Northern Canadian, the Joliette works were closed, 25 machinists were removed from the Rivière-du-Loup shops and 105 men were ordered away from the latter place, to be transferred to St. Malo from now up to May 1.

The removal of a hundred employees, many of whom with families, that means a loss of over 500 people to rivière-du-Loup. Shops are degraded, a city is ruined, a minority of tax-payers are staggering under a heavy debt, which to a large degree has been created in the interest of the shops and employees removed from the city; a whole division is disorganized, everything is thrown into confusion, and now people wonder that so many railway accidents occur on the Northern Canadian and such disorder in the administration is prevailing.

In view of such mismanagement by the Canadian Northern Commission, which had pledged itself not to interfere with the interests of Rivière-du-Loup, all that remains for us to do is to register our protest today, to protest again when the Railway Estimates come before the House, and to go on protesting, until justice is done to the city of Rivière-du-Loup.

Mr. Speaker, I must congratulate the leader of the Opposition on having brought down the amendment which we are requested to consider. It was about time to reassure public opinion, poisoned as it was, every day, by newspapers devoted to the ministry. We could read, every day, that the Liberals were eager to go to the people. Well, this amendment will bring that legend to an end, and the public, anxious to get rid of the incapable men by whom we are governed, will feel grateful to the Liberal party for having so gallantly demanded an election.

In concluding my remarks, Sir, I may point out, as the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe has said, that the province of Quebec is biding its time, not for purposes of revenge, for we, in the province of Que-

bec, are ignorant of that word, for the reason, first, that it is unchristian, and that it does not suit the chivalresque nature of the French race; but we are biding our time to ascertain whether the insulters of the eve and the would-be peace-makers of the morrow are sincere or not, whether their regrets dwell in their hearts or on their lips, and then, but then only shall we choose our allies. All we ask in the province of Quebec, is that our religion, our language and our customs be respected, that we should be treated on an equal footing; we are born of a race which has no reason to be ashamed of its past, we who wish to remain the loyal subjects of the Empire, but with all the liberties implied in that status. When this has been understood by the enemies of our race in this country, we shall have peace and justice, harmony and liberty in a rejuvenated Canada soaring towards the brightest destinies which it is possible for a country like ours to dream of.

Mr. ROBERT JAMES MANION (Fort William and Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, I unfortunately have not sufficient facility in the French language to follow completely the speech of my hon. friend (Mr. Gauvreau), but I must say that I am sometimes struck with the fact that there are people in Quebec and people in Ontario who think too much of their respective provinces and forget the Dominion of Canada as a whole. I personally have and always have had, and I hope always will have, the most friendly feelings for the people of Quebec, and I think those from that province who know me understand that I have those feelings. But I have no sympathy—I am not referring to my hon. friend (Mr. Gauvreau)—for any man from Quebec who is an extremist any more than I have sympathy for the man from Ontario who is an extremist.

The hon. member made a statement regarding the appointment of a librarian. I do not know Mr. Sévigny; I have no knowledge of him whatever; I have never met him; but I take it from the remarks of the previous speaker that, if it is necessary to have Mr. DeCelles, who is a personal friend of mine, and for whom I have the highest esteem, replaced—and I trust that will not be necessary, because I think a great deal of him—my hon. friend would object to Mr. Sévigny receiving the appointment. He did not give his grounds for his objection, but I sincerely hope that he is not objecting merely on the grounds of differences of political opinion.

I should like to join with those other speakers who preceded me in offering my felicitations to the mover and the seconder of the Address. It is true that hon. gentlemen to whom the honour falls of moving and seconding the Address are expected, as a rule, to speak in generalities; but when the generalities are placed upon such a high plane, and when they are full of so many ideals to which we should all aspire as were the speeches of the hon. gentlemen a few days ago, we may well rejoice that such capable members have been chosen to move and second the Address.

I should also like to join with those who congratulated ourselves on having the privilege of being members of this Parliament when we moved from the old Museum building into this magnificent edifice. While I join in the congratulations which have been showered upon the architect of this building, I should at the same time, even at the danger of lèse majesté upon architecture, like to sympathise with those hon. gentlemen who occupy the thirty or forty feet of this chamber furthest removed from you, Mr. Speaker, because when any one sits down in that thirty or forty feet of this chamber straining his ears to try—and often vainly—to catch the faintest echoes of some of the whispered conversations which are carried across the floor of this House, he realises that in the construction of this chamber utility was more or less sacrificed to beauty. When I first came into this chamber the other day and sat at this end of it, I was reminded by the distance that you, Sir, were from myself and the difficulty that I had in realising that it was you instead of one of the page boys sitting in the Speaker's chair, of a little incident that happened to me some years ago in the city of New York. I had walked into the rotunda of a hotel and there met a friend of mine who had the previous night visited the Metropolitan Opera House for the first time. He had paid four or five dollars for a seat in a rear balcony to hear Caruso and Farrar, and in telling me something of the distances of the building, he said, disgustedly: "Honest to George, I was a quarter of a mile from the stage." I thought of that incident when I came into this chamber the other day, because the distance seemed almost as great. Therefore, while I congratulate the architect on the beautiful Gothic lines of the building, I sympathize with the hon. members who sit in that thirty or forty feet of which I spoke, and if I may offer any suggestion to the powers that be, I would suggest that they

arrange the seating so that the members of whom I speak may not be entirely excluded from participating in the proceedings of this House.

I have listened with a good deal of interest to the discussion so far in this debate on the Address. As is usual on an occasion like this, almost every subject worthy of discussion has been touched upon, and, I think, despite criticism, that is as it should be, because there is no other time so suitable for discussing a variety of subjects as the early days of a session, when members have an opportunity of offering suggestions to the Government and to this Parliament. I have no intention of giving any long dissertation on any of the subjects which have been discussed; in fact, I shall occupy very few minutes of the time of the House and shall discuss only two or three, or four at most, of the points touched upon in the discussion of the speech from the Throne.

First, with regard to the amendment offered by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King). That amendment in brief is to the effect that the Government should pass a franchise Bill and then bring about a dissolution and go to the country. The leader of the Opposition has been accused of playing politics in this amendment inasmuch as it is claimed that he has no fear of it carrying in this House, and therefore the question is not to be put to trial. I do not accuse him of that, because it is a disputed question whether or not we should go to the country at the present time. I think there are arguments on both sides of the question. However, I have discussed the question in my own constituency with many men who were followers of this Government, Liberals and Conservatives, supporters and friends of mine; and most of those with whom I discussed the question thought that we should not go to the country at the present time. One man who has always been a Liberal, and who I think will support the leader of the Opposition in the next election, expressed himself so strongly as to say that if we went to the country at the present time it would be an unpatriotic act. I must confess that when I hear the argument of patriotism on a question of this kind, I think that possibly there was something in what Dr. Johnson said. But I mention these things simply to show that there are great differences of opinion on this question, and as far as I have been able to gather, the majority opinion is against an election at present.

[Mr. Manion.]

One thing about the amendment that has struck me as rather strange is this: It is in effect a vote of want of confidence, yet proposes that after the Government is given a vote of want of confidence by this House it should still go on and legislate, and put on the statute books of this country a new Franchise Act. That seems to me a little strange, because if a vote of want of confidence were given, the Government would likely dissolve at once and would not attempt to put any legislation on the statute books. To my mind, irrespective of what has been said by other members, the two main arguments against the amendment are these: First, the Franchise Act is not, as implied in the amendment, the only important business to come before the House this session. There are a number of other very important matters which I think should be dealt with before this Parliament dissolves or even prorogues. One important matter that should be dealt with this session is an increase in pensions for disabled soldiers, and more particularly an increase in pensions for dependents of soldiers who lost their lives at the front. In the last session of this Parliament, the Special Committee which was appointed on Re-establishment, brought in a report that the mothers and children of soldiers who had died at the front were inadequately pensioned, and yet so far the Government and this Parliament have done nothing to make those pensions adequate. To my mind, that is a very important matter, and I do not think the House should prorogue before dealing with it.

Then there is the question of shipping, and the question of the Civil Service Act. There are 60,000 Civil Service employees in this country, and according to the press they are very much dissatisfied that classification has not been adopted or disposed of in some way. Then there is another matter on which I think this Government has been lax, and on which I hope they will bring down a policy very soon, and that is the development of our natural resources—a subject which I have brought up on a number of occasions in this House. Perhaps that is not as pressing as a number of other subjects, but I have named two or three, in addition to the new Franchise Act, which should be dealt with by the House as promptly as possible.

Another reason why I do not support this amendment is that, to my mind, it is a vote of want of confidence in the Government, and I have had no particular reason for thinking I should vote want of confi-

dence in this Administration. Political life at any time is not distinguished for the gratitude shown to its participants, and so far as I am concerned, I have no desire to be one of those to say to the members of this Government: Here are your hats, and there is the door. I feel they have done their best, honestly and fairly to give good Government to this country, and I was pleased the other day to hear the Acting Prime Minister (Sir George Foster) make the statement, and I believe sincerely, and it was repeated this afternoon by the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) with equal sincerity, I believe, that this Government has given to Canada the best government it ever had. Another thing that struck me when the Acting Prime Minister made that statement was this: So far as I remember, in the political life of this country there has hardly ever been a government of either political colour of which some member, whether rightly or wrongly, has not been accused of grafting or dishonesty, but I have yet to hear of any shadow of accusation of graft or dishonesty levelled against any member of this Government. I have, therefore, no apologies to make for voting against this amendment, and no apologies to make that I have so far given an honest and fair support to this Government. At the same time, while I am not at all convinced that there is the urgent necessity for an election which is implied in the amendment of the leader of the Opposition. I think that after this session of Parliament it is the duty of this Government to give very serious consideration to the claims that the Union Government has fulfilled the purposes for which it was elected, and that it is time for the people to be given a chance at the polls to elect a group of men, perhaps this same group, or a different one, to handle the affairs of this country. I am not absolutely convinced that the election that is spoken of in the amendment should be indefinitely postponed, because, after all, in a democracy the people must have some say in running the country. Therefore, I repeat, the Government should give serious consideration to that question, and if they feel that the demand for an election is as widespread as it is claimed to be by some, it should be their duty to think of going to the country and giving the people an opportunity to express themselves at the polls.

Regarding the Franchise Act, I think two sentences will suffice, and I think they will cover pretty well what most members on both sides of the House feel regarding a franchise Bill. First, it should be fair and honest, and should be based on sound Canadianism; and the machinery for operating the Act should be as fool-proof and as crook-proof as possible. Furthermore, I think the Government should keep faith with any men and any people to whom they have given a promise, so long as those people have neither been disloyal nor done anything detrimental to good Canadian citizenship.

Now I am going to tread on dangerous ground, particularly for a young member like myself; I refer to the tariff. We have listened in this House for some days now to views upon the tariff, some of which were extreme on opposite sides. We have heard the extreme free traders of the West, or one or two of them, and a few extreme protectionists from the East. I am of the opinion that the sane moderate minded people of this country, and I think that means the majority, will not allow this question to be settled either by extreme protectionists of the East or by extreme free traders of the West. I believe that they will ultimately demand that a thorough investigation be made of this question and that the findings of that investigation be utilized as far as possible in framing a scientific tariff of moderate proportions. In that connection there are three principles which appeal to me. First, any industry of which there is no hope that it will ultimately get to the stage where it does not need to be pap-fed, the stage where it can compete with industries of like nature in other parts of the world, should not be given protection. No further attempt should be made to build it up. The fact that there are a number of industries in this country which have been highly protected for forty or fifty years, and which still claim to be infant industries, is one of the reasons why a great many of the moderate-minded people of this country feel a little disgust with high protection. The second principle which appeals to me is that if fifteen per cent of protection is enough to assist a certain industry to compete with the same industry in the United States, there is no reason for giving an industry such as this thirty-five or forty per cent protection. If you give too high a protection to an industry such as this, you simply eliminate completely any competition from other countries, you enable the owners of the industry to overcharge the people of this country, and you may give rise to dangerous combinations in restraint of trade. In other words: A very high tariff

gives no revenue to the country. This was well illustrated the other day in an item that I read from Windsor or Sarnia. The city being very close to Detroit, the people went across the border to get a good many of their supplies. Due to the fact that fifteen or sixteen per cent has been deducted from the value of our dollar by exchange and this amount being added to the existing thirty-five per cent of protection on a great many things that come into this country, there was a practically prohibitive tariff and it cut down the customs house receipts at that port by two-thirds of what they had been before. There was only one-third the quantity of goods being imported. This shows conclusively that a high enough tariff excludes goods altogether and gives no revenue; whereas, with a moderate tariff you would receive a certain amount of revenue as well as afford a certain amount of protection. The third principle is that your tariff on luxuries may be as high as you wish but your tariff on the necessaries of life should be as low as possible.

There is only one other subject that I wish to touch upon, very briefly, and that is the question of Canada's status in the League of Nations. Recently the hon. the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) and the hon. the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighten) have been making a number of speeches in the country that I think ought to appeal to Canadians. Canada's magnificent war record, the fact that she entered the lists among the very first to fight Prussianism and the fact that she gave more lives in the cause of freedom than did the United States, has not prevented some senators of the United States from suggesting that Canada should take second place to a number of unimportant countries, more particularly some Central American and South American republics. Here is the list of a few of the countries to which Canada is asked to take second place: Brazil, Bolivia, Cuba, Haiti, Liberia, Portugal, Peru, Denmark and the Kingdom of Siam. These are only a few that I might mention but they are much less important countries than Canada, they made very much less sacrifice than Canada, and in fact many of them made no sacrifice in the war whatever. I believe that the Canadian people are not in any mood to give up any of the attributes of nationhood which they won with the lifeblood of their sons.

The right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) has made the statement that in the near future there will be an Imperial Conference, and the Acting Prime Minister (Sir George Foster) stated the other day that it might be held in Canada; at which Conference the status of the self-governing dominions will be decided. Canada will have representatives at that Conference. There are two axioms which appeal to me as a native-born Canadian and which I think should be remembered by those representatives. One of those axioms is that under no circumstances must they agree to any arrangement which will lessen the autonomy, or self-governing powers, of this country. The second is that no great change in the constitutional relations of this country in connection with the other nations of the Empire or of the world shall be made without proper consultation with the Parliament of Canada and perhaps with the whole people of Canada.

For, Sir, Canadians are proud of the high position won by the magnificent services and immense sacrifices of their men at the front; they are jealous of that position which they must guard if they are to fulfil their destiny of building up on the northern half of this continent a great Canadian nation.

Mr. PIUS MICHAUD (Restigouche and Madawaska): Mr. Speaker, I have followed with great interest the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the Throne, and it is my privilege to congratulate both the mover (Mr. Cronyn) and the seconder (Mr. McGregor) on the part which they have taken in it. The hon. mover has given this House much good advice but I am afraid his efforts to convince the supporters of the Government of his good intentions will have little effect. The hon. member advises us "not to fall into the mortal error of mistaking feeling for thought or of substituting mere passion for argument."

Into this new and beautiful building we members of the House of Commons should come with new ideas and never should we express views the adoption of which would not contribute to the welfare of the Canadian people. Since Confederation this Dominion of ours for some reason unknown to me; has been slow in its progress, except for a certain period. We have had great statesmen, we have great resources; our lands, our forests, our mines and our fisheries are equal to any in the whole world. We have developed to a certain extent many of our natural resources, we have built railways, and developed our harbours; our transportation facilities are equal to the demand to handle in a comparatively satisfactory manner the products of the country. What is wrong? The policy of the present Government? We are asking

the Government to-day to make an appeal to the people of this country. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) has faith in the Canadian people and we are asking for an appeal to them which will be refused, I am sure, by the supporters of the Government. We can trust the people. If we do not do so we have no right to be here.

There is great unrest in the country, especially amongst the returned soldiers. What are the reasons for that unrest? One great reason is that many of our men came back from the front in poor health with very little means of subsistence and since their return a great number of them have had to be supported by their relatives. They spent months and years in the trenches at a dollar and ten cents a day, whereas in this country lots of people have made millions of dollars. The war has impoverished many and has enriched certain classes. What we need in this country is a large influx of immigrants, not artisans—immigrants who can engage successfully in the great industry of agriculture. These new comers should be drawn from the rural districts of the old country and not from the cities, of whose denizens we have had too many in past years.

What must be termed the great calamity of the present century is the ambition of some people to make too much money. We have been fighting for the cause of humanity and to ameliorate the condition of the smaller nations. To-day in Europe widows and orphans are stretching out their hands to the United States and Canada asking for bread and clothing. The currency of those countries has been so much debased that it is worth very little at the present time, and thousands of these poor sufferers are actually in need of the necessities of life. It is really too bad when realizing how many thousands of men have been sacrificed in the recent great struggle that we are taking such little interest in their poverty-stricken families. Now that the war is over we must forget class feeling and antagonism and go to the rescue of the nations that are so greatly in need of assistance, especially those that we reckoned as our allies.

There is something wrong with our commercial system when it is possible for such great sufferings to occur without the means of redress. Foch has said that "equality of gold should follow equality of blood," and in this sentiment I concur. It is rather amusing, Mr. Speaker, to hear some of the great financiers of this country calling upon the Government to cease borrowing money —to hear them preaching economy and hard work by all classes. I remember not very long ago reading an expression of some such views by Sir Edmund Walker. I wonder if this is the same gentleman who advised the Government not to borrow money when we were buying the Canadian Northern railway. Lord Beaverbrook has called upon the women of the world to give up their gold in order to save the country. These also are noble sentiments. Are these people sincere? I hope they are, but they should at least be prepared to practise what they preach.

It is very timely to ask the question, what is wrong with the country? The more we inquire the more we learn that the National Policy of the present Government has not given satisfaction. There is unrest and dissatisfaction abroad, and an appeal to the country will permit of an unmistakable and unequivocal expression from the people. Therefore the amendment before the House is very timely. By appealing to the people we shall show our confidence in them and we must not fail to respect their views. The popular verdict will be for the advantage of Canada. The present Government seems to entertain a fear of the people at the present time, and does not want an appeal to the country. That in itself seems to suggest that there is something wrong. Let us appeal to the people at once. Let us ascertain what they think of the high cost of living, and whether they are not in favour of reducing the present high taxes on the necessities of life, the imposts on clothing, boots and shoes, farming implements and so forth.

In conclusion let me say that I shall vote for the amendment in the hope that by its means we shall be able to appeal to the people and ascertain what their views are on the vital questions of the day.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON (Muskoka): I would like at the outset to join with other hon. gentlemen, even at the risk of being a little tiresome, in congratulating the mover (Mr. Cronyn) and the seconder (Mr. Mcgregor) of the Address upon their notable contributions to the debate. The effort of the mover was, I think, worthy of that great relative of his, who for so many years adorned the popular Chamber and whose voice was so successful in the past in shaping the policies of one of the great political parties. The hon. member for London (Mr. Cronyn), in moving the Address, brought to his task a great deal of ability, a great deal of study, and produced a finished effort creditable alike to him and to his great relative Hon. Edward Blake.

I would like also in passing to offer my congratulations to the leader of the Opposition who has this session for the first time taken the actual lead of his party. As that hon. gentleman looks back over the names of the illustrious men who have adorned the position he now occupies I hope that he may be stimulated to guide his party wisely, sanely, and well.

Before proceeding further I would like to associate myself with other hon. gentlemen in supporting the stand taken by the different members of the Government in opposing what is known as the Lenroot resolution in the American Congress. Canada has gone too far in its progress amongst the nations of the world to be content with a position restricted merely to the northern part of this continent, and before the present session prorogues I would like to see a resolution passed by the House backing up the Government's stand and insisting that Canada be given her full status as a nation of the British Empire.

I feel like apologizing to the House by entering upon the discussion of matters that more properly pertain to the Budget—

Mr. CLARK: Not at all.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON—but I agree with the member for Red Deer that the debate on the Address is the great "free for all" the great opportunity that members have of laying before the House, and consequently before the country, at the beginning of the session, their ideas, in order that the Government may shape its policy according to the wishes of the people. And it is for that reason and partly to correct some misstatements that have been made in this House that I ask you at this late hour to bear with me for a few minutes while I discuss matters which as I said, more properly belong to the Budget debate

Now, Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said, and I think rightly said, in this debate about the exchange situation not only in Canada but throughout the world. It has been rightly said, I claim, because that is one of the disturbing influences in commerce to-day. I may say that I think the member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) was a little bit hasty and, perhaps, a little bit sarcastic in telling the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) that he did not know even the A.B.C. of the economic principles that govern these matters because that gentleman asked him a simple question or two. I was especially astonished a few minutes later when the hon. member for Marquette asked the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) a question which, to use an expression of his own, was simplicity itself. He asked the hon. minister to explain how it was that previous to 1911, when Canada had an adverse trade balance, her exchange was at par or nearly so—not knowing evidently, as he should have known, if he had gone at all into this question, that previously to that year Canada had been borrowing some five or six hundred million dollars a year from the Old Land.

What are the principles underlying the depression in exchange to-day? The first principle is, of course, the post-war conditions which have led to a heavy adverse balance of trade in many places; another, the abandonment of the gold redemption made necessary by the large issue of paper money; and a third, the diminution of the gold reserve, made necessary in many countries by the export of large quantities of specie. I might say, in passing, that I was rather surprised to hear the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) state that an adverse balance of trade of any kind had, in his opinion, very little to do with the exchange situation.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): Might I explain to my hon. friend that I ought perhaps to have been a little more explicit in my statement. I am sure that my hon. friend would not wish to misunderstand, and still less to misrepresent me. When I said that in my judgment there was little connection between the so-called adverse balance of trade and the adverse exchange rate, I meant, and I thought the House would understand me as meaning, that there was little connection as between cause and effect. My hon. friend is a medical man and knows the difference in disease between a cause and a symptom. I meant there was little or no connection between them as related to cause and effect, and I thought I explained afterwards that they are both symptoms of a disease, the characterization of which I did not wish to attempt.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON: I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that I am the last one who would wish to misrepresent the hon. member for Red Deer. His statement was that before 1911 Great Britain always had an adverse balance of trade, that the British sovereign "spoke all languages," and that British credit was the highest in the world. My point is simply that had it not been for other conditions British exchange

would not have been at par. I am sure he will agree with me when I state that before 1911—and even now for that matter—Britain was the great carrying nation of the world, and it was the receipts from her great mercantile marine that helped to keep the British sovereign at its high point. Then may I remind him also that not only was Britain the great carrying nation of the world, but she was the great money market of the world, and the interest on her foreign loans was also a great factor in keeping British exchange from where it would have been had she relied only on her trade. Before the war Great Britain had no less than $19,000,000,000 loaned to other countries. When we conceive of the interest on that vast sum and take into consideration, as I said, the large receipts from her shipping, we have there the reason why the adverse balance of trade was offset and the British sovereign stood on the highest pinnacle of finance.

And I might just add this for the comfort of those who have any doubt as to the ultimate solution of this exchange question. Great Britain is still the great carrying nation of the world, and she is still, in spite of her external debts, the great money market of the world. The $19,000,000,000 that she had loaned to other countries before the war has been reduced, it is true, but it is still somewhere in the neighbourhood of $13,000,000,000, while her external debts are in the neighbourhood of $6,000,000,000, leaving a balance in her favour of about $8,000,000,000 in foreign lands. I am confident that in the near future British exchange is going to rapidly recover—in fact, it is rapidly recovering now, and I think inside of the next twelve months we will have an entirely different state of affairs as far as Great Britain is concerned, and possibly by that time the British sovereign will have regained its old place. Why do I say that, Mr. Speaker, I have already given you two reasons for the cause of the present exchange situation. A third reason, to my mind, will be the great tourist traffic to see the battlefields, which will help to increase the value of the British sovereign.

Another factor is this, and it is of importance in its bearing not only on this country but on nearly every country with which Great Britain will do business, and what I say regarding Great Britain will apply in a more or less degree to Canada: At a word from the war office in 1914 the whole machinery of Great Britain was scrapped. What took its place? Instead of machines requiring skilled mechanics behind them, the best brains of Great Britain were put to work to produce fool-proof machinery. They succeeded. They have also increased their army of working men by hundreds of thousands. These men have been taught to use the lathe, the micrometer and the gauge, and where before you had tens of thousands of skilled men you now have them in their hundred thousands. She has also greatly improved her ports and her railways—this affords me an opportunity of congratulating our Government on their shipbuilding programme and their amalgamation of our railways, because I think that policy is going to be a great factor in our national trade—I say that Great Britain has improved her ports, she has improved the calibre of her working men and of her machine shops, she is still the great money market of the world and the great carrying nation of the world; and when she gets through, as she will before very many more months, buying millions of dollars every day of food and materials from the American republic and paying for them in cash, not for herself but to turn over to the starving nations of Europe on credit, we will have a different condition in the exchange situation of the world. What applies to England will apply more or less to Canada. If the time comes in the near future when we can collect from Britain, the exchange situation so far as Canada and the United States are concerned will very rapidly improve. I say, therefore, that the time is coming when we shall not be able to buy cheaply from Great Britain and sell to advantage to United States, on account of the exchange rate.

I see difficulties and dangers for Canada as a result of this condition. The ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) pointed out this afternoon what we all, of course, know, that the German mark has depreciated from about twenty-three cents down to about one cent. Only to-day or yesterday we have seen in the press a report to the effect that the Supreme Council of the Allies are arranging for a large industrial loan to put Germany on her feet. That loan is to have priority upon the assets that were to secure the liability of Germany to the Allied nations. When Germany gets established, if the exchange rate is anything like what it is now, I see difficulty in Canada's upholding her position in the commercial world. I was told last session—probably many of you have heard of the same thing—that a certain firm needed a certain kind of machinery

which in this country or in United States would cost $2,600. They bought it in Germany, paid the duty and practically had it set down in their work shops for $650. I make no comments upon the patriotism of that firm; they were probably doing good business. But I do say that the difficulty involved in the conditions respecting the exchange rate may be very hurtful to the industrial life of Canada.

The member for Marquette (Hon. Mr. Crerar) stated in so many words that what we called protection was a tax on the many for the benefit of the few. Mr. Speaker, I do not hold that opinion. A tax it may be, if you wish to call it so; but it is a tax to keep up the established industries of our country—industries which, as time has proved, are of great benefit to Canada. I do not think it is fair to repeat the assertion that moderate protection is a tax on the many for the benefit of the few. As the ex-Minister of Finance put it this afternoon, it is a machinery for developing our great industries and our great natural resources so that we can take the natural product worth one dollar, and, by the application of Canadian labour and Canadian skill, we can increase the value to three or four dollars, export the product and realize that increased value. I would like to see the products of our forests manufactured into lumber and pulp, a proper system of reforestation being carried on in the meantime. I would like to see a proper return obtained in Canada from our fisheries. I would like to see our wheat ground in this country so that the farmers could have the bran and shorts which they are so much in need of. I would like to see our minerals refined here; I would like to see Canada get the full benefit of her great natural resources. I am absolutely opposed to exporting our raw material to other countries. We have a very good example of the effect of that in Ontario. A few years ago American lumbermen would buy our logs, take them over to the other side and saw them there, the money being used to build up the American republic. What happened when that procedure was forbidden? The American mills moved over to this side; the work is done in Canada; the money is spent in Canada; Canada gets the benefit.

10 pm.

The member for Marquette went down to New Brunswick on the occasion of the last by-election there, and the press reported him as having advocated the abolition of all duties. I do not know whether or not they reported him correctly. I put the question to him on the floor of the House the other night and he said that if I would wait I would get an answer. I have patiently waited for the answer. When he came to that part of his speech in which he dealt with the raising of the revenue he laid down two planks in his platform. First he said he would tax luxuries. Yes; so we all would. But are they not taxed now? Not enough, my hon. friend says? Then I say tax them more; I would tax them to the highest possible degree. But I would remind my hon. friend that last year the value of luxuries that came into Canada was only $88,000,000; the revenue required if we do away with the protective tariff is $170,000,000.

Then, my hon. friend said that he put on an income tax. Have we not an income tax now? Perhaps it is not producing enough money; I shall not quarrel with my hon. friend if it is simply a matter of administration. But if the rate is not high enough, why does my hon. friend not say how high he would put it? He was a member of this Government when these taxes were being imposed; did he ever oppose them as being too low? These, then, are the only two methods that he suggests of raising the $170,000,000 to take the place of the protective tariff. I shall refer later to what that would mean to the poor man of this country, to the working man, to every man. If there is one thing this Government and every Government have to do, it is to keep their hands off the farmer's means of living. He finds it hard enough to live as it is.

The member for Marquette also said—I think I am quoting him correctly; I would not like to do otherwise—that eighty per cent of our revenue was raised by taxation of foodstuffs. I am not just sure that he used the word "foodstuffs," but that is the meaning I took out of what he said.

Mr. M. CLARK: For consumption.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON: I thank the hon. member for the correction. I have taken the trouble to go through the tariff to a certain extent, and I want the House to bear with me for a few moments while I cite some of the items. I am speaking now of revenue. Last year we raised on spirituous liquors, wines, sparkling and non-sparkling, which are getting rapidly to be a thing of the past, alcoholic perfumes, silks, fruits, green and dried, nuts, jewellery, $11,731,000. I may be met with the statement that these were for consumption. Some of them no doubt were, but I do not think they were in the class referred to by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr.

Crerar). With regard to the duty on coal—and of course the House knows that this refers chiefly to soft coal used by railways, factories and so on—we raised $7,594,000 last year. On iron and steel products—and in this I am eliminating all farm implements, over $25,265,000 was collected. On a number of items such as blacking, brushes, cartridges, rifles, pistols, cineomotograph (moving picture) films, fancy goods, jewellery, musical instruments, optical instruments, photographic supplies, small express parcels, pencils, polishes and a number of other miscellaneous articles, $5,455,000 was collected. On animal and vegetable products such as furs, feathers, etc., $4,315,000 was collected. On plated ware, silver and such like, we collected $3,054,000. On ores, metals and metal manufactures other than iron and steel, we collected $6,250,000, and on wood, wood products and paper, we collected $5,090,000. If we total all this up, including the war tax, we shall find that in groups of that kind we collected last year duty amounting to no less than the large sum of $90,000,000. I have not the least doubt in the world that if I had had time to go through the list and pick them out, I could have added to that list materially, but I think I have produced sufficient evidence to prove to this House that the statement referred to is, to say the least, not very accurate. I object to statements going out to the country that 80 per cent of the revenue of Canada is collected on articles of consumption. When we make in this House statements that are going out to the press and to the people of this country, we ought, at least, to try to be fairly accurate.

I come to the revenues to which some of our friends object most. I refer first to the revenue collected on boots and shoes. I have not been able to get the latest figures for this year, but the hon. member for Parry Sound (Mr. Arthurs) last year placed upon Hansard some figures that I think hon. members ought to remember. He quoted from the latest returns of that date, and we find that only $934,000 or less than a million dollars, had been paid in duty on boots and shoes entering Canada. There are two classes of boots; there is the ordinary boot such as the farmer's or workingman's boot, and then there is the high-class boot. On the first class to which I refer it will be found that only about $3,000 was paid in duty. That is, only $3,000 was paid in duty on workingmen's shoes that come into this country. What does that mean? It means that the Canadian-made boot was either a better or a cheaper article and evidently a better seller than the American boot. My hon. friends may say, as probably they will, that that indirectly contributed to the manufacturers' profit. I am not here to defend the manufacturers; I am not interested in their case; I am interested only in the general welfare of the people of this country. I am not a manufacturer not related to any manufacturer; neither do I own any stock in any of their institutions; but I am interested in the question of what is fair and just in the general interest of Canada, and when the Government of this country collects a duty of only $3,000 upon the shoes of all the workingmen of this country, that duty is not excessive. The hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Euler), I think, last year also placed on Hansard figures in regard to this matter, and he showed that the difference in price between the high class shoe in Canada and the same shoe in the United States was only about equal to the duty that is paid on the raw material. I am not arguing for the manufacturers, but I say that the hon. member's statement has never been contradicted, and if it be true, it shows that the tariff is not a means of putting money into people's pockets as it is sometimes claimed it is.

I want just for a moment to refer to agricultural implements. Let me say here again that I am quoting from the speech made by the hon. member for Parry Sound (Mr. Arthurs) the figures he put on Hansard last year showed that the total duty paid on agricultural implements, including the war tax of 7½ per cent, was only $6,117,000, or equal to about 7 cents per acre. The hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) I think it was, made a similar statement at the same time, namely, that the duty paid by the average man in the West on agricultural implements, figuring the farm at 355 acres, was only $25. I am not assuming that is too much or too little, but I do not think it is excessive. I want to remind the House that these figures are the figures preceding the reduction of last year, and, as hon. members know, last year there was a reduction in duty from 27½ per cent to 17½ per cent, and in some cases, to 15 per cent.

Let me point this out in passing. Last year there came into this country free of duty no less than $390,000,000 worth of goods, and that is something I think our friends opposite ought to remember. Another fact that might interest hon. members is that last year in the three western pro-

vinces there were no less than 100,000 automiles. If we value them at, say $1,000 apiece, we would have $100,000,000 invested in automobiles.

I do not think the provinces that can invest $100,000,000 in automobiles should grumble very much in post-war days at paying a few dollars duty on agricultural implements, when we have in Canada a population of 8,000,000 and a debt of two billion dollars. Suppose we take the hon. member at his word and wipe out all this duty and raise by direct taxation the $170,000,000 that we now raise by the tariff. I am interested more in the workingman than anybody else, and what would that mean for the workingmen of this country? It would mean $21 per head, and taking the average family as five—husband, wife and three children—you would have a tax of $105 per family per year. Do you think such a tax should be placed on the workingmen of this country? I do not. Furthermore, when you take into account those who cannot pay, how large a tax would you have to impose on the people who could pay?

Suppose you put a tax on farm lands. The farm lands of Canada are valued at about $4,000,000,000. It would mean that we would have to impose a tax of 4½ per cent on farm values, which on a farm worth $5,000, which is the average price set by the Soldier Settlement Board, would mean an annual tax of $225 on every farm. Are our friends willing to pay that?

We have to have a policy in this country that will develop all our resources, so that we may stand as a unit before the world. While agriculture is the basic industry in Canada, it is not everything. I have in my hand statistics for 1919 of agricultural and manufacturing valuations. First, take agriculture. I find that the capital invested in land was $2,792,229,000; buildings, $927,548,000; implements, $387,079,000; and live stock, $1,102,261,000—or a total of $5,209,117,000. The total agricultural production that year was $1,546,541,000. It is something we should be proud of and should encourage in every possible way, but is not the only thing. Let me remind the House that 85 per cent of the production of our farms is consumed in Canada. Let us now look at the other side. The capital invested in the manufacturing plants of this country was as follows: Land, buildings and fixtures, $705,926,161; machinery and tools, $868,422,191; materials on hand, stocks in process, etc., $692,242,994; cash, trade and operation account, $520,058,381; or a total of $2,786,649,727. Production was no less than $3,015,577,940, making a grand total of over $5,802,000,000. So there is not so very great difference between the two after all. Last year the manufacturers had in their employ 692,067 persons, and they paid out in wages, $553,301,675. Taking the agricultural population of this country as 40 per cent of the whole, and figuring out the male population, we see that there are not very many more people engaged in agriculture than in the manufacturing industries of this country.

I do not want to be misunderstood. I am in favour of doing everything that can be done to promote the great basic industry of agriculture in this country. I agree with the hon. member for Marquette that we have as yet only touched the fringe. We have over a billion 400 million acres of land in this country, over 30 per cent of which is supposed to be arable, and we have under cultivation only the comparatively small area of 53,000,000 acres. I should like to see the whole available area under cultivation, and our western provinces filled with population of the right kind. This question of population is one of the big problems before this country. I have said before in this House that I believed if we took down the barriers and allowed people to come into this country we could double our population in a few years. I noticed the other day that the New York Herald stated that in the lifetime of people now living in Canada we would have a population of 50,000,000, and I do not think that estimate will be very much out. I have given these figures to show the importance of these twin industries, as I might call them, and in the hope that we may look at these things from a broad standpoint, rather than from the standpoint of how any particular section or province will be affected. Let us consider the matter in a broad way and without regard to the effect our decision may have on our political future.

I want to refer for a moment to the Franchise Act. The member for Marquette said we must have an honest franchise and honest machinery to operate it. So say we all, but he spoiled it by saying a few moments afterwards that he would give to Germans in Canada who had German brothers or other relatives fighting against us at the front the right to help determine the destinies of Canada even in the midst of a war. I want to register my most emphatic protest against any such proceeding. I am told by those who know that if the fran-

chise had been extended to these people in 1917, as the hon. member proposes should be done, he would not be representing the constituency of Marquette in this House to-day; I do not know whether that is true or not. I know that the principle this country has to stand for in the future is that of sound Canadianism. The people will not stand for anything else. They will not stand for politicians keeping their eyes on their own constituencies, and framing a franchise that will re-elect them to this House to preside over the destinies of this country.

There is just one more thing and that is the amendment that is before the House. I do not have to tell this House, I hope, what I am going to do. I do not believe for one moment in the sincerity of this resolution. I do not believe that there are ten men outside of Quebec—no, nor five—who do. I ask the leader of the Opposition: Is he ready for an election in Ontario? What happened to his party in the last provincial election? What happened to the boast of the gentleman at present leading the Opposition in the province of Ontario who said he would put up a man against the Attorney General, the Minister of Agriculture and the Premier of the province? Ask the hon. member for East Kent (Mr. McCoig) what happened when that leader turned up in that constituency for the purpose of putting a man in the field. The leader was told to go home and mind his own business. As everybody knows, the minister got his election by acclamation. Does the leader of the Opposition mean to tell me that his member from West Lambton, or Middlesex, or East Kent, where they were practically wiped out at the last election, is ready to go back and appeal to the people? He may say so, but he does not mean it. Bad and all as the proposition is, I would have more respect for him but for his slander upon the health of the Prime Minister of Canada. What does he say? In effect this: We want to vote this Government out, but we will let them stay for a couple of months to pass a Franchise Bill. He knows, if he knows, anything, that inside of two months the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) will be back in this House. Why could he not have withheld his resolution till the Prime Minister was here? Would not that be the honourable, gentlemanly and sportsmanlike thing to do? The Prime Minister, who broke himself down in the service of this country in the great war, is away now trying to regain his health, and they come along with a resolution to vote him out of power. They ask this party to play the traitor to their leader during his absence. The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) never said a truer word than when, in his speech the other day, he said that Sir Robert Borden was as real a casualty of the war as if he had served in the front line trenches. Yet they come along with a resolution to vote him out. If the leader of the Opposition had served in the trenches overseas with some of us, he would have known that it was not the custom of the Canadian boys to shoot down their leader who had been wounded on the field of battle.

Mr. JAMES McISAAC (Kings, P.E.I.): Mr. Speaker, at this late hour I desire to make a few remarks on the question before the House. I shall endeavour to confine myself reasonably close to the subject matter of this resolution. There are many questions of vast importance that could be discussed, and some of them have been discussed during the debate. I am sure there will be ample opportunity later on, when these different questions come up in their order, to give them ample consideration and discussion.

I wish even at this advanced stage of the debate to add my congratulations to those which have been so generously and deservedly accorded to the mover (Mr. Cronyn) and seconder (Mr. McGregor) of the Address before the House upon the admirable manner in which they have discharged the important duty resting upon them. I wish also to refer to that which constitutes the subject of the first paragraph in the speech from the Throne and to say a word, however humble, by way of congratulation to ourselves upon being able to assemble in these magnificent new Parliament Buildings. Buildings of this character constitute important elements in the history of every country and go far to afford some idea of the character of the people, their tastes and aspirations. This magnificent architectural pile, erected as the home of Canada's legislators, is destined in the ordinary course of events to continue for years to come, to pass down the ages and athwart the centuries, standing as emblematic of Canada's greatness. The vast extent of this magnificent structure, its architectural beauty and symmetry surely go far to symbolize our greatness, the loftiness of our hopes and aspirations for Canada's important, honourable and distinguished place in the galaxy of nations. Here we might say that this magnificent, this beautiful architectural treasure crystallizes

the thought, the aspirations and the distinguished achievements of the great Canadian people. There is another thought that presents itself to me which may not be inappropriately associated with this subject, and it is that the rebuilding of this magnificent House of Parliament synchronizes, in greater part, with the heroic efforts of our soldiers abroad when they were writing glorious pages in the history of the Dominion and distinguishing themselves by their bravery, their prowess and sacrifices on behalf of Canada, the Empire and civilization.

The thought of war and the mention of battle suggests this other idea—that here, in this arena of the people, we strive one with another for the mastery, that we enter into combats not with mortal weapons but strive with intellectual rapiers, that one may win over the other. These struggles continuing down through the ages while the Parliament of Canada continues to meet and assemble in this stately building.

Having said so much by way of introduction I would like briefly to refer to some of the subjects touched upon in the speech from the Throne. So far as the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) is concerned, the speech did not seem to please him at all. He considered that it did not contain sufficient matter; he thought it was very meagre and that it constituted "a poor bill of fare." If I might indulge in a play upon words I think it was "a pretty fair bill." However, from the very start the leader of the Opposition found fault that there was not enough of the legislation intended to be discussed during the present session foreshadowed in the speech from the Throne. If I remember rightly, and if my knowledge is sufficient, I think it is not customary in our day to anticipate very much of the legislation to be submitted to Parliament in the speech that is placed in the mouth of the representative of His Majesty, because from day to day the facilities exist for expeditiously and easily placing before Parliament and the public the matters that may be decided upon by the Government for legislative action during any particular session. Therefore I do not think any serious complaint can be made on that particular score, and so the objection referred to is not very tenable or very well founded. The whole attitude of the leader of the Opposition, having reference to the subject matter of the speech and the course of the Government, was throughout one of dissatisfaction and fault finding. The hon. gentleman seemed to have drawn his inspiration from the sensational headings of articles in the newspapers and to have supplied what might therein be lacking by drawing upon his own lively imagination.

The hon. gentleman declared and repeated that the present administration led by Sir Robert Borden was unpopular and it was therefore time that it should resign. Let me discuss that point for a moment. The word "popular" has a variety of meanings and I think that perhaps, using the term in its best sense, it will be found on analysis and on investigation that the present Government is a most popular one. This is a Government that did things not only during the war but in peace times. It has been, and is still, engaged in great projects that tend to promote the national interests regardless of whether they may be popular or not. The carrying on of war, I think all will agree, is not a very popular undertaking. When Canada became involved in war and when it became necessary to do everything that was possible to draw upon the resources of the country and to strain every nerve to see that our share in the struggle should be in the highest degree successful it was altogether likely that the Government would be obliged to do a great many things that the leader of the Opposition and a great many other persons would not regard as popular. But the measures adopted by the Government were for the national interests, were for the maintenance of our liberty, were for the safety of our country and our Empire, and generally speaking, for the preservation of civilization. In order that our share in the struggle should be as full, comprehensive and successful as it was possible to be, the Government of Canada, under the leadership of Sir Robert Borden did everything that could be done, and they succeeded to an eminent degree in their undertakings.

It seemed to me that in the course of his address the leader of the Opposition scarcely mentioned the word "war." One would almost think from hearing his speech that there had been no war at all within the last few years. Certainly one would scarcely gather from what the hon. gentleman said that there had been anything of the kind. I do not know exactly what the hon. gentleman's attitude toward the war was. For all I know it may have been one of benevolent or inocuous neutrality. There was nothing it his speech to indicate that he was at all deeply interested in the triumphant outcome of the war, and that he would be willing to make any sacrifices or to put forth

any extraordinary exertions in order that Canada's efforts might be successful.

The leader of the Opposition in his references to the Prime Minister seemed to consider that the latter should be here under all circumstances and at all times. I do not think such an argument is a very forcible or substantial one. If we consider the Imperial Parliament we all know that the British Premier, the Right Hon. Lloyd George is very frequently absent from the House at Westminster; and in the case of the leader of this Government there are ample reasons for his absence from this Chamber. Every one knows that the arduous labours of the Prime Minister, his extraordinary exertions, his long continued vigilance and his anxiety during the prosecution of the war that it might have a successful outcome and that Canada might succeed in all she had therein undertaken, as well as the important legislation that was rendered necessary after the war closed, broke down Sir Robert Borden's health, and he was obliged to seek in another climate the renewal of his strength and the regaining of his shattered health. Surely no one would be so ungenerous as not to afford the right hon. gentleman such respite as might be necessary in order to enable him to regain his health. I would like, for a moment, to point out that even some hon. gentlemen who have stated that they intend to vote in favour of the amendment of the leader of the Opposition have been sufficiently generous to accord the Prime Minister his due meed of praise for the most important part which he has played in the administration of the affairs of the country during the last five years.

I will quote first from the remarks of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) which will be found on page 151 of unrevised Hansard, where he says:

> I wish here and now simply to bear testimony to this fact that the Prime Minister of this country carried a burden which very few citizens of Canada appreciated, and discharged the most onerous tasks with a conscientiousness and sense of duty that certainly challenged the respect of those who were intimately associated with him.

Notwithstanding that the hon. member for Marquette intends to support the leader of the Opposition on this amendment, he is sufficiently fair minded, generous and truthful to make that declaration regarding the leader of the Government.

The hon. leader of the Opposition in the course of his speech said that this Government had no policy, and that it had no leader, and then in the next breath he said that it had three leaders. Let us take up the matter of policy and of leadership. What is the policy of the Government regarding the carrying on of our national affairs, and what is their position regarding the leadership? Not so long ago there was a locum-tenens in the leadership of the Opposition, and the real leader when he took his seat last session was a kind of supernumerary, so that we had the spectacle of the acting leader of the Opposition and his chief of staff conducting the business. I think we have a somewhat parallel case just now, There is the leader, then he has his chief of staff on his left, and he who was the acting leader is now relegated to third place, and I think, if I am sufficiently familiar with military terms, he fills the place of what might be called an adjutant or helper. Therefore we have the leader, the chief of staff and the helper —a delectable trinity to be sure!

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have the hon. leader of the Opposition concluding his speech by moving an amendment to the Address. It is quite proper and perhaps not unusual to move such an amendment, but it appears to me that an amendment of this nature surely should have some semblance of being based on a question of public policy. What is the public policy upon which this amendment is based? As the hon. member for Red Deer expressed it, it is made up largely of preamble. Well, Sir, preamble is not a very important question of policy. Then after all this preamble it winds up by saying:

> The regrettable protracted absence of the Prime Minister, the widely accepted belief that it is not his intention to return to the duties of his office—

and so on make it necessary that this Parliament should be dissolved and a new Parliament summoned. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman was warranted in saying that he did not expect the Prime Minister might return to his duties. But of course that is in line with most of his expressions of thought throughout his speech, which is largely based on rumour, imagination and speculation. But we have had the very comforting intelligence communicated to us within the last few days that the right hon. Sir Robert Borden, barring unforeseen contingencies, will be back in this House before the session closes, in good health and ready to resume his leadership of the Government.

I would like also to refer to some remarks on this amendment by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), who is distinctly

understood to be a leading member of the new party and who has expressed his intention to vote for the amendment. However, the hon. member is sufficiently generous to accord a meed of praise to the right hon. the leader of the Government. At page 177 of unrevised Hansard he says:

> I do not quite see the force of all the speech of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) in supporting this amendment. Naturally, the speech partook of the nature of what I have ventured to call a preamble. Amongst other things he charged the Government with having no policy.

Further on he says:

> I did not, however, quite understand how my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition could be so light-hearted in charging the Government with having no policy, unless indeed he had gone on to tell what his own policy was.

The member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Levi Thomson) at page 189, adds his tribute of praise to the Prime Minister and expresses regret at his absence. He says:

> I am willing to give the Government credit for everything it has done, especially during the war, and am not inclined to condemn it for all its acts since the war terminated, because I recognize it has had to deal with exceedingly complex problems. The Government is now treading new and unbroken ground and its position is very difficult, very much more difficult than any previous Government in Canada has had to face.

These are the tributes of respect and appreciation that are accorded to the Government by the members of the third party, who intend to vote with the leader of the Opposition on the proposed amendment.

I should like to refer for a moment to the speech of the hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie). As he delivered his speech he seemed to be light-hearted—in the very best of humour. It was a very moderate speech—moderate for him. It abounded in generalities. After listening to him and subsequently reading his speech I said to myself: 'Surely this is a very light performance for an hon. gentleman who occupied such an important position in the councils of his party, although now somewhat degraded from the high office that he held a year ago. I would go further; I would be disposed to regard his speech as a collection of political puerilities. I do not think that many sentences in it were worthy of being embalmed in Hansard. I noticed particularly that the hon. gentleman did not indulge in so many scriptural quotations as was his wont some time ago. I think he might, had he searched the scriptures, have found something that would fit right into his position at the present time. He might have found something like this: "Every one that exalteth himself shall be humbled." He might have found other texts that would be equally applicable. Although the hon. gentleman seemed so light and airy when he was delivering his remarkable speech, perhaps he was not in as good spirits as he would like to have us understand or believe. Perhaps in the secrecy of his chamber he was lamenting in sackcloth and ashes and quoting those words of the great dramatist which were put in the mouth of a really great man: "Farewell, a long farewell to all my greatness!" After listening to his speech I could easily understand why it was that, if I may be permitted to paraphrase the words of the wizard of the North,—

> —from his feeble hand
> Fell the borrowed truncheon of command.

There are several other matters to which I might refer, Mr. Speaker, but the night is somewhat advanced and I do not desire to trespass any further upon the patience of the House. I may say, in conclusion,—although it is, perhaps, not necessary for me to say it—that it will afford me great pleasure to vote against the amendment submitted by the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. WALTER DAVY COWAN (Regina): Mr. Speaker, at this late hour, I promise you, my remarks will be very brief. I intend to vote against the amendment submitted by the leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie King), and to support the motion for the adoption of the address in reply to the speech from the Throne. I offer no excuse whatever for the course that I intend to pursue, in fact, I would have to offer an excuse to myself if I did not take that course. Why should I vote to turn the Government out of office?

The member for Fort William (Mr. Manion) made a statement this afternoon which was sufficiently important to be noted throughout the whole of the country. He said that no charge of corruption had been levelled against the present Government. In our section of the country, Mr. Speaker, the people demand ability on the part of their representatives and strict attention to business; but above all they demand honour, honesty and integrity, and these are things that we have found in the present Government. I have given some attention to political matters in days gone by, and I cannot recall an election fought at any time in connection with which charges of some kind were not made against the party in

power, whether it were Grit or Tory. I do not say whether or not the charges were true, but this much I will say: that while the Opposition—that is, the direct Opposition—has opposed almost everything that the Government has submitted to the House, there has not been even a whisper against the honour, the honesty and the integrity of the members of this Government. That is one reason why I think the Government should remain in power. When I get a man who is naturally honest I want to keep him as long as I can.

Upon what policy has it been suggested by the Opposition or by the cross-benchers that we should appeal to the country? None that I know of. The only reason given is that we should appeal to the democracy of Canada. Well, Sir, it seems to me that this term "democracy" is being horribly overworked in these days. I recall that in the election of 1911 the members of the Tory party to which I belonged—and I offer no excuses for belonging to it; I am not ashamed of the Tory party—were charged with rolling the Union Jack around themselves and making patriots of themselves. The Opposition at that time said, and I rather agreed with them, that they did not have to get out on the housetops and holler out their patriotism; that they were patriotic and everybody knew it. I sometimes felt that they were right. I knew that I was a sufficiently good British subject and that I did not consider it necessary to inform people of that fact. Well, these very same gentlemen who told us at that time that they did not have to get out and holler their patriotism from the housetops are to-day shouting from the same housetops that they are democrats. I am sufficiently a democrat and sufficiently a believer in democracy to make it unnecessary for me to tell it to anybody. One of the reasons why I intend to support this Government is because in my humble opinion every piece of legislation that they have submitted to this House, without a single exception, has been democratic and in the interests of the common people of Canada.

At this late hour I will not go over the list. I am sorry that the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould) is not in his seat, because he comes with the latest expression of opinion from the people of western Canada, his constituency adjoining mine. I should like to know what he has brought back as an expression of opinion from the common, ordinary people of western Canada, a very democratic people, in regard to legislation which has been submitted to this House by the Government and which has been passed. Let me take for instance the question of woman suffrage. Was that a democratic measure? Was it a thing you would expect from an autocratic government? Autocratic, hon. members opposite call it, because, they say, it has made most of its legislation by orders in council. Just in parenthesis, let me say, in the language, I think, of an American, that sometimes we have to enthrone autocracy temporarily in order to save democracy, and that was the case while the war was on. During that period we were all willing to forgive a certain amount of autocracy. But to come back to the point I was making, let me ask whether the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould)—and the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Maharg) was in the West at that time and he can correct me if I am wrong—appealed to the electors of Assiniboia for election in opposition to that democratic measure, namely, woman suffrage? Not a bit of it. He knew better than to attempt to do so. He knew very well that the people were behind the Government in passing that Bill. And the same is true in regard to the Representation Act. At the time of that election this Parliament had before it the Grand Trunk Acquisition Bill. Was that a democratic measure? Was that in the interest of the Canadian people, to take from those who are generally classed as capitalists, and moneyed people, the control of one of the great railway systems of Canada and to vest it in the hands of the common people? Did the hon. member for Assiniboia in that constituency oppose the action of this Government on that particular occasion? I should like to see him or any other person dare to go out into any constituency in western Canada and oppose the Government on that Bill. Similarly, every other Bill that has been brought in by this Government and passed could have been fought out in that constituency. Was it? Never a particle of opposition—

An hon. MEMBER: Prohibition.

Mr. COWAN: You could not take a jug of whiskey into Assiniboia at all. I know that constituency sufficiently well to know that. The people would not have anything to do with it. I will only say that the hon. member for Assiniboia was not elected by whiskey, and if he had opposed the passing of the legislation which we did pass, he would never have been here. What then is the ground upon which—and to-

night I am speaking chiefly to those cross-benchers from the province of Saskatchewan who have seen fit to leave this side and to go over there—they are opposing the present Government? There is only one question upon which there is any difference, and that is the question of the tariff, and I cannot understand the hon. gentlemen taking the position they do take when they do not know what is the policy of the Government which will be submitted to this Parliament on the question of the tariff. Had they waited until after that policy was announced, I could have understood their opposition to a course with which they did not agree. But to take opposition before the Government's policy was announced, on the only question on which there is any difference at all, is quite beyond my comprehension. On the question of the tariff, what is the difference? Free trade against protection? Oh, no. Why, even the leader of the cross-benchers says that he would not enact free trade at one fell swoop. Therefore, according to his own admission, free trade is an utter impossibility for this session or for this Parliament. If he means—and I think this is probably what he has in mind—that five, ten, fifteen, twenty or thirty years from now free trade may be a good policy for this country, then all I can say is that we have no mortgage on brains and ability, and hon. members who come here five, ten, fifteen, twenty or thirty years from now will be quite able to govern this country without our present assistance, and we can leave the future in their hands. What is the sense of speaking about a policy that we cannot enact and which my hon. friends admit we cannot enact at the present time? The only thing, therefore, that is left to us is a possible revision of the tariff, and I think everybody on this side of the House is agreed, because the Minister of Finance at last session announced as a policy of the Government that a revision of the tariff should be made at the earliest possible date, admitting, of course, that such abnormal conditions exist throughout the world at present that a satisfactory revision, one that would endure for any length of time, is quite out of the question. In parenthesis, however, speaking about free trade, let me note what the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark) said in this House yesterday. To me, if I were a free trader, it would come as a body blow. The hon. member is probably the most consistent advocate of free trade we have in this House and, perhaps, in Canada. I like to listen to a man who believes in any policy, persistently advocating it, as he certainly does. He has a knowledge, which I wish I had of the question, but what did he tell us? Up to the present time he has been under the necessity of defending free trade; he believes in it and he has defended it consistently and persistently. But yesterday he was under an entirely different necessity; he had to prove that the adverse balance of trade is not responsible for the adverse exchange. What did he tell us? Why, he said if it were responsible for the adverse exchange, Great Britain long ago would have had an adverse exchange, because the balance of trade has been against Great Britain all these years. So, what free trade produces, is, according to his own admission, an adverse balance of trade. Just the day before an hon. member, I do not remember who, spoke of agricultural conditions in Great Britain under free trade, and he told us that thousands of acres of land had gone out of cultivation and required the stimulus of the war to bring them back to cultivation. Free trade giving us an adverse balance of trade! Free trade giving us depressed agriculture! For goodness sake, who has benefited in Great Britain from free trade? Are these the conditions the hon. gentleman wishes to have imported into this country for us to apply here? An adverse balance of trade and agriculture ruined! I hope not. But that is just in parenthesis. The hon. gentleman made the statement in order to prove that an adverse balance of trade does not produce adverse exchange.

Mr. M. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I must rise to a point of order. My hon. friend is not quoting me correctly. I said, a so-called adverse balance of trade. I never for a moment admitted that the adverse balance of trade, so-called, was really adverse to Great Britain.

Mr. COWAN: The hon. member, however, admitted that there was an adverse balance of trade in Great Britain, and I think statistics prove that he is correct. Let me point this out to the hon. member, that all these years Great Britain has been building up a great monetary system until to-day she is—and she has been for years—the money market of the world, the result being that the wealthy people of Great Britain have their money invested in all parts of the world. Before the war, practically the whole national debt of Canada was carried by the moneyed men of Great Britain as

were also the provincial and municipal debts, all our debentures being sold in Great Britain, and the same may be said of the United States, billions of pounds being invested in that country as in every other country in the world. But, while the adverse balance of trade existed, the interest earned was pouring into Great Britain in great streams and, in that way, counterbalancing the adverse balance of trade. The result was, as the hon. gentleman said, that "the sovereign spoke in all languages." That proves to me, and to every one I should think, that if we are going to exist as a nation we must produce those things that will make us, as far as possible, a self-sustained nation. That leads me to this conclusion, that it is up to us in Western Canada, instead of always cursing the financial interests and our system of protection, to turn in and take advantage of the privileges which are accorded to us under that system. If we develop the industrial resources of Western Canada, as I think we should, far more than we have ever done in the past—and I am certain we can do it—we shall be able to meet many of the objections which hon. gentlemen on the cross benches are urging.

Is the tariff responsible for all of the troubles we have in Canada to-day? Is it entirely responsible for the high cost of everything in this country to-day? If it is then I for one would say, let us wipe it out, because the cost of living in Canada to-day is exceedingly burdensome. It is the one great problem this Government ought to tackle just as quickly as it can, and through whatever medium it can. Let us take two or three articles for the sake of illustration. Western Canada is suffering most acutely from the excessive cost of lumber. In the little city of Regina, which is the most progressive city in Canada to-day, we shall spend in building this year $5,000,000. If the price of lumber were reasonable I believe we would exceed that by another $5,000,000. Our building operations will be limited solely by the price and supply of lumber. The cost is almost prohibitive to-day. Is the tariff responsible for that? Does the tariff come into it at all? As a matter of fact, lumber is free; it is only dressed lumber that is taxed. Is lumber coming into Canada or going out of it? There is no question at all that the export of lumber from Canada to-day is the cause of the high prices. Why then keep up this everlasting cursing of the tariff? Why not let us unite our efforts in discovering the cause of these high prices? If it is the tariff then let us apply the remedy, but if it is not, there is no use concentrating our efforts on the tariff alone and leaving the real causes untouched, because that will only mean we will continue to suffer. The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) would not treat a case of the flu by vaccinating for smallpox, but that is about what he proposes to do here. They are cursing the tariff and ignoring other causes of high prices. The consequence is that high prices continue to exist longer than they otherwise would. Anthracite coal is absolutely free. Before the war we could buy it in our part of the country at $10 a ton, but to-day we are paying $22, and according to Government analysis thirty per cent of it is ash and fifty per cent rock, which means we are really paying from $50 to $60 a ton for coal. Is the tariff responsible for that? Most undoubtedly it cannot be. So I say we should not concentrate our attention entirely on the tariff, leading our people to denounce it as if it were the only cause of high prices in this country to-day, and leaving all the other causes untouched. I say if we do, we are the worst enemies of our people. My suggestion is that we make an inquiry into the operation of the tariff as quickly as we can, and wherever it is found to be responsible for high prices, let us apply the necessary remedy as soon as we can. If it is not the tariff, let us find a remedy as quickly as we can from whatever source we can. In that way we shall better be able to overcome the present difficult situation.

Hon. gentlemen opposite say that there is disunion or disorganization in the Unionist ranks. I suppose it is possible that if you used a microscope you could find some sign of it, but I have been too busy performing the duties I am sent here to perform to notice anything of it. I believe in supporting constituted authority until they show some reason why I should not. Have we any evidence of union directly opposite on this fiscal policy, which is the only thing that might separate us on this side of the House? I have not seen any. Are the cross-benchers united in their policy? I have not seen any evidence of it at all. In fact, it is the very opposite. Only the other day their leader got up and advocated an income tax. He did the same thing in our little city when he was holding a public meeting there. I think he was hardly fair in the manner in which he advocated it in our part of the country and in the House, in that he compared the amounts raised by Great Britain and New Zealand by income

taxation with the results obtained in Canada, but he failed to tell his audience in Regina that in New Zealand there is only one Government that levies all taxes. There is no taxation field there pre-empted by provincial governments, whereas in Canada there are at least ten governments all having the right to levy income tax. My opinion is that the federal government, by reason of the fact that by common consent we have given to the provinces the right to levy income taxation, will be limited in its income tax possibilities to the residue left by the highest taxing province in Canada, because you have to make your income tax equitable throughout the Dominion, and if British Columbia has a high income tax for provincial purposes and gives to the municipalities the right to levy income tax, which tax the municipalities do levy, you have there two bodies levying income tax, and soon you reach the point where there is no income left to tax. I think the Minister of Finance will agree with me on that. So our revenue possibilities in that direction are exceedingly limited. Immediately after his leader had advocated income taxation, the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. MacNutt) said he objected to income taxation and did not want any income tax imposed on the farmers. Is that an evidence of union? What is going to happen when the whip of the cross-benchers whips in the hon. member for Saltcoats to assist his leader on the question of income tax? What is going to happen when he starts whipping himself in to support his leader? I should like to know.

Again, the leader of the cross-benchers strongly supports a tax on unimproved lands. Just what he means by "unimproved lands" I do not know. Are they lands that are not in any sense cultivated? Or is he advocating a tax on all lands according to the value of the unimproved land? I could not gather from his remarks just what he meant. The hon. member for Saltcoats comes along and says he wants a tax on improved lands. Now who is going to run that party? Where are the farmers going to get off at? If the leader means unimproved lands, I would also ask where they are situated. In the province of Ontario there are mighty few unimproved lands except those owned by the Crown, in right of the province, and is the Crown as represented by the Dominion going to levy a tax on the Crown as represented by the province? And it is the same in Quebec and all the other provinces except Saskatchewan and Alberta. Under the policy of the leader of the cross-benchers, who is supposed to represent the western people, the lands of Western Canada are going to be taxed for the whole Dominion. That is a nice policy upon which to appeal to the people of Western Canada. I hope he comes along with that policy any old time. The hon. member for Saltcoats wants a tax on improved lands. That might apply more equitably at the present time, but let me draw his attention to the fact that the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta have a far greater area of arable land than any other province, and it is only going to be a question of ten or fifteen years before Western Canada, if my hon. friend's policy is followed, will be paying an outrageous portion of the taxes of this Dominion. Is that a policy that would appeal to Western Canada. Not much. It does not appeal to me. I want to look a little bit ahead, and the rest of Canada must pay their share of taxation if I have anything to say in the matter. So the union they have over there is not alluring to me, not a bit.

There is one other point, and the leader of the Opposition will kindly take note of this. He and his whole party have been condemning the War-time Elections Act. Why? Because it disfranchised a certain number of foreigners who had become Canadian citizens. We have another Franchise Act coming on; we must have it. If I interpret this amendment aright, he is going to disfranchise as many women as we disfranchised men under the War-times Elections Act. We are not going to naturalize people in Canada in the way we did in days gone by. I know what it was in our part of the world, because I helped to do it. At election time Grits and Tories alike both did it. They would say: "You vote for us and we will naturalize you." It cost us $1 apiece. I helped to do lots of it. But that day has gone by, and it has got down to the time when people have to be real British subjects in spirit before they will be naturalized in Canada. I take it that under any franchise Act which we are likely to enact any man or woman who is a British subject, or who can become a British subject within the period necessary, and can qualify, will have the right to vote. But they will have to be naturalized in their own personal right. I approve of that, and I think the great bulk of the people of Canada approve it. I believe that will be the policy which will be followed by this Parliament; I cannot conceive of any other.

We have in Western Canada some thousands of women who have been here for some ten, fifteen or twenty years, who have proved themselves loyal though of foreign extraction, and who have never been naturalized in their own personal right. They will have to be naturalized in their own personal right, to my way of thinking, before they will be able to vote. How long is that going to take? Can they be naturalized within the period of time specified within the amendment submitted by the leader of the Opposition? It cannot be done. In Saskatchewan alone we have probably 300,000 foreigners, and the courts of Canada are going to take their time to see that every person who applies for naturalization has the necessary qualifications. It cannot be done in less than a year's time and do justice to Canada and its people. A lot of these people do not know yet, and cannot possibly know until the Franchise Act is passed, that they will have a vote. They will then have to go to the courts to be naturalized. But by that time the election, if held as proposed, would be over and these people would be left without votes in that election. And there are some, I am sure, who should have the right to vote, because I know many of them and, while they are foreigners, they will make good British subjects. On the other hand, there are many who have not proved themselves sufficiently British in spirit to entitle them to vote. It is absolutely necessary, if we are to carry out the principle of an honest and just Franchise Act, that the elections should not be held for at least one year to come.

Just a word about the Board of Commerce and I am through. The high cost of living is the big trouble to-day. It is the one thing that the people are up in arms about, and I do not wonder at it in some cases because it is a real hardship to those who have been living on salaries, those who have retired on what they thought was a competency or those who held bonds other than industrial bonds. These people are suffering very keenly. The Board of Commerce was appointed to meet a popular demand—there is no question about that. It was appointed because the Government recognized that something should be done to try and lower the cost of living and to stop profiteering. I am satisfied that the Board of Commerce has already accomplished satisfactory work and that a great deal of benefit has resulted to Canada. If the Board of Commerce has not succeeded under the chairmanship of Mr. Justice Robson in accomplishing what we all desire, it could not be accomplished by anybody in Canada. I know Mr. Hugh Robson, as I call him. He is a rank Liberal and always was before he was appointed, and that is why I know him so well. He and I fought each other on many platforms in Regina. I know him to be a thoroughly honest man. He is one of the best citizens that Regina ever turned out. He has ability, and, as I say, if he could not accomplish what we desire in this matter of prices, it could not be done. But the fact that he has resigned should not deter the Government from continuing the work which they have started, and which, if carried out, should be a benefit to this country. We should continue the Board, or if not that board, one similarly constituted, and if Mr. Justice Robson, in his letter of resignation, has indicated to the Government that there are defects in the law, it is our duty to remedy those defects as quickly as possible. We should study his report and see where the defects actually exist and remedy them so that we can meet, somehow or other, the conditions which exist at the present time in Canada and which are affecting so keenly the comfort and happiness of our people. I am going to vote against this amendment because the Government deserves something from this country, it deserves the support which all loyal subjects can give to it.

On motion of Mr. Robb the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Doherty, the House adjourned at 11.35 p.m.

Tuesday, March 9, 1920.

The House met at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

PRIVATE BILLS.

Bill No. 4, to incorporate the Armor Life Assurance Company.—Mr. Griesbach.

Bill No. 5, respecting the Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Company.—Mr. Crowe.

Bill No. 6, respecting the Canadian Mining Institute, and to change its name to "The Canadian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy.—Mr. Fripp.

REPORTS.

Report of the Minister of Agriculture for the year ended March 31, 1919; Report of the Dominion Experimental Farms for the year ended March 31, 1919; Report upon the Agricultural Instruction Act, 1918-1919.—Hon. Mr. Tolmie.

ST. LAWRENCE SHIP CHANNEL—ICE CONDITIONS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly-Verchères): Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Government to a most important and urgent matter. I am informed from reliable sources that the ice jam on the St. Lawrence is much deeper this year than ever before. At Cap Rouge, above Quebec, there is a gorge, and I am informed the ice has frozen 40 feet deep, and that the water behind has risen 6 feet higher in some places. There is an ice barrage. If this barrage is not immediately broken up there will be serious floods from that point up to Montreal. We had ice-breakers that were built for that purpose. I understand that the "Earl Grey," the "Minto" and the "John D. Hazen" were sent to Russia in 1915-1916 and 1917.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. gentleman is beyond question bringing forward a subject of public importance, but he should not attempt to enter into any argument. If he will state the ground work and put his question, he will be quite in order.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: The "Montcalm" is at Halifax and I understand the "Lady Grey" is not powerful enough to break the ice there. I am informed that unless dynamite is used to break the ice very serious floods will occur with resulting damage. What I wish to know is if the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne) is aware of the facts, and what steps he intends to take.

Hon. C. C. BALLANTYNE. The hon. member for Chambly-Verchères (Mr. Archambault) was good enough yesterday to give me notice of the question he has just asked. I am afraid that the information that has reached the hon. member is not accurate, and I shall be very glad indeed to give the information that the hon. gentleman asks for. First of all I wish to say that the first part of the winter was not very cold, and no ice bridge formed on the St. Lawrence up to Nicolet Traverse (a distance of 90 miles above Quebec), until the last week in January. The ice jammed several times during the winter at Cap Rouge—the Quebec Bridge site—which is considered the key of the ice situation, but was successfully broken up by the ice-breaker "Lady Grey." With no ice bridge formed at this point, there is no fear of disastrous floods occurring above. The channel is now clear of ice up to a point near Portneuf, 35 miles above Quebec, where the "Lady Grey" is working to-day and is making good progress.

I will not take up the time of the House by going into further details except to say that the conditions this year, I am happy to inform the hon. gentleman, are not much different from those of former years. The "Lady Grey" hopes to reach Cap Charles, 50 miles above Quebec, very shortly. In regard to the "Montcalm," I think hon. members are aware that first of all she had to go to Belle Isle to take the place of the steamer "Arranmore" that was wrecked, and to relieve the lighthouse people there. She afterwards had to go to the assistance of the Canadian Government steamer "Canadian Spinner" that was stuck in the ice below Father Point. After releasing that steamer she proceeded to the Magdalen Islands carrying provisions for the distressed people upon those islands. Owing to the severity of the weather and the thickness of the ice she was delayed a month in making that voyage. She returned to the city of Halifax requiring repairs, especially propeller blades, but owing to the wreck of the steamer "Bohemian," she had to go to her assistance. The "Montcalm" is now in Halifax and will go on the dry-dock as soon as possible. I do not anticipate any serious results from floods this spring—no one can accurately tell—but I am pleased to say that the "Lady Grey" is working so well and that the ice bridge is broken.

PEACE WITH ENEMY COUNTRIES.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. A. R. McMASTER (Brome): I would like to inquire from the Acting Prime Minister whether a state of Peace now exists between the Dominion of Canada and its former enemies? If not, I would ask what action is necessary on the part of the Government to bring about that consummation so devoutly to be wished, and, if it is necessary to have a Declaration, or an Order in Council passed for that purpose, how soon may we expect such customary action on the part of the Government.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Acting Prime Minister): In answer to my hon. friend may I congratulate him on retaining his voice after his excursion to the far West. A state of Peace actually and presently exists between Canada and the Empire, and Germany. A state of Peace will be proclaimed between the Allies and former enemies as each Treaty of Peace comes to its final ratification and the Proclamation

is made. I cannot think of anything that will hurry this along, except that perhaps the hon. gentleman might introduce a resolution.

Mr. McMASTER: May I explain to the right hon. gentleman who leads the House that this is not a mere rhetorical matter or one of mere abstract interest, but I am informed that in one of the departments which my right hon. friend is in control of—I think the Patents Department is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Trade and Commerce—

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to inform the hon. gentleman that he is taking a course which he may not pursue on the Orders of the Day.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Consideration of the motion of Mr. Hume Cronyn for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his Speech at the opening of the Session, and the proposed amendment of the Hon. Mackenzie King, thereto resumed from Monday, March 8.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Russell): Mr. Speaker, at the outset I desire to associate myself with the congratulations that have been offered by hon. gentlemen who have preceded me in this debate to the mover and the seconder of the Address in reply to the speech from the Throne. If I do not dwell upon the speeches of these two hon. gentlemen, or upon those of other hon. gentlemen who have followed them in this discussion, it is because I have a good deal to say on other subjects and I do not want to occupy the time of the House at undue length.

Let me, then, Sir, at once begin by implementing a promise that I made to this House some four or five months ago. It will be recalled that in September last, during the session that was then in progress and while I was absent from Canada, the President of the Privy Council (Hon. Mr. Rowell) delivered a speech which he and his kept press were pleased to describe as a reply to a speech that I had made about eighteen months previously. It will be further recalled that when I returned to the city I spoke in this House on a question of privilege, and as the rules of the House prevented me from saying all that I wanted to say I gave the House an assurance that I would return to the subject at the next session of Parliament. That, Mr. Speaker, it is my purpose to do in extenso this afternoon.

Before dealing with what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Rowell) said last session it is desirable that the sequence of facts leading up to his speech should be first presented to the House. Let me then state briefly what had occurred prior to September last. During the last general elections when the anti-Laurier, anti-Quebec and anti-Catholic madness was at its height, the President of the Privy Council fanned the flames of sectarian hate and added fresh fuel to the fire by a speech which he made at North Bay on December 6, 1917. In the course of his inflammatory harangue the hon. gentlemen indicted the people of Quebec for their alleged lack of sacrifice, and he then made an attack on the members of the Religious Orders from France who had been in Canada and whom he falsely said had not gone back to help their Mother Country in the war. As reported in the "Toronto Globe" the hon. gentleman, after denouncing the attitude of the Quebec Nationalists towards the war, said:

> In this attitude they were undoubtedly encouraged and abetted by the members of the Religious Orders from France who found an asylum in Canada and used that asylum to undermine Canada's strength in the struggle.

Believing this statement to be made with knowledge of the facts, and that it was true, many newspapers and speakers who were supporting Union Government used it throughout the country, and in this way spread the flames which the President of the Privy Council had deliberately kindled. A short time after the election the President of the Privy Council was written to and asked to give the proofs in support of his attacks on the French Religious. His reply was a brief letter in which he said he was investigating the facts. In other words, Mr. Speaker, he admitted over his own signature that although he had made a wholesale charge of treason against a body of men several weeks previously, he did not know whether the charge was true or false; but the elections being over, and his purpose accomplished, he was going to take time to inquire whether his statement was true or false. I do not pause here, Sir, to use the only terms that would fittingly describe the self-confessed turpitude of the hon. gentleman—in fact I need not do so in view of the judgment the public has already pronounced upon him. In addition to the written request that I have mentioned, the hon. gentleman was publicly challenged by two newspapers—the Catholic

Register of Toronto and the Catholic Record of London—to prove his statement about the French Religious, or withdraw it. He did neither. Then it was that I decided to expose him, not for any personal reason —and this I want to emphasize—but to vindicate the characters of the men whom he had maligned and to remove from the public mind the false impression that he had placed there. Accordingly, Sir, I spoke in the House on March 19, 1918, in refutation of the attack made by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) at North Bay in the previous December, and I proved, by the facts and figures I submitted to the House, that the hon. gentleman's statement about the French religious orders was a foul slander. Incidentally, I applied to the hon. gentleman's political record the test of sacrifice that he had applied to the people of the province of Quebec, and the evidence I submitted proved conclusively that the hon. gentleman did not measure up to his own standard. So convinced of this were his own colleagues who were in the House at the time that they did not continue the debate nor move its adjournment, but they allowed it to collapse after I had spoken.

It might possibly be within your recollection, Sir, that on March 19, 1918, I rose to speak just before six o'clock, and that through your courtesy and the courtesy of the right hon. the Prime Minister I was not obliged to begin my speech then, as the House adjourned for dinner. All the members who were present, including the President of the Privy Council, knew that I had the floor and would be the first speaker when the House resumed its sittings at eight o'clock the same evening. However, the hon. gentleman did not reappear at the evening session, but for that I am not to blame. I am recalling these facts now, Sir, because of some whining the hon. gentleman has indulged in about being absent through sickness so as to gain the sympathy of certain innocent people of both sexes.

When the House met the next day, March 20, 1918, the hon. gentleman was in his seat reading Hansard. I naturally expected him to rise on a question of privilege and tell the House that in view of the facts and figures I had presented the previous day he desired to withdraw the statement he had made at North Bay about the French religious orders, that he apologized to the members of those orders who were living and that he desired to make reparation to the memories of those who had died gloriously on the battlefields of Europe. But not he. That is not the way of commercialized Christianity. I recall, too, Sir, that several Government supporters spoke to him as he sat in his seat, and judging by their gestures towards the copy of the previous day's Hansard that he held in his hand, they were asking if he was going to make reference to my reply to his attack. I can also recall his weary smile that afternoon, for the reason that when I noticed it I understood for the first time what O'Connell meant when he compared Sir Robert Peel's smile to the shine of a silver plate on a coffin.

But the hon. gentleman remained silent throughout the afternoon of March 20, 1918. On the evening of that day, however, he was well enough to hand the Press correspondents the following interview:

OTTAWA, March 20, 1918.

Hon. Newton Rowell to-day told newspaper interviewers that he would have no statement to make in reply to the vitriolic attack made on him in the House last night by the Hon. Charles Murphy of Russell.

On the following day, March 21, 1918, the hon. gentleman was again in his seat. Again he said nothing. But on the evening of that day he handed out another interview to the Press, in which he placed the responsibility for his silence on his Cabinet colleagues. This is the way he put it:

OTTAWA, March 21, 1918.

Mr. Rowell said to-night: "The opinion of my colleagues is that having regard to the circumstances and the animus of the attack, no answer on my part is necessary."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not giving away any Cabinet secret when I remark that that is not what some of his colleagues said to me.

That set of facts, Sir, is sufficient to dispose of the hon. gentleman's whine that he was absent through illness on March 19, 1918, and on the days immediately following.

Having allowed the Session of 1918 to close without any explanation of his conduct, the hon. gentleman found that public opinion had hardened against him, and after receiving sundry prods from behind —and notably one or two from the vicinity of Peterborough—he decided at length to make what would look like a defence. This he did in a speech at Bowmanville on December 17, 1918,—nine months after I had given the facts to the House. In that speech he not only did not withdraw his false charge against the members of the

French religious orders, but he aggravated his original offence by meanly and untruthfully alleging that the French law of compulsory military service compelled these men to return to France.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is exceeding the rules as well as the amenities of debate in attributing untruthfulness to another hon. member.

Mr. MURPHY: I bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, and I shall observe the amenities of debate in what further I have to say.

I was proceeding to state, Sir, that the hon. gentleman sank to a depth that was never plumbed by Mr. Pecksniff or Uriah Heap when he added—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. MURPHY: Those names seem strange to some hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House.—when he added:

If I had known of the position of those members of the French clergy I should have paid a tribute to them.

The Catholic Record of January 4, 1919, dealt with the hon. gentleman and his Bowmanville speech in the following article:

Mr. Rowell vs. Mr. Rowell.

In our comments last week on Mr. Rowell's charge against the members of French religous orders living in Canada we took the report of the Free Press as quoting his very words so far as he touched, in his Bowmanville speech, on his famous—or infamous—accusation. The Free Press report we find was incomplete.

Before us now is the Globe's full verbatim report of Mr. Rowell's Bowmanville address, and we shall quote his every word of explanation or justification.

Our readers will have noted that we have always confined our comments on Mr. Rowell's North Bay speech to this single charge against the French religious orders. Cleverly enough, perhaps, for the audience, as well as that portion of the wider public to which he addressed himself, Mr. Rowell first appeals to anti-Bourassa and anti-Quebec prejudice, reiterates his general charge against the clergy of Quebec, deliberately and dishonestly transfers some of the very words of his particular charge against the French religious orders to the general charge against the French-speaking clergy of Quebec:

"The substance of my statement about the French-speaking clergy in Quebec was that the majority of them were supporters of Mr. Bourassa in his attitude on the war, and that in the course they were pursuing *they were undermining Canada's strength in the struggle.*"

The words we have italicized referred, in Mr. Rowell's North Bay speech, solely and exclusively to the members of the French religious orders who had found an asylum in Canada. It must be admitted that Mr. Rowell is a good "mixer"—when he has reasons for not being straightforward.

Then the sometimes Liberal leader poses theatrically as the bold and fearless champion of free criticism of any class of citizens.

"If their objection was to my discussing the question at all, then I can only say that this country does not and will not recognize any immunity of the clergy from just and fair criticism of their acts as citizens or residents of Canada."

As no one ever hinted at or thought of claiming any such immunity the speaker delivered a knockout blow to this straw man which he had set up to show his prowess—and his courage.

"Fair and just criticism"—that is an important limitation to all criticism. It is fair and just criticism to quote,—in Mr. Rowell's own words,—the most serious accusation ever made against any class in Canada's population; to point out that if true the Government have a duty in the matter that cannot be shirked without such moral cowardice and betrayal of trust as would brand them as accessories after the fact to the alleged monstrous abuse of hospitality charged against the immigrant French religious; to demand, therefore, that the allegation publicly made by a public man be substantiated; or if made under misapprehension of the facts or misinformation, then for the sake of decency, honour, truth and justice, public and private, that the charge be withdrawn, the amende honourable made, and the injury repaired.

Mr. Rowell makes a high patriotic virtue of his long silence in face of the peremptory challenge to prove or retract. He brings in Mr. Bourassa's name at every turn: "Mr. Bourassa and those who think with him" is his favourite way of using the proverbial herring.

"While the war was on," asserts this high-minded patriot, "I ignored all these attacks." Yes, just such "attacks" as the Kaiser repelled when he inaugurated his war of self-defense! Mr. Rowell is even less frank than the Kaiser. The patriotic and long-suffering Liberal-Unionist leader conveniently forgets that it was he who made the attack, a wanton attack, an attack which he has never justified, against a whole class of Canada's population. He gently and virtuously insinuates that he has been wantonly attacked and plainly boasts that it was from patriotic motives alone he remained silent. Oh Spartan patriotism!

So far as Mr. Bourassa and the clergy and laity of Quebec are concerned they have their press, their full representation in Parliament, and are well able to take care of themselves. We have never troubled about them; Mr. Rowell is as disingenuous here as elsewhere in insinuating that it is only sympathizers with Mr. Bourassa and his Nationalist party who called him to account for his public accusations. Mr. Rowell of course knows better; but he is playing to the gallery.

The charge which we challenged Mr. Rowell to prove was this:

"In this attitude," added Mr. Rowell, "they were undoubtedly encouraged and abetted by the members of the religious orders from France, who found an asylum in Canada, and used that asylum to undermine Canada's strength in the struggle."

This is a specific accusation against the religious from France; it is a sweeping charge without any reservation whatsoever

against these men, all of them or at any rate as a class. If any doubt remained as to the general application of this sweeping charge Mr. Rowell cleared the minds of his hearers and readers most effectually by adding:

"It is a misfortune that they did not follow the example of the priests of the Catholic Church in France, who threw themselves into the struggle of their people to preserve their national existence, and by their courage and sacrifice won for themselves a new place in the hearts of the French people."

Challenged to substantiate so grave a charge Mr. Rowell remained silent; confronted with the statistics adduced by Mr. Murphy in Parliament Mr. Rowell was dumb.

These statistics proved incontrovertibly that the maligned French religious who found an asylum in Canada not only emulated the priests of France, but by their courage and sacrifice, by their unselfish devotion to their beloved France whence they had been exiled, they wrote the most sublime chapter in the sublime record of patriotism during the Great War. We reprint in this issue that portion of Mr. Murphy's speech which dealt with these heroic dead and no less heroic living Frenchmen to whom Canada will ever have been proud of having opened wide her hospitable gates. Their glorious record cannot be read and reread without a thrill of pride by every Catholic, by every Canadian.

Nevertheless these slandered dead and slandered living heroes Mr. Rowell allowed to rest under his baseless calumny for a full year. At last in his Bowmanville speech he makes this allusion to them:

"In order, however, to make political capital and stir up religious and racial feeling against Union Government, it is suggested that my references covered the French reservists who were members of religious orders, and who, when called to the colours by their Government, returned to France and fought as members of the French army. My references were not to men who had gone forth to fight but to men who stayed at home, men who were in the province of Quebec during the war, supporting Mr. Bourassa. Of the men who went forth to fight none can speak in too high terms."

And this is all that Mr. Rowell feels called upon in honour and justice to say in explanation or justification of his wanton and unwarranted attack on the gallant religious, "a body of men," to quote Mr. Murphy when marshalling the facts to rout Mr. Rowell's slanders, "whose courage, devotion to duty and self sacrifice in the present war stamp them as worthy to follow in the footsteps of that noble band of French missionaries who first made this land known to Europe and blazed the way for its colonization and development."

And the reason that even this tenuous, disingenuous, quasi-retraction, quasi-justification was so long delayed was that Canada's part in the war might not be impeded!

Note the impudent charge and the base appeal in the opening sentence; and then in what immediately follows:

"The trouble is, not that I misrepresented anybody, but that I told the truth about the situation then existing in the province of Quebec. An explanation of the campaign of misrepresentation now being pursued by Mr. Bourassa and those associated with him in this province is that they hope by representing that their faith is attacked, and by posing as defenders of that faith, to unite behind them in one party, for political purposes and political action, all those who share their religious views."

Dr. Johnson is sometimes quoted in a more comprehensive sense than he intended when he said that patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel; but that honest and sham-hating old Briton could find to-day in Mr. Rowell's speech an apt illustration of his meaning. "Patriotism" and prejudice, partizan, racial and religious, are the last refuge of Mr. Rowell.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. There is an imputation in the latter portion of the letter editorial, or newspaper extract from which the hon. member is quoting which he might not himself make in the ordinary course of debate. The hon. member may go no further in reading from an extract than he could go if the remarks were his own. I sincerely hope that the hon. member will, during the further course of his remarks, adhere more closely to the amenities and the technicalities, if I may so term them, of debate.

Mr. MURPHY: Anything which in your judgment, Mr. Speaker, is objectionable in the editorial I quite agree should be excised. The editorial then proceeds:

Mr. Rowell's charge a year ago was plainly, unequivocally, directly, against the French religious resident in Canada, and against them as a class without qualification or reservation.

Now he has the effrontery to say that "in order to make political capital and stir up religious and racial feeling against the Union Government it is suggested that my references covered the French reservists who were members of religious orders and who, when called to the colors by their government returned to France and fought as members of the French army."

When Mr. Rowell meets Voltaire in the Elysian fields the famous French infidel will greet the Christian statesman from Canada as a man after his own heart—"l'Audace l'Audace, toujours l'Audace!"

In the first place few if any of the slandered religious were reservists. They were not obliged to return and fight in the French army, as Mr. Rowell insinuates, though he dare not say so outright.

Mr. Rowell knew this. Mr. Rowell knows that it required a special treaty to enable the United States, after entering the war and puting conscription in force, to reach American citizens subject to the draft who were by accident or design in Canada or Great Britain. Mr. Rowell knows that with Ireland exempt from conscription Great Britain could not reach the tens of thousands of Englishmen subject to the draft who sought refuge in Ireland during the war.

Mr. Rowell knows that the French government, which had exiled the men whom he maligned, had no jurisdiction over them in Canada to compel them to return and fight in the French army.

If Mr. Rowell had told his audience that every single man of military age and fitness of that class which he had slandered had, in spite

of any feeling of resentment he may have felt at being expatriated, gone freely back to fight for France, that a score of them had laid down their lives in that cause which he had accused them of undermining, that military honors and military orders had recognized the valor and gallantry of those who still lived, the honest feeling of even that partizan and misinformed gathering would have found expression in applause and cheers. Then he might, in the contagion of that honest and honourable and manly feeling, have found it in his heart to admit that he was ignorant of the truth when he spoke a year ago at North Bay. But, like many other politicians, Mr. Rowell has too low an opinion of the sense of decency, the sense of honor and justice, the manliness and mental capacity of the common people if he does not realize that in honestly acknowledging his error he would stand in their estimation of mind and heart in a place which he has chosen to abdicate.

Some families gave their every member capable of bearing arms to the cause now crowned with victory. Not one of these exceeded the record of the French religious resident in Canada.

By their action at the beginning of the war in rushing to the colors and giving a tremendous impetus to Canada's effort, a magnificent inspiration to Canada's loyalty, the British-born who had chosen Canada as their home won for themselves undying honour and gratitude.

The British-born as a class, magnificent as in their record, can not equal the sublime record of the men whom Mr. Rowell accused of monstrous abuse of Canada's hospitality and of undermining the cause for which they were ready to die.

At the conclusion of his recital of the evidence which crushingly refuted Mr. Rowell's charges, Mr. Murphy on the floor of the House of Commons thus summoned their author to retract:

"If the hon. gentleman's statements were not made for a wicked and a malicious purpose, then by every standard of public and private honour he is required to retract what he has said, to offer an apology to the living and to make reparation to the memory of the dead."

Mr. Rowell's friends can hardly be proud of the way he has attempted to measure up to the standards of public and private honour.

Upon reading that editorial, a Toronto gentleman with whom I was not then acquainted wrote me in these terms:

TORONTO, JANUARY 7, 1919.

The Hon. CHARLES MURPHY,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—I read an article in the Catholic Record which was a summary of your reply to the Hon. N. W. Rowell's shameful allegations regarding the French Religious. I had not read his speeches but was so disgusted, although not a Catholic, at his want of fairness, I immediately sat down and wrote him a letter, a copy of which I enclose herewith.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member is proceeding to quote from a letter written by a gentleman outside of the House, in which letter that gentleman attributes certain allegations to the President of the Privy Council, stating that they were shameless and also using other words which no hon. member in this House might use in debate. Much less may they be used by quoting some person outside of the House. I must ask the hon. member to delete those portions of the letter.

Mr. MURPHY: Very well, Sir. The enclosure that accompanied the letter which I read is as follows. It is a copy of a letter that was sent to the President of the Privy Council:

TORONTO, JANUARY 7, 1919.

The Hon. N. W. ROWELL,

Dear Sir,—I came across the enclosed article in the Catholic Record this evening, and if the speeches in which you made the accusations referred to are correct, I am amazed, shocked and grieved that a man occupying the position in Canada you do could be wilfully guilty of such calumny. From the article containing the refutation of your charge, it appears you are challenged to give proof of the truth of your wicked allegations, and you remain silent. Shame on you! How can you ever hope to be great?—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. One hon. member may not say anything of that character to another member of this House, and the hon. member for Russell cannot shield himself behind a letter from some person outside of this House. I must ask the hon. member to withdraw those words "shameless" and others of like character, whether they be written or spoken.

Mr. MURPHY: I will see that these are deleted from the report. The letter proceeds:

If you have done wrong, be a man and apologize. I am not a Catholic nor party politician, but a British subject who loves fair play.

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) ARCHIBALD BROWNE.

Any comment on that enclosure is quite unnecessary. I need only add that since the date of the correspondence I have learned that the writer is a sturdy Scotchman whose sense of decency and fairness was so outraged by the conduct of the President of the Council—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member is going very far beyond the rules of debate when he uses such language in the course of his comment on a letter written by a person outside of this House.

Mr. MURPHY: Surely my allusion to a gentleman outside of this House does not bring the remark within the rules of the House when I state the reason that this gentleman had for writing the letter which I have just read.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot shield himself behind any remark made by some person outside this House. What he may not say himself, he certainly may not quote.

Mr. MURPHY: I am not trying to shield myself behind any remarks made by anybody in or out of the House, and I think I may appeal, Sir, to your knowledge of me to justify that statement. I do not want to use in debate any language that is not in accordance with the rules of debate, and if in your judgment Sir, anything contained in the letters that I have read should not be repeated, then they may be deleted from the copy.

Thus matters stood until last session, when, during my absence and while the debate on the Address was in progress, the President of the Privy Council for the first time in the House professed to deal with my speech delivered eighteen months previously. What the hon. gentleman said in the House was largely a repetition of what he had said in his Bowmanville address of December, 1918, and before I deal with certain specific utterances of the hon. gentleman, I want to point out that neither in his Bowmanville speech nor in his speech of last session does the hon. gentleman dispute the correctness of the following charges contained in my speech of March 19, 1918:

1. That his support of the Ross Government entailed no sacrifice on his part, but on the contrary resulted in his securing control of the reorganization of the Clergue industries at the Sault, and that he derived therefrom the profits that I described.

2. That while the hon. gentleman acted as Provincial leader, there was a fund of about $3,750 raised to enable the hon. gentleman and his press agent to go on a Cook's tour to the battle front.

3. That in his North Bay speech of December 6, 1917, the hon. gentleman garbled the facts relating to the Conservative alliance with the Nationalists of Quebec in order to conceal the fact that his present leader was in active personal alliance with the Nationalists in 1911.

4. That he had sent as his agent to the city of London, Ontario, Colonel F. H. Deacon to induce a prominent Liberal of that city to desert the Liberal candidate by offering him as a bribe the Chairmanship of the War Purchasing Commission.

5. That he deputed another Toronto gentleman to interview various Liberals as to whether they thought the public would stand the appointment to the Ontario Supreme Court Bench of a member of the present Union Government.

6. That he sent a third Toronto gentleman to eastern Ontario to urge Liberal candidates to desert Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and that this emissary pointed out the advantages by which such treachery would be awarded.

7. That as charged by the Toronto Telegram in its issue of March 14, 1918, Mr. Robert A. Mulholland, who had been nominated for the House of Commons in Durham county was bribed with a seat in the Senate, to make way for the hon. gentleman as a candidate in the county of Durham.

That is the indictment which in his two speeches the hon. gentleman has not dared to challenge. It is too late for him to do so now, because no credence would be given to any belated statement he might now make. With reference to these unchallenged charges, I have only to observe that many a man has forfeited his position in society on a much less serious indictment than the one which the hon. gentleman has allowed to stand against him.

Now let me examine what the hon. gentleman pretended to explain or refute in his speech in the House last September. Here is what he said about his North Bay charge against the members of the French religious orders (unrevised Hansard, September 17, 1919):

4 p.m.

Mr. PROULX: Will the minister cite the figures which were given by the hon. member for Russell as to the number of members of each religious order who crossed over and fought?

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friend simply anticipates the point I am coming to. At the time I spoke at North Bay I was not aware that the French law of compulsory military service covered members of the French-speaking clergy of military age who had come to Canada, and who remained citizens of France; that they were obligated by this law to return to France for military service; and that those who were physically fit, and were not exempted temporarily or otherwise, did return to France when called by their government to do so. As I did not know this, I could not specially refer to their service, but my attitude to all who went forth to fight was clearly shown by my reference to the clergy of France. If I had known of the position of these members of the French clergy, I should have paid a tribute to them.

Further on he is reported to have spoken as follows:

Had I known that the law of military service had applied to those men and that they had gone forth to fight, I should have paid a tribute to them with greater cheerfulness than I paid the tribute to the French clergy in France.

Still further on, he is reported to have said:

I do not question the figures set out by the hon. gentleman in his speech, as illustrating the part which those men took in the struggle.

With that tissue of amazing evasions, and the hon. gentleman's failure to do what any other man in Canada would have done under similar circumstances, the Catholic Record, in its issue of October 11, 1919, deals in this fashion:

The Honourable Newton Wesley Rowell, President of the Council, has at last summoned up courage to refer on the floor of the House to a subject that affects his honour as a public man, his conscience as a private individual, and his personal reputation for truthfulness, decency and fair dealing.

It is worth while recalling and setting forth in all its naked malignity the foul and unfounded charge which Mr. Rowell made against a body of men whose record in the war compels the grudging admiration of even Mr. Rowell himself. The enormity of the original and still unretracted charge and Mr. Rowell's shiftiness and evasion demand, even at the expense of brevity, a clear and full restatement of the question at issue, and an analysis of Mr. Rowell's explanation or palliation or whatever his latest pronouncement may be called.

In the course of a speech delivered at North Bay, December 6, 1917, after discussing the attitude of Quebec Nationalists, lay and clerical, Mr. Rowell added:

"In this attitude they were undoubtedly encouraged and abetted by the members of the religious orders from France, who found an asylum in Canada and used that asylum to undermine Canada's strength in the struggle."

No charge of graver or more menacing import was ever preferred against any body of men in Canada; and this charge was publicly preferred by a man prominent in Canadian public life.

It was promptly and peremptorily challenged; it was never substantiated; it was never withdrawn. It still retains, after Mr. Rowell's recent speech in the House of Commons, all its importance, all its implications, all its menace. Its truth or its falsity does not and can not lessen its tremendous import or alter the fact that it was made by a responsible public man now holding a high position in the Government of Canada.

If the charge were true then the Government was bound to stop this monstrous abuse of Canadian hospitality, and by interning or deporting the ingrates prevent further undermining of Canada's strength in the struggle in which we were then engaged; nor, if true, can the Government evade its plain duty in the premises now that the war is over. To maintain its truth is to point out inexorably that plain governmental duty; to admit its falsity lays on Mr. Rowell, if he desires to retain his position of leadership in Canadian public life, the duty of clearing himself from the imputation of being a slanderer and a coward. It will be a bad thing for Canada and a worse thing for Mr. Rowell if he be allowed to escape the responsibility and evade the duty of making good his hideous accusation, or of retracting it, admitting his misinformation and making the *amende honourable* like an honest and honourable man.

In his recent speech in the House, which in so far as it deals with the question in issue we reproduce on page 5, he does neither the one thing nor the other; he advances not a shadow of proof of the truth of his charge, but he does not withdraw it. He writhes under the lash of Mr. Murphy's facts and figures with regard to the French religious; he makes an oblique admission that these figures prove the class he had branded as ingrates, who shamelessly abused Canada's hospitality, were "gallant men who left Canada and went overseas to fight for the cause of liberty," but he does not withdraw the charge that they "used their asylum in Canada to undermine Canada's strength in the struggle." It is a difficult feat of shiftiness and evasion; but Mr. Rowell accomplishes it. Still one can see that he is not proud of his performance and one can admire the prudence of selecting a time when Mr. Murphy was out of the House and out of the country; and when the rules of debate preclude all possibility of reply this session.

Mr. Rowell is progressing. On the 17th of last December, at Bowmanville, nine months after Mr. Murphy's crushing refutation of his charge against the French religious resident in Canada, he deliberately transferred the very wording of his charge against these French religious to make it read as though it applied to the French-speaking clergy who were supporters of Mr. Bourassa. That was crude work for an artist in evasion. Mr. Rowell has evidently come to be ashamed of it. In the House he read his infamous accusation verbatim. But as he comes to his reference to the priests of France he interrupts himself to exclaim:

"I am accused of belittling the work of the priests; I am magnifying the work of the priests."

Now, that is less clumsy than the Bowmanville method; but not less disingenuous. "I am accused," says this eminent patriot and long suffering, pious Christian, "of belittling the work of the priests." No, Mr. Rowell, you are not accused of anything. You, Mr. Rowell, made an infamous accusation, you admit you made of it; that accusation was proved up to the hilt to be a foul and baseless slander. You admit that, too, in a half-hearted way; *you dare not deny it. You are the accuser. You pretend to deal with the accusations you made and you whine or boast*—"I am accused." Then you glory in the tribute you paid to the priests of France as showing your breadth of mind and freedom from bigotry, when you know that you referred to the priests of France solely for the purpose of making their brother French priests in Canada stand out in odious contrast.

Mr. Rowell concludes his tribute to the priests of France by saying: "No one can speak disparagingly of the work of those men at that time." In what did the conduct of the priests of France differ from that of the French priests who had found an asylum in Canada? In no single particular, save that the patriotism of those gallant men against whom Mr. Rowell levelled his false and foul accusation of shameless ingratitude to Canada and treason to France, stands out in higher relief than even that of their brethren of France. Those resident in Canada had that magnanimity of patriotism which impelled them, despite the fact that they were despoiled and robbed and expatriated, to go back and fight shoulder to shoulder with the priests whom Mr. Rowell professes so much to admire.

Does "the magnificent service of those gallant men" shame Mr. Rowell into withdrawing his charge? Not at all. On the contrary. These are his own words:

"At the time I spoke in North Bay I was not aware that the French law of compulsory military service covered members of the French-speaking clergy of military age who had come to Canada and who remained citizens of France and that they were obligated by this law to return to France for military service; and that those who were physically fit, and were not exempted temporarily or otherwise, did return to France when called by their government to do so. As I did not know this I could not specially refer to their service. . . . Had I

known that the law of military service had applied to those men and that they had gone forth to fight I should have paid a tribute to them. . . ."

Magnanimous Mr. Rowell!

With "damned iteration" and awkward repetition Mr. Rowell seeks to convey the impression that some of these men "who were not exempted temporarily or otherwise" went back to fight for France because they were compelled by French law and the French Government to do so.

This is a clear case of deliberate suggestio falsi made with malice aforethought.

Mr. Rowell knows, as everybody knows, that the exiled French priests resident in Canada were beyond the reach of legal compulsion and beyond the jurisdiction of the French Government. These men whom Mr. Rowell accused of using their asylum in Canada to undermine Canada's strength in the struggle went freely back to France to take their heroic part, yes, to die in that very struggle. But Mr. Rowell " did not know," he " was not aware" or he "should have paid a tribute to them." Yet now that he does know, he still has the infinite meanness of spirit to suggest a new falsehood while failing to retract the old false accusation.

Could any one in Canadian public life other than Mr. Rowell be guilty of this:

"I have no hesitation in saying that if the general expression I used hurt the feelings of any in that I did not recognize the fine service of the men of whom I did not know, I would be the first to withdraw any such suggestion. I recognize the service they rendered. But when my friends say that I have attacked the Catholic Church I say there is no foundation whatever for that statement."

In the very pretence of dealing straightforwardly with the specific and definite charge against the French members of the religious orders he flounders into this rambling profession of ignorance, withdrawal of the "suggestion of his general expression," and denial that he attacked the Catholic Church.

But he allows the definite and specific charge to stand.

"I do not question," says Mr. Rowell, "the figures set out by the hon. gentleman in his speech as illustrating the part which these men took in the struggle;" but he does not withdraw the charge that these same men used their asylum in Canada to undermine Canada's strength in the same struggle.

"Again I repeat," said the conscientious and truth-loving President of the Council, "my references at North Bay were not to the men who had gone forth to fight, but to the men who stayed at home, men who were in the province of Quebec during the war supporting Bourassa;" but he offers no suggestion of proof or ground for suspicion that of the religious whom he maligned as a class the members who stayed at home because of military unfitness were a whit less enthusiastic in the cause than their militarily fit brothers who fought and died in the struggle.

Should some unscrupulous politician for sordid purpose accuse certain families, whom he disliked, of shirking and slacking during the Great War; nay, should he go further and accuse those families of treason and sedition, traducing them where they were not known; and then should some well-informed friend confront the traducer with incontrovertible proofs that every single member of every slandered family was serving at the front, some of them having already given up their lives, what would happen?

[Mr. Murphy.]

Amongst people with instincts of decency and fair play the traducer would be called to account. Suppose in a sanctimonious, self-sacrificing way he explained that he did "not question the figures," and that he "did not know that they were obligated by the law of compulsory military service," had he known "he would have paid them a tribute;" and professing again his ignorance of the record of these families, expressed his willingness, if any one felt hurt, "to withdraw the suggestion of his general expression." Why, such an unscrupulous politician would be hooted down by his very friends and made either to prove his charge or withdraw it.

But a Christian statesman may do just that sort of thing when he traduces the members of religious families, and poses as a martyr while doing so.

In his speech in the House of Commons Mr. Rowell has not substantiated his infamous charge; he does not question the accuracy of the figures which are its crushing refutation; but he has not the honesty or manliness to withdraw it. Mr. Rowell's position no honest or self-respecting man can hold. No public man can be allowed to hold it without degrading the standards of Canadian public life.

After that masterly analysis of the hon. gentleman's performance in connection with his base and unfounded charge against the living and the dead members of the French religious orders, there is nothing left for me, or for any other hon. gentleman who might be disposed to defend the living and the dead members of these orders, to say. In his speech in this House on the 17th September last the hon. gentleman put up a number of straw men so that he might display his prowess in knocking them down. One of them was that I had said that he had received moneys from the Secretarial Fund. I never said anything of the kind. In support of his assertion the hon. gentleman said that I had received letters of protetst from Liberals in Ontario asserting that my statement was untrue. Out of the hundreds of letters I received in approval of my speech of March 19, 1918, there were two in which it was mentioned that I had been in error in saying that the hon. gentleman had been paid out of the Secretarial Fund. One of the writers was Mr. Bowman, the former Liberal whip in Ontario, whom the hon. gentleman mentioned in his speech of September last. Upon receiving Mr. Bowman's letter, I wrote him on the 7th May, 1918, as follows:

"Let me point out that you have fallen into the error that a number of others fell into, namely, that you have interpreted my statement as being one to the effect that the gentleman referred to shared personally in the fund mentioned. I did not say that. My information was derived from three contributors to the fund, and, therefore, I was too well informed to make any such statement as the one you seem to think I did make. This correction of your misunderstanding should be made as early as pos-

sible, and that is why I am sending you this line."

What I made plain in that letter to Mr. Bowman, and what I said in this House, I repeat, namely, that the secretarial fund was raised to guarantee the hon. gentleman against any loss while engaged in his work as provincial leader. Briefly stated my argument was that in the field of provincial politics, as in other fields, the hon. gentleman had made no sacrifice because this secretarial fund had provided the money to defray the expenses of his work which otherwise he would have had to pay for out of his private means. I am going to prove by evidence that not even the hon. gentleman would controvert that what I said was absolutely correct. I hold in my hand a document with this heading:

Mr. Rowell's Secretariat, Third Annual Report. November 1st, 1914, to October 31st, 1915.

It bears at the end of the signature "Main Johnson, private secretary." I will read a few extracts from this report:

To the Committee:

Gentlemen,—I beg to submit the report of Mr. Rowell's secretarial office for its third year.

1. Private Secretarial Work. One of the principal duties of this office from its inception has been to do private secretarial work for Mr. Rowell in connection with the various phases of his public work. A new aspect has been given to this activity during the present year by Mr. Rowell's speeches on the war, and his visits to all parts of the country in connection with recruiting meetings. The private secretary accompanied Mr. Rowell, for example, on his visit to the Canadian West this summer and the office has been kept busy securing and keeping material for Mr. Rowell's use in his addresses.

In addition to these special features of the work, the secretariat has continued to do the ordinary, daily work of a political private secretary's office, both during the session of the Legislature and during the rest of the year as well.

2. Publicity. A considerable portion of the work has consisted in complying with the request of newspapers that we keep them supplied with reports of Mr. Rowell's speeches on the war.

Then there is reference to the Liberal Club Federation of Ontario and after mentioning that this federation had been formed in 1913, the report proceeds:

The Federation has adopted as its motto the word "service"——

I would like you to note that, Mr. Speaker, because I shall refer to it several times in my subsequent observations:

The Federation has adopted as its motto the word "service," a choice which has aroused much favourable comment in the press of the province.

And listen to this, Mr. Speaker. In view of the denial of the hon. gentleman,—just listen to this paragraph:

The Liberal Club Federation has its own officers and is entirely independent of the Liberal Party or its organization. The secretarial office, however, acts in co-operation with the Federation as its business office, and the private secretary assists the officers in their activities throughout the province.

And then the gem of the lot is in the concluding paragraph, No. 5. "Staff" is the heading:

The office staff remains as in the two previous years—two stenographers—one for Mr. Rowell, who does Mr. Rowell's legal and political work and whose remuneration is divided between this office and Mr. Rowell's legal firm, and a stenographer for Mr. Rowell's private secretary who does political work exclusively.

Now, that report, Mr. Speaker, proves several things. In the first place, it proves to the hilt my assertion that the Secretarial Fund was for the purpose of guaranteeing the hon. gentleman against any loss while engaged in his work as Provincial Leader. In fact, the last paragraph of the report shows that a portion of the fund was even used to assist the hon. gentleman in his private legal work. That alone, Sir, should dispose of all further pretentions about "sacrifice." What further does the report prove? It proves to the hilt my assertion, which the hon. gentleman pretended to dispute, that the organization of which the hon. gentleman was the Provincial head was separate and distinct from the Liberal Party, and was designed to advance not the cause of Liberalism but the "uplift" fads of the hon. gentleman himself. The adoption of the word "service" as the motto of the so-called Liberal Club Federation makes it clear that it was intended that the Federation should be a kind of glorified Sunday School with the hon. gentleman as its teacher, and not a political organization to advocate or press forward Liberal principles. And what else, Sir, does this report prove? It proves that the Secretarial Fund was used largely to advertise the war speeches of the hon. gentleman, and that he did not hesitate to use the war and all connected with it for his personal glorification. Other public men in this country did their duty quietly and at their own expense, but the hon. gentleman had his war activities financed by special funds and advertised by a special staff. More sacrifice, Mr. Speaker!

In his speech of last September the hon gentleman denied that Sir Joseph Wesley Flavelle had contributed to the Secretarial

Fund, because he said, and mark the reason, "the fund was a Liberal fund and Sir Joseph is a Conservative." But we all know, Mr. Speaker, that as between commercialized Christians a little thing like that does not stand in the way. However, the fact is that my information on that subject came from two prominent gentlemen in Toronto whose veracity and good faith I have no reason to doubt, and as they have not corrected their original statement, which I repeated, I must continue to rely upon it. But even if my informants placed Sir Joseph's name on the wrong list of contributors, that would not be surprising in view of the number of funds raised for the purpose of assisting the President of the Privy Council to make sacrifices.

I have spoken of the Secretarial Fund, and the fund raised to send the hon. gentleman and his press agent on a Cook's tour to the battlefront. My further information is that there were at least two other funds into which the hon. gentleman dipped. One was a Prohibition Fund to which very generous subscriptions were made. Several of those whose names have been given to me are represented to have subscribed in amounts that reached four figures. Now, I have been told that for his services as a Prohibition speaker some years ago, the hon. gentleman was paid out of this Prohibition Fund. Then I am informed there was another fund, a campaign fund, raised by his friend Colonel F. H. Deacon a little over five years ago, and that subscribers to this fund in the city of Ottawa were told that it would amount to $25,000 and that it would be used to assist the hon. gentleman in his public work. Possibly Sir Joseph Wesley Flavelle's name should have been placed as a subscriber to either of these two latter funds, but if any error of that kind was made the hon. gentleman could easily rectify it by giving the House a complete list of the subscribers to all the funds from which he has benefited together with the amount of their contributions. That, Mr. Speaker, would stop all controversy and besides it would be illuminating—very illuminating, Sir, I can assure you.

Now, Sir, although the hon. gentleman has lived, breathed, and had his being in funds of various descriptions, he was not content with that; and his frugal mind, constantly running in the direction of sacrifice and service, suggested to him that a Cabinet Minister might also become a tax dodger and no one would be any the wiser. Sir, let me expose to you how he, as a Cabinet Minister, tried to work this little game of the tax dodger. An item in the Toronto press in October, 1918, tells the first part of the story. It was this:

SEEKS TO ESCAPE INCOME TAXATION.

Hon. N. W. Rowell Claims Exemption Because No Longer Resident.

Hon. Newton Wesley Rowell, President of the Council in the Dominion Government, is appealing to the Court of Revision against an income assessment of $5,000. He claims that being no longer a resident of Toronto the assessment should be cancelled. The Assessment Department contends that Mr. Rowell secures the income from his law practice in the city, and is therefore liable for income tax.

That is the first part of the story; the second part of the story was supplied here at Ottawa. You will observe that the newspaper item states that the hon. gentleman appealed against his income assessment of $5,000 in Toronto because he was no longer a resident of that city. In other words, he took the position that as a Cabinet Minister he was a resident of Ottawa. Now at the time that he launched this appeal in Toronto, both his salary as a Cabinet Minister and his sessional indemnity as a member of Parliament were exempt from taxation in Ottawa under a special agreement that then existed between the Government and the local municipal corporation. The result, Mr. Speaker, therefore would be that if he escaped taxation in Toronto on the ground that he was living in Ottawa, he would escape the payment of taxes in both cities. The publicity given to the hon. gentleman's Toronto appeal apparently killed it. In any event, the papers were taken off the files in the Toronto City Hall so that no record would remain there of this remarkable act of sacrifice and service on the part of the President of the Privy Council. And by the way, as I see my hon. friend the Minister of Finance in his seat, I would suggest to him that before we are put to the trouble of getting a return brought down in the House, he would make examination and find out what kind of Government income return his colleague the President of the Privy Council has made.

Now, Sir, it is a singular fact that the individual who is most careful about his own money very often displays the utmost recklessness in spending other people's money. That is particularly true of the President of the Privy Council. His abnormal craving for notoriety, combined with the pushfulness that distinguishes the commercialized Christian, has resulted in the wasteful expenditure of enormous sums of

money since he came to Ottawa. The public records contain some items, others have not yet been made public, but the character of them all may be seen by running over a few of those that have come to light.

According to a calculation made by the Toronto Telegram in its issue of March 14, 1918, the capital value of the life interest in the seat in the Senate, acquired by the candidate who made way for the President of the Privy Council in the county of Durham, amounts to $50,000. The payment of that sum the hon. gentleman saddled the country with in order that he might get into Parliament.

A second obligation of the same kind was imposed on the country last year when the President of the Privy Council had appointed to the Senate another gentleman who had been rejected in turn by the Liberals, by the Conservatives, and by the United Farmers of his own county. Thus, according to the calculation of the Toronto Telegram, another $50,000 charge upon the country must be credited to the hon. gentleman.

Speaking in the House on March 27, 1918, the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), in reply, I think, to the then leader of the Opposition, said that the Food Controller's branch was in the hands and under the direction of the President of the Privy Council. Up to that time the cost of the department averaged close to $200,000 per year, and the Farmers' Sun has described it as the most useless as well as the most costly of all the commissions that had been appointed by the Government.

Within a few weeks of assuming office the President of the Privy Council summoned a women's conference here at Ottawa. In due course the women delegates came to spend an afternoon, and were received by the hon. gentleman. There is no record of whether they put in the time crystal gazing or denouncing cigarettes, but it is on record at page 875 of Hansard for 1918 that the country paid $4,427.91 for that afternoon tea.

As an offset to this conference and just to show his impartiality and versatility, the President of the Privy Council next summoned a conference of organized labour. The delegates came at the appointed time and met the hon. gentleman, and for the afternoon of mutual improvement the country paid another $4,427.

Then, Sir, you have heard of the Department of Public Information. That was a "Puffery Bureau," operated for the especial benefit of the President of the Privy Council, and down to the 30th of September last it had cost the country $168,000. That amount, Sir, must have been greatly increased since September, because to the expenses of the office here must be added the expense of opening up and maintaining a similar office in New York.

Another of the hon. gentleman's fads was the Repatriation Committee. To give it an air of usefulness and respectability, there was attached to it an advisory committee of the Great War Veterans' Association. The gentlemen who composed this advisory committee endeavoured to give the President of the Privy Council and his colleagues the point of view of the returned men through a series of recommendations on a large number of practical subjects, but when they found nothing was done they resigned on October 29 last, and in their letter of resignation they said:

> To our regret and disappointment the greater part of these recommendations have been ignored or only partially considered. Had these matters been dealt with in a statesmanlike manner the present Parliamentary Committee would have been unnecessary, and the unrest among returned men,—the direct result of inaction and half conceived measures,—would have been prevented. Even after the Parliamentary Committee met and the facts had been presented to them its recommendations are apparently such that we are constrained to regard them as unsatisfactory, and we are therefore placing our resignations in your hands, once more as a protest against the inadequate measures of re-establishing the man from the battlefields of Europe.
>
> (Sgd.) "William D. Tait,
> R. B. Maxwell,
> David Loughnan."

Now, Sir, up to the 29th of October last, the date of the resignation of the Great War Veterans' representatives, the Repatriation Committee had cost the country $194,309.08, and no doubt that amount also has been increased since that date.

Another creation of the President of the Privy Council was the Canadian Official Record. This publication was used as a medium for boosting the Government in general and the President of the Privy Council in particular. Its contents were largely reprints of articles that had appeared in other publications, and so indefensible was the expenditure of public money on such a sheet that Government newspapers like the Toronto News and the Ottawa Journal made strong protests against it. However, in less than eleven months the President of the Privy Council made this country pay $40,134.36 for this toy of his.

Then, Sir, the President of the Privy Council went into the moving picture busi-

ness. Although the Department of Trade and Commerce has a splendid outfit for the production of moving pictures, and has expended upon it and its Publicity Bureau a sum that must now approximate $100,000, the President of the Privy Council insisted on attaching to his Department of Public Information another moving picture outfit. According to a return brought down in the House, the hon. gentleman after paying $5,000 in connection with moving pictures, entered into a contract for one year with the Pathescope Company of Toronto for producing other moving pictures, to be approved by him, and he is paying the company $50,000 for their year's work. It is significant of the flouting of Parliament in the matter of public expenditure that that $50,000 payment is to be made out of moneys provided by the Demobilization Appropriation Act of 1919. In that way the transaction would be covered up and thus escape criticism in Parliament. Now that it has been exposed it will, I hope, open up a field of work for those who believe that the Government should practice economy.

In regard to this moving picture business the Farmers' Sun a short time ago drew the attention to a Government expenditure of $504.80 for bacon-hog moving picture films. Now, Sir, that is a suspicious looking item.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Hon. Mr. MURPHY: At once it raises the question of whether Sir Joseph Wesley Flavelle, through his fellow Christian the President of the Privy Council, has succeeded in getting an advertisement for his bacon at the public expense. That will also bear investigation at the hands of those who believe that the Government, particularly at this time should practise economy. In view of this indefensible waste of public money the "Farmer's Sun" is moved to say: "But still we, the common people, are adjured from Ottawa to 'produce, produce; and save, save.' Isn't it about time Ottawa itself set an example in economy?"

Now, Sir, if we pursue a little further our scrutiny of what the President of the Privy Council has been doing here at Ottawa it will be plain that, in his case at all events, appeals for economy will fall upon deaf ears. He believes in bolstering up his political fortunes at the country's expense, and there is no field in which he is not prepared to make a new venture, regardless of the cost. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that not long ago the hon. gentleman announced that the Canadian people were suffering from neurasthenia, and as his colleagues were insensible to this national affliction he took it upon himself to act as national physician. Accordingly he established a new Department of Health at an initial cost of $66,000 and put himself at the head of it as Dominion Physician-in-Chief. This was too much even for Toronto, and, as if to ridicule the minister's new pose, that city at once proceeded to develop an outbreak of smallpox. This lack of appreciation by the city in which he had tried to dodge his taxes must have astonished the minister, because even though he may have consulted all the pharmacopoeias in the Toronto Star office and the Methodist Book Room, he did not emerge from either place with any remedy adequate to meet the new smallpox situation. In fact, while he was trying to think up something that would make his new Health Department function, the health authorities of the ctiy of Montreal first, and later those of the province of Quebec, issued regulations forbidding any person coming from Ontario to enter the province of Quebec unless proof of recent vaccination could be furnished. This was done, of course, purely as a measure of self-protection, but in view of the hon. gentleman's record and temperament nobody need be surprised if he should issue an order in council declaring that after careful analysis his Health Department has found that the action taken by Quebec is a dangerous symptom of French-Canadian lèse-majesté, and that to prevent its becoming contagious a new branch will be created to deal with it exclusively.

Mr. Speaker, not only has the hon. gentleman taken our national health under his wing; he has done likewise with our national morals. He is not only the national physician; he is also the national big policeman. If we will not be good, he will throw us all into jail; and for this purpose he has organized a new police force. This he did by prying loose the Dominion Police Force from his easy-going colleague the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Doherty) and then merging it with the Royal Northwest Mounted Police force under a new name. The combined force, according to an official announcement handed out by the minister, is to consist of a mounted section and a dismounted division. The duties of the former were defined in this official announcement in these words:

> The mounted section of the force will be extended in its operations to the East, so that a series of detachments will be available in all the Provinces for the enforcement of Federal laws and also to assist the Provincial authorities at any time.

Mr. Speaker, when I read this language I was astounded. It was such a plain intimation of future encroachments upon provincial rights and suggested so many possibilities of stirring up trouble in the provinces of Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, that I wrote the premiers of those provinces directing their attention to the announcement the minister had given to the press and inquiring in each case if the province had asked for the assistance of this new "Rowell Police" or if any situation in which these police would be required was likely to develop. The replies from the provincial premiers were to the effect that their provinces had made no request for the new police; that they were not aware of any situation in which the services of these police would be required, and that, speaking generally, the provinces were able to look after their own affairs without any outside assistance. The reply from Sir Lomer Gouin, Premier of Quebec, states the case so admirably that I will read it:

Office of the Prime Minister,
Province of Quebec.
QUEBEC, February 4, 1920.

Honourable Charles Murphy, M.P.,
46 Elgin Street,
Ottawa.

Dear Mr. Murphy,—I have your letter of the 31st ultimo, in which you are so good as to call my attention to the official announcement of the merging of the North West Mounted Police and of the Dominion Police.

You ask me if I can let you know whether any request was made on behalf of this province, at any time, for the services of this new police force and, if not, whether any condition of things exists, or is likely to exist, that will make it necessary for us to call in its assistance.

In answer, I have to state that we made no request in connection with police assistance to the Federal Government and that we do not anticipate that any condition will arise necessitating our having recourse to the Federal Police.

I must add that I felt an astonishment equal to your own when I read the announcement you refer to as I have always considered that police matters, in the province, are within the exclusive attributes of the provincial governments as being a part of the administration of justice, of municipal and local matters in the province.

Mr. ROBERT H. BUTTS (Cape Breton South and Richmond): Will my hon. friend read the reply made by Hon. George Murray, Premier of Nova Scotia?

Mr. MURPHY: I would like to oblige my hon. friend but I prefer to read the reply which I am now reading to the House.

I have grave doubts as to there being any jurisdiction at all in the Federal authorities in this connection. Some time ago Lord Rosebery stated something which I believe has its application here. The Imperial Government had advertised the sale of a part of his property which it had used during the war, without in any way consulting Lord Rosebery in the matter. The latter, on seeing the advertisement, gave out to the press that the Government and its Commissions had so frequently and to such an extent encroached upon the rights of private individuals during the war that it probably had come to think that these rights existed no longer. I am inclined to believe that the numerous encroachments upon Provincial rights and powers of which the Federal Government and its Commissions have been guilty during the last four or five years have also given them the idea that Provincial rights exist no more.

I can assure you that we feel capable of coping unaided with every thing that occurs in this Province in the way of administration of justice and the protection of the life and property of its inhabitants, and that we are perfectly secure in the opinion that nothing will occur that will be beyond our powers.

Believe me.

Yours faithfully,
LOMER GOUIN.

Of course, there is another purpose for which the new police force could be used. While the hon. gentleman remains at the head of the force, it can be used for raids on private houses, colleges, and libraries, that may contain books or papers objectionable to the hon. gentleman or his friends. In point of fact, that very thing has been done in several parts of the Dominion in a way as high-handed and unjustifiable as if the Kaiser himself was directing the raids. On this point, the Grain Growers' Guide made a few timely observations. In a recent issue, that paper said:

The people of Canada will not be true to their instincts, their traditions, and their just rights, as a free, self-governing people, if they do not demand, and insist upon getting, an explanation from Ottawa, in regard to the arbitrary proceedings that have taken place recently, months after the cessation of hostilities, in the invasion of private houses, colleges and libraries, under the provisions of an order-in-council framed explicitly for war-time conditions, the seizure of books and papers, and the sentencing of individuals to terms of imprisonment for having in their possession literature under the war-time ban of the censorship.

In Alberta, and in Ontario, these searches, arrests, confiscations, and punishments have been carried out in a manner which would have been more in keeping with the old methods of the old autocratic regime in Russia than with the institutions of government in this free country.

But, Sir, the invasion of private rights has not been restricted to the cases referred to by the Grain Growers' Guide. Of late, a new line of activity has been opened up for the new police force which apparently has instructions to make war on women

whose political opinions do not happen to please the President of the Council and his friends. The latest instance of this kind that came to my notice happened in Toronto, an dthe particulars of the incident are set out in the following letter:

DAUGHTERS OF CANADA, INCORPORATED 1919, DOMINION CHARTER.

TORONTO, Feb. 25, 1920.

Hon. CHAS. MURPHY, M.P.,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir:—I am sure that you will be interested to know that we have got as far as the Dominion Mounted Police.

Our first intimation of this was that the Y.M.C.A. refused us a room. The President, the Secretary, and I, called to see the man in charge, and to ask why—since many organizations have meetings there—the Daughters of Canada were excluded.

He told us that a man had called from the Mounted Police, armed with some newspaper clippings (!) and asked for the address of our officers, as he was going to take action against us for disloyalty. Our Corresponding Secretary Mrs. Stevens, then went to the headquarters of these Police, and found an Englishman, Inspector Bates, in charge. She demanded his authority for interfering with our organization, and asked to see the newspaper clippings. He told her that they had been passed on. She could get no further information. I can't help wondering if they were "passed on" to the minister whose special brand of courage is attacking women from afar off.

Yours truly,

(Signed) CHRISTINE ROSS BARKER,
Treasurer D. of C.

Making war on women! Imagine what a degradation that must be for the gallant members of a force with the magnificent record and the world-wide reputation of the Royal North West Mounted Police. As the Ottawa Citizen, in its issue of February 6, said:

Changing the name of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, or the Dominion Mounted Police, does not necessarily mean that law and order is being promoted. Royal Northwest Mounted Police is a name known and respected in every part of the world. When a man joins the Royal Northwest Mounted Police, he becomes conscious of having to live up to the traditions and reputation of the force, created by half a cenury of service on the side of law and order. Mr. Rowell's new police begins without any such name, and with nothing very inspiring at its political head. When the present government, itself governed by fear, gives place to government with confidence in the good sense of the Canadian people, the Royal Northwest Mounted Police should have their honored name restored to them.

Not only should they have their honoured name restored to them, but they should be returned to the work which they have done so long and so well. To use the phraseology of the Ottawa Citizen, "the good sense of the Canadian people" will commend any action of this Parliament that will restore the Royal North West Mounted Police force to the enviable position it occupied in our national life before the President of the Privy Council succeeded in pulling it down from its high estate.

The hon. gentleman poses as an exemplar in so many lines, and by reason of that so often assumes the right to set standards for other people, that a few minutes may be profitably employed in examining the kind of an example he sets the public in the matter of loyalty to his own colleagues. Last year, during the debate on the Budget, we had the spectacle of the hon. gentleman conveying to the House and to the country the intimation that his former colleague, the ex-Minister of Agricutlure (Mr. Crerar), had taken in Council a position on the tariff inconsistent with that which he afterwards took in this House. Up to the time the President of the Privy Council made his appearance in Dominion politics, the proceedings of Council were regarded as secret, and the members of Council were regarded as being bound by their oath of office not to reveal them. Only certain decisions of Council were made public, and those only in an official and a well-understood way; but the hon. gentleman, with that fine sense of honour that distinguishes him from common folk introduced a startling innovation when, in replying to the speech on the Budget of his former colleague the ex-Minister of Agriculture, he gave the House and the country plainly to understand that the attitude which the ex-Minister of Agriculture had taken in Council, where all that is said and done is of a confidential and secret character, was at variance with the attitude which the ex-Minister of Agriculture took later in this House. This is what the President of the Council said. I quote from Hansard of June 12, 1919, page 3407:

Every man must exercise his own judgment on an important issue like this and I have the greatest respect for the judgment and sincerity of my hon. friend, the member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar), but I say to the House and to the country that if I was prepared, as all my colleagues were, to support the Finance Minister in coming down to this House during this war year without any revision of the tariff, I do not believe that I am absolved from supporting him when he has revised the tariff in a measure according to the lines that I desire.

Hon. members will note the oblique and tortuous way in which the President of the Council, in the words which I have just quoted, put his former colleague the ex-

Minister of Agriculture, who was known to favour tariff revision, in the position of having first agreed in Council that there should not be any revision of the tariff in 1919, and then of having later opposed such a revision as he desired when it was brought down in the House. The President of the Privy Council did this knowing that the only way in which the ex-Minister of Agriculture could refute him would be by disclosing what that hon. gentleman had said and done in Council, and the President of the Privy Council knew perfectly well that as an honourable man the ex-Minister of Agriculture would make no such disclosure. So, relying on the sense of honour of his ex-colleague, the President of the Privy Council in violation of his oath of office did not hesitate to place his former colleague in a false position before the House and the country.

The precise character of the offence committed by the President of the Privy Council will be made more clear if I read that portion of the oath bearing on this matter, which he took as a Privy Councillor. The oath was in these terms:

> You Newton Wesley Rowell do solemnly promise and swear that you will serve His Majesty truly and faithfully in the place of His Council in this His Majesty's Dominion of Canada, you will keep close and secret all such matters as shall be treated, debated and resolved on in Privy Council, without publishing or disclosing the same or any part thereof, by Word, Writing, or otherwise to any Person out of the same Council, but to such only as be of the Council.

That is the beginning of the oath which is taken by all Privy Councillors, and which the President of the Privy Council took when he was sworn in as a member of that Council, and it was in violation of that part of the oath which I have read that he made the statement in the House to which I drew attention a few moments ago. I have only to observe further, Sir, that even if the intimation given to the House by the President of the Privy Council about his colleague's attitude in Council were true, that would not justify this breach of the spirit and the letter of his oath of office.

Now let me recall the attitude this same hon. gentleman has displayed in the House and in the country towards his colleagues the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) and the late Minister of Customs, now the Secretary of State (Mr. Sifton). These two hon. gentlemen represented Canada at the Peace Conference. The President of the Privy Council was not there, although he and his kept press made frantic efforts to induce the right hon. the Prime Minister to send him there. When the Peace Treaty was signed, it was the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) and the then Minister of Customs (Mr. Sifton) who signed it on behalf of Canada, but when anything is to be said about the Peace Conference or the Peace Treaty or the League of Nations the President of the Privy Council, who was not at the Conference, and who did not sign the treaty, coolly elbows his two colleagues out of the way and tells the House and the country what was done at the Conference, what the Peace Treaty means, and particularly what the League of Nations means. There, Sir, you have another example of the hon. gentleman's modesty and of his fine regard for the feelings of his colleagues —of his always doing that which will promote harmony in the Cabinet and in the Government ranks.

In case some one might be tempted to say that an Opposition member should not complain if the President of the Privy Council is acting in the way I have described, let me point out that I am not complaining; far from it, I am simply drawing attention to what is going on.

We had another example of the hon. gentleman's loyalty to his colleagues and his fine regard for their feelings when the Grand Trunk Bill was under discussion last session. The Minister of Railways (Mr. J. D. Reid) and the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) had charge of that measure, but on a number of occasions the President of the Privy Council shoved them aside and took the conduct of the Bill out of their hands. That was particularly the case on a memorable evening when, after the hon. member for Cape Breton North (Mr. McKenzie) had moved an amendment to the second reading of the Bill, the President of the Privy Council struggled with his colleague the Minister of Railways for possession of the floor. The incident is embalmed in Hansard of October 21, in these few lines:

> Mr. J. D. REID: Mr. Speaker—
> Mr. ROWELL: Mr. Speaker—
> Some hon. MEMBERS: Who has the floor?
> Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.
> Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

To our surprise the Minister of Railways gave way and allowed this great railway authority to make the speech which under all the rules of the House the Minister of Railways should have made on that occasion.

Having disposed of the Minister of Railways and the Minister of the Interior, the

President of the Privy Council next displayed his loyalty to his colleague the Minister of Labour by going down to Washington and usurping his place there at the International Labour Conference. Incidentally, he found time during the Conference to make a trip from Washington to Detroit, at the public expense,

5 p.m.

I have no doubt, for the purpose of addressing a Y.M.C.A. conference in the latter city. He is reported by the Toronto Globe to have said when speaking at Detroit:

> No nation can go out to the other nations of the world as a Christian leader until it establishes social justice within its own boundaries. We have not achieved social justice. We have not succeeded in amplifying the ideal of human brotherhood sufficiently to entitle us to be spiritual leaders.

He must have had an access of modesty that day. He continued:

> I think quite probably there will be some funerals in both your country and mine before we accomplish that.

As you will observe, Sir, the hon. gentleman's remarks at Detroit were somewhat doleful, and they have a sound like that which a person makes when he is preparing a soft spot for himself to fall on. In point of fact, that is just what the hon. gentleman was doing. He spoke at Detroit shortly after the Ontario elections, and as the county of Durham, which he represents in this House, by way of a senatorship in another, had just elected a Liberal and a Farmer as its provincial representatives, he felt it was high time to begin practising his political swan song, and so he began at Detroit with this reference to funerals. He added another verse at Port Hope, and of that I shall speak a little later.

Meanwhile I want to deal briefly with a few of the hon. gentleman's other activities which have combined to create confusion in the public mind. The misleading propaganda in which the President of the Privy Council habitually indulges has been given free rein in connection with his utterances about the League of Nations and the eight-hour day. Although it has taken the United States Senate many months to discuss the Covenant of the League of Nations, and the obligations that the United States will assume if the Treaty is adopted without reservations, the Parliament of Canada, after a superficial and brief discussion was induced, chiefly by the hon. gentleman to swallow the Treaty and Covenant and to reject the eminently proper amendment proposed from this side of the House by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding). Since that time the President of the Privy Council has adopted a truculent attitude towards the United States, and in addresses before various clubs has laboured to create the impression that principally through his efforts Canada has assumed the moral leadership of this continent, that the United States Senate in not swallowing the Treaty and the League of Nations with its eyes shut has forfeited public respect, and is derelict in its duty towards other entente nations, and that the chief, if not the only objection of the United States Senate to the Treaty was the number of votes given to Great Britain and the Overseas Dominions.

Just to illustrate the difference between such a dabbler in world politics as the hon. gentleman and a man of trained experience and sound judgment in international affairs, I am going to refer you to a notable article in the North American Review for January last written by the Hon. J. M. Beck who was deputy attorney general of the United States in the Garfield Administration. Mr. Beck has delivered many important addresses in Canada and he was well known here as a staunch friend of the Allies long before his country entered the war. Mr. Beck's article begins with a reference to the traditional policy of the United States towards world politics and after recalling an unsuccessful effort that was made one hundred years ago to have the United States join a European League of Nations, Mr. Beck points out that under the American constitution no official, however great or illustrious he may be, could commit the United States to any treaty obligation except upon the concurrence of two-thirds of the Senate. Mr. Beck then recalls the storm of protest throughout the United States with which President Wilson's announcement that he was going to Paris was received; the refusal of the American people in the State elections of 1918 by a majority exceeding 1,000,000 votes to grant the President an unlimited moral authority to commit them to any peace programme; the formal notice given by more than one-third of the Senate on the return of the President with the first draft of the Covenant of the League that it would not be accepted by the American people, and the fatal blunders that were made by the European nations in not heeding these notices and warnings. Notwithstanding these blunders and the Senate rejection of the Peace Treaty on account of the League of Nations, Mr. Beck declares that

"the Anglo-French-American entente is not dead" and that "the best hope of the world for the preservation of a just peace lies not so much in the League of Nations as in the spirit of mutual co-operation between the members of the great alliance which called it into being." In final explanation of the attitude of the United States Mr. Beck says:

> It is now obvious that the United States while willing to be the helpful friend of her sister democracies was not disposed to be a partner of a large number of nations, some democratic and some autocratic and with some of whom she has scant sympathy.

Throughout the article there is but one allusion to the votes allowed Great Britain and the overseas Dominions and that is made merely for the purpose of explaining that the multiplied vote of the British Empire was desired by the Overseas Dominions rather than by England. Mr. Beck makes it clear that the action of the Senate was in no way influenced by these votes or by other alleged considerations but that it was based upon constitutional principles and upon the broadest grounds of patriotism because the covenant would permanently affect the destinies of the American people. He adds that a majority of the American people take a just pride in the fact that the Senate "refused to permit its high prerogative to be defeated by that which was virtually a policy of coercion." For us Canadians that article in the North American Review is full of significance. It shows how careful our neighbours to the south are about entering into foreign engagements of any kind and how rigidly opposed they are to the surrender of any constitutional privilege they now enjoy. In a word, Sir, the article is instinct with the spirit of a people who are free and who are determined to remain free without giving offence to any other people enjoying the same freedom.

If, in conjunction with that article, there be borne in mind first, the testimony of William C. Bullitt before the foreign relations committee of the United States Senate to the effect that Secretary Lansing had said in Paris that if the United States knew what it was being let in for it would never ratify the Treaty; secondly, the recent statement of Mr. Asquith during the Paisley election that the peace arranged at Versailles was a bad peace, and, thirdly, the still more recent statement of Earl Curzon that the Peace Treaty will have to be rewritten, that it was never intended to be permanent—if, I repeat, these things be borne in mind, is it not about time for the Canadian people to call a halt to the wild capering of the President of the Privy Council through the mazes of the Treaty and of the League of Nations and that they read for themselves what men who understand both the Treaty and the League of Nations are saying about them. In any event, Sir, should not Canada be as little disposed as the United States, in the words of Mr. Beck, "to be a partner of a large number of nations, some democratic, some autocratic and with some of whom she has scant sympathy?" The future of this country, like that of the United States is on this continent. That being so, I ask why should Canada be less careful than the United States in committing herself to foreign engagements of which she knows nothing? Why should this Parliament as the guardian of Canadian interests allow herself to be stampeded in the dark in reference to such vital matters as the Treaty and the League of Nations when eminent jurists on both sides of the Atlantic make it plain that neither is what the President of the Privy Council says it is.

Let me make a few observations in reference to the hon. gentleman's performances in connection with the eight-hour day. Having elbowed his colleague, the Minister of Labour out of the way and assumed the role of labour leader of the Dominion, the President of the Council then put himself forward as the leading authority on the eight-hour day and the forty-eight-hour week in this country. More than anything else, his speeches created the impression in the public mind that the Peace Treaty made or would make the eight-hour day obligatory in the countries which signed it. The Treaty does nothing of the kind. The Treaty only sets forth as a principle that the eight-hour day should be a "standard to be aimed at," the inference being that it should be adopted by a country when the economic conditions of that country justified such action. Beyond that the language of the Treaty does not go. The pretensions and performances of the President of the Council in reference to the eight-hour day received some attention at the hands of a newspaper which is a supporter of Union Government. In its issue of December 19 last the Montreal Gazette said editorally:

> Mr. ROWELL'S MISSION.
>
> Having committed the Canadian Government to the principle, if not the practice, of the eight-hour day, at the Washington Conference, Hon. Mr. Rowell is now engaged in discussing the matter with the Canadian pub-

lic. A reversal of this procedure would have been more in harmony with the theory of responsible government. Mr. Rowell's ministerial record does not reveal him as a consistent apostle of that theory, and it is due as much to his instrumentality as to that of any other member of the Administration, that responsible government has so largely given place to Cabinet rule in this country. Mr. Rowell spoke for the Canadian Government at the Labour Conference in Washington. He did not speak there for the Canadian people nor for Canadian labour. He was quoted as stating that the matter was one to be determined by the Government, and having enunciated that progressive principle, he announced his support of the eight-hour day convention.

A little later the same article reads thus:

The reduction of the aggregate hours of labour means a reduction in the amount of work done. Experience has by actual demonstration shown that to be the case. Yet Mr. Rowell talks in the same breath of the desirability of the forty-eight hour week, and the necessity of increased production. It would be difficult to imagine two more inconsistent propositions, and yet Mr. Rowell presents them as complementary.

Further on the article says:

Some further effort might probably be made toward a declaration in definite terms as to the exact nature and scope of the conditions attached to the acceptance of the eight-hour day. What limitations were made, and how far do they go? Is it proposed to apply the so-called principle of the eight-hour day to the basic industry of Canada, that of agriculture? Are the fisheries to be operated on an eight-hour day basis, and is the forty-eight hour week to prevail in the great lumber industry? These are all seasonal occupations, carried on under conditions which do not lend themselves to the operation of an eight-hour day, or, if at all, only at enormous additional cost, which must be borne by the consumer. As against this increase in the cost of production there is, of course, the alternative of a reduction in the production itself, again with its burden of higher prices to be paid by the consumer.

Take agriculture as an example. It is hardly necessary to state that a reduction in the agricultural yield means higher prices for the amount actually produced. The eight-hour day in agriculture would inevitably reduce production, unless more labour is employed, and more labour, if it can be secured at all on the farm, means increased cost of production, which the consumer must pay. The question as to the practicability of applying the eight-hour day to farm work was answered only a few days ago in Toronto by J. C. Dixon, of Warfield, presiding as master of the Dominion Grange. It would mean, he said, that the people would have to pay 30 cents a quart for milk, $2 a peck for potatoes, $5 a bushel for wheat, and $1 a pound for butter, and would "come nearer to jarring the Canadian people back to a level of common sense than anything else that could possibly happen at present." If the eight-hour day means this in agriculture, how is it to result differently in other industries? Does it not mean reduced production, or the maintenance of production at greater cost, and increased prices to the public either way?

So much, Sir, for the vapourings of the President of the Privy Council and the misapprehension which he has created about the terms of the Treaty relating to the eight-hour day. What has happened in this regard furnishes another proof of the mistake Parliament made by allowing itself to be hurried into ratification of the Treaty before examining and discussing its contents in detail.

Mr. Speaker, apart from anything the Treaty may contain, if you want sane leadership in Canada on the question of an eight-hour day you can get it from the National Trade Unions in the Province of Quebec. There was a labour convention held in Three Rivers in September last, which was attended by delegates representing sixty-three National organizations and 30,000 workmen from all parts of the province. The convention adopted a number of resolutions of the most practical character. Here is the resolution that was adopted with reference to hours of work:

The Convention expresses the opinion that any provision enforcing a fixed number of hours for the legal working day is arbitrary, unwise and inopportune, but it maintains that the length of working days should be such as to give the workman a reasonable time to recuperate, to perform his duties as husband, father, citizen, and Catholic, and to do justice to the reasonable obligations of commerce, industry and finance.

A report of the convention contains this summary of the discussion about the eight-hour day:

"We see no advantage," declared some of the speakers, "in legalizing a uniform eight-hour day for trades requiring little effort and carried on under favourable sanitary conditions. On the other hand, we find the same eight-hour day excessive for other very exhausting trades practised under most distressing conditions. Instead of claiming an arbitrary regulation which ignores obvious differences, we lay down the principles governing the whole question and let the various trades conform to those principles according to their respective needs."

"Less working hours and a higher salary is all very well," remarked a speaker, "but if every one does less and earns more, the cost of living will go rising and where will it stop? Then what about the poor devil who belongs to no union and can get no increase? Will his condition improve?"

Thus you see, Mr. Speaker, that the labour unions of the province of Quebec keep in mind not only the welfare of their own members, but also the welfare of those workers who are not represented in unions. While doing this for the workers, they acknowledge their duty to do justice to the reasonable obligations of commerce, industry, and finance.

Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder that, industrially, Quebec has become the admiration and the envy of this continent, and the one

province in Canada where foreign capital seeks investment? Is it any wonder that a man who knows the conditions in Quebec as Sir Andrew MacPhail does should speak of that province in these terms:

"Quebecers were referred to as Canadians and there was nothing more true. It was very significant that the spirit of Quebec governed Canada, and without that spirit Canada could not be governed.

"The people had inherited the qualities of their forefathers, and these qualities, which had kept France to the fore in Europe had also kept Quebec in the lead in Canada.

"It was the spirit of Quebec that made of the province a paradise of common sense, of political wisdom and of personal liberty. If that spirit could be maintained, Quebec would be the last refuge of civilization on the continent."

Mr. Speaker, no more deserved tribute was ever uttered than that paid by Sir Andrew MacPhail to the spirit of Quebec. Splendid at all times, that spirit has been particularly splendid during the past two years and a half. Reviled, insulted, and outraged on behalf of Union Government, Quebec went quietly and steadily upon her way. In less than eighteen months after winning a criminally conducted election, Union Government was on its knees to Quebec praying that some of its public men would join the Government and save it from destruction. What a spectacle, Mr. Speaker, was presented last summer when the head of the Union Government, the right hon. the Prime Minister himself, and his new Minister of Finance, went sailing up and down the St. Lawrence river calling at every other wharf and beseeching one French Canadian after another to enter the Government and save the country. But the men of Quebec were true to the spirit of Quebec; and as their province had gained in national fibre and in national respect by resolutely refusing to have anything to do with Union Government, they could not be coaxed, bribed, or cajoled into an alliance of any kind with the vilifiers of their province, their race, and their creed. And so, Sir, they remain aloof and apart from this Union Government conserving their strength for the day upon which the spirit of their province will be triumphantly justified by the defeat of the cowering politicians who let loose the floodgates of passion and prejudice, and who to-day cry aloud to be saved from the ghosts of their own raising.

Mr. Speaker, we hear from time to time a great deal of talk about the need of unity in this country; we have heard during this debate declarations of that kind from the hon. member for London (Mr. Cronyn), from the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Whidden), and from other hon. gentlemen. As I listened to these hon. members I could not help reflecting that they were somewhat late with their appeals, and that there would have been more point in those appeals if they had been made, for instance, two years ago last December, while the general election was in progress. As the result of that election the present Government attained office. This Government is called a Union Government, but Sir, it has destroyed every vestige of unity in this country. How could it be otherwise when the head of the Government is a gentleman who, a little over two years ago, used language in this House calculated to incite returned soldiers to turn their arms against those who dared oppose him and his policy? So that there may be no doubt of what the right hon. gentleman said I will quote his exact words. They will be found in Hansard for 1917 at page 2195. He then stated:

If what are left of 400,000 such men come back to Canada with fierce resentment, and even rage in their hearts, conscious that they have been deserted and betrayed, how shall we meet them when they ask the reason? I am not so much concerned for the day when this Bill becomes law, as for the day when these men return, if it is rejected.

That is the language used by the Prime Minister, and its meaning admits of no doubt. Naturally, with such a man at the head of this Government national unity is an impossibility. But, Sir, it is doubly impossible when the aims and objects of a body from which the right hon. gentleman derives his chief support are made known. That body is the Orange Order of Canada; and I propose to disclose to the House and to the country the kind of contribution to national unity that this chief prop of Union Government has been making.

Mr. Speaker, if I were to quote statements about the Orange Order made by persons not members of the Order it might be objected that such statements were prejudiced or were incorrect or unreliable, because made by persons without actual personal knowledge of the aims and objects of the Orange Order. In order that no such objection may be urged, I propose letting the Orangemen speak for themselves, and I am going to read from a circular which carries the names of the leaders of Orangeism in the province of Ontario. The circular is self-explanatory, and while I will not read the whole of it on account of its length, I will be pleased when I am through with it

to hand it over to any person who may be desirous of seeing all that it contains. It has to be kept in mind, Mr. Speaker, that I am about to quote from this circular for the purpose of making it clear that while the sentiments that find expression in its pages are held by any considerable number of our people, and are sanctioned by any government in this country, national unity is a hollow phrase and a mockery of existing political conditions.

The circular, which might well be termed "A Canadian Hymn of Hate" begins in this fashion:

(Strictly Confidential.)

To be referred to or read only within the tiled doors of lodge, chapter or preceptory, and must on no account pass out of your possession.

Report of the Joint Legislation Committee of the Orange Order.

70 DEWSON STREET,
TORONTO, ONT., March 1, 1918.

Dear Sir and Brother,—As soon as you receive this copy of the report of the Joint Legislation Committee, will you very kindly return a note acknowledging the receipt. This is very important, as we are anxious to know that the document comes into the right hands. A stamped addressed envelope is enclosed for this reply.

A further report will be presented to the coming session of the Most Worshipful Grand Lodge of British America at its meeting in Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, next July.

Our financial year ends on March 31, and the report will be issued shortly thereafter.

I am, faithfully and fraternally yours,

Signed W. BANKS,
Secretary-Treasurer.

R. W. Sir and Brethren—Your Joint Committee on Legislation beg leave to report as follows:

The black clouds of war still overshadow God's beautiful world, and the bloodthirsty and impious War Lord of Germany continues, with the aid of his willing and equally guilty satellites, to pollute the earth, to break every promise, to boast in his sinfulness that he is God's representative on earth, whereas we know he is the Devil's most faithful ally.

Then they come down to matters more prosaic:

At our last meeting we reported that the Premier, in answer to our urgent request for compulsory military service on the draft principle, had said if an emergency arose he would not hesitate to follow such a course.

We continued our effort for this military service law, and shortly before the Military Service Act was introduced into the Commons a deputation from our committee which went to Ottawa, were assured that a measure of compulsory military service would be introduced, and this has, of course, now become law.

* * * * * *

We have renewed our request for the exclusion from Canada of all evil-disposed and disloyal people who may desire to enter our Dominion

[Mr. Morphy.]

from the British Isles or other lands, under whatever name or disguise they may assume.

We have asked for the exclusion of alien enemy immigrants, for the refusal of land grants to all alien enemies, and we are pleased to report that by instructions to the customs officers, immigration officers and land agents, our requests along these lines are being carried out.

Naturalization of people from alien enemy countries is at a standstill, and the War Elections Act was passed, as we urged it should, by which alien enemies in Canada were almost entirely disfranchised.

Acting in hearty co-operation, as we always do, our own Order, through its M.W. Grand Master, Dr. Ellis, and the Royal Black Knights through their Grand Master, Bro. A.A. Gray, issued an appeal to both memberships to use every legitimate means to secure the support of the members of Parliament in every constituency for the Military Service Act and the War-time Elections Act. We must see to it that the safe-guards of this Election Act are not thrown away when the war is over.

I commend that to your notice, Mr. Speaker, in view of the new franchise Act we are promised.

We are urging the Government to see to it that people who, by reason of peace treaties at the close of the war may be entitled to come here from alien countries, should not be enfranchised at all, and that under no circumstances shall their descendants, or the descendants of people of alien enemy countries now naturalized here be enfranchised until they can read and write in the English language and until they sign a document agreeing to obey our laws, learn the English language, have it efficiently taught in their schools, and to forfeit all their property and civil rights and be liable to deportation on conviction of failure in these matters.

* * * * * *

We congratulate the Ontario Government—

Of course, this was drafted, Mr. Speaker, long before the recent Ontario election.

—on its new land regulations, which provide against any alien enemy or military shirker securing lands in New Ontario, and for the first time in the history of this Dominion it is made part of the contract for securing the land that the would-be settler agrees to forfeit his claim if he disobeys the military and other laws of the Dominion, and if he refuses or neglects to have his children educated thoroughly in English, or disobeys the school laws, or other laws of the province.

With Bro. the Hon. G. H. Ferguson, as Minister of Crown Lands—

There no longer, Mr. Speaker.

—with R. W. Bro. Dane as Commissioner for these new lands, and W. Bro. W. D. McPherson Chairman of the Soldiers' Aid Commission, which is helping to settle soldiers in the North, we hope soon to have the disloyal French Canadian element on these new lands in their proper place.

* * * * * *

We regret that the Ontario bilingual school fight is still unsettled. We repeat what we said last year on this subject:—

Then the report goes on to deal with the usual arguments about bilingualism in Ontario.

Then it proceeds:

We have, at the request of our Princé Edward Island brethren, secured the legal opinion of two eminent lawyers on the question of the right to use French in the schools of that province. We believe the opinion will greatly help our Island brethren in their fight against French aggression.

It has become quite apparent that the school situation in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Alberta, must be thoroughly investigated, and our brethren in each of these provinces, assisted by legal advice, organization and investigation, so that effective steps may be taken to put an end to Rome's tactics in using French in schools wherever she can.

Mr. GEORGE BOYCE (Carleton): I may inform the hon. gentleman that the members of that band belong to the most loyal race in the Dominion of Canada. That cannot be said for his followers.

Mr. MURPHY: I did not quite catch what the hon. gentleman said, but in view—

Mr. BOYCE: Do you want to hear it again?

Mr. MURPHY: In view of the contents of the circular and of the fact that the hon. gentleman's name is attached to it I can understand his anxiety at the present moment.

Mr. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, I have to say that these are the most loyal men in all Canada; they stood boldly for their country when Canada stood in need of loyal men.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MURPHY (reading):

We have notified the Government that the 446 French signs on post offices outside of Quebec, and the 859 bilingual post office signs, also outside of Quebec, must all be removed, as we believe such signs, with any other language on them than English, are illegal. An order has been issued, forbidding the putting up outside of Quebec of any more bilingual or French signs, and an inquiry is to be made into our complaint.

Fortunately we can raise these and other matters in the House of Commons and the Senate, and trust in this way to be able to force the removal of these signs, put up to irritate English-speaking people. Dr. Coulter, Deputy Postmaster General, told us that he had very little control over the French-speaking inspectors. Your committee believe it is high time some one with a steel backbone and club undertook the control of the French officials.

We have complaints about French Canadians being on the railway mail service all over the province outside of Quebec. In view of the fact that the Quebec mail clerks will not allow a clerk from any other province to secure a Quebec appointment, it is time we gave them a dose of their own medicine. Our investigations along these lines are still proceeding.

Permit us to remark here that every French-Canadian who comes to Ontario to take the place of the "White men" who enlisted should be sent back to Quebec at the close of the war and a heavy tax levied on their Ontario earnings.

We are pleased to report that the Protestant Alliance we organized in Montreal is going ahead slowly but surely, and is already doing good work in looking after returned Protestant soldiers.

We are quietly continuing our investigations in the case of judges, school boards, councils, and other official bodies using the French language instead of the English. We have a good deal of territory to cover and have to proceed with caution.

We still have to watch Rome and her emissaries. She is ever on the watch for opportunities to help her cause, and interferes in public library matters, especially in rural centres, to keep out Protestant literature and introduce Romish. She also tries for control of parts of high schools, and in a thousand other ways endeavours to get her grip wherever she can. We appeal to our members everywhere to notify us of any incident of Rome's interference.

We say in the most emphatic manner that all our public business and correspondence must be in the English language and all records of courts, councils, school trustees and other public bodies, all tax bills and official notices of every kind, must be in English only. French and German languages or any other language than English must not be recognized in Ontario, and we must heartily endorse the Bill dealing with the German language presented to the legislature by Dr. Forbes Godfrey. We must respectfully suggest that he add after the words "German language," "or any other language than English."

We have complaints of Romish priests and nuns in hospitals and homes, supposed to be public institutions, interfering with Protestant patients, trying to get their money first, and then to join the church on their deathbed. We have had several investigations of this kind to undertake and the Provincial Secretary's Department has always helped us.

We do not for a moment desire to prevent our fellow Roman Catholic citizens from their fair share of public positions,—

I cannot read that without a smile, Mr. Speaker.

——but we do believe that in view of present conditions no Roman Catholic should be in charge of important public papers or in a position where he can favour people of his own race or creed.

We must not, however, stop at this. We must now begin a systematic campaign for the inspection of every convent, nunnery, monastery, and other secret places, places men and women are immured. We must demand legislation for the registration of every inmate, for the registration of all births and deaths, for the notification of every removal from one institution to another, for the absolute prohibition of the removal to places outside of this province of any inmate of these institutions, and for the holding of an inquest in case of every death in these places, as is necessary in the case of the death of any other prisoner.

Now is the time to act, and to act persistently and continuously, until we win.

In spring and early summer there were rumours that in some Romish centres arms were coming in and drilling taking place among Romanists. We immediately started searching investigations, and the Provincial Government employed secret service men also to investigate. The Dominion Government, at our request, also investigated.

And then, Mr. Speaker, listen to this.

No definite case was found, but there is an almost absolute certainty that these investigations put an end to any action Rome had planned for causing trouble here. The Dominion Government insists now on knowing the actual contents of packages, cases and other articles coming here from the States, as Britain does on all shipments from there.

Once again we desire to impress upon all officers and members the wisdom of doing everything possible to assist our returned soldiers. Our secretary has had scores of cases, in which our Orange members at the front have asked that their children, their wives, and their parents, be looked after. Some cases were very sad. In every case prompt attention was paid and many letters of grateful thanks have been received. Our secretary is a member of the Ontario Soldiers' Aid Commission, and is thus better able to attend to those cases. He has now the names and addresses of over 15,000 returned Ontario soldiers,——

Possible voters, you see, Mr. Speaker. (Reading):

——and in the course of the next few months he intends supplying every County Master with the names and addresses of these men in his county, so that those eligible can be induced to join the lodges in their respective localities. The entrance fees in such cases might be entirely abolished or reduced to a minimum.

The advisability of getting these men to join our ranks has been made perfectly obvious by the results of the general elections. It seems to us that parties are so changing that this Order, if our leaders are far-seeing and wise, will become the governing force in Dominion affairs, gathering to its side all loyal English-speaking and Protestant people. Very, very few Roman Catholics will aid us,——

Well, they at least give us credit for having a little sense. (Reading):

——and the vast majority of the French Canadian people will follow their British-and-Old-France-hating priests as they have done in the past.

When it became evident that a war-time election was to be forced on the country, this committee, knowing how the vast majority of our members desired the triumph of the loyalists, took steps to see that loyal candidates were chosen. The Union Government was formed, and then it became for us a loyal and patriotic duty to support the Union candidates. Some mistakes were made by the Government in the choice of these candidates.

I wonder if this refers to the constituency of Parkdale. (Reading):

We rejoice that so many of our Orange leaders were victorious in the campaign. So far as we have been able to secure definite information relative to the results, fully thirty or more Orangemen now have seats in the Commons. We anticipate that they will organize as a loyal Protestant party, with their own Whips, and act fearlessly and independently on all questions in which we are vitally interested.

They will have to be the watchdogs of the loyal Protestants of the Dominion. We congratulate every one of our members who, in the great battle for our country, our King, and our Empire, carried the Orange banner to victory. We have a right to expect the members of this Order, who are now Commoners, and Senators, to consult together and to work together, using their united influence to defeat all traitors and conspiracies, and we believe this they will do.

We have urged on the Government to see to it that sound Orangemen are elevated to the Senate in place of the late M.W. Bros. Sir Mackenzie Bowell and Hon. Dr. Sproule. We will continue this demand until we succeed.

All through this war the vast majority of French Canadians, blindly led by priests who hate Protestant Britain and who hate modern France, because she freed her schools from the licentious priesthood, have stood with our enemies and against all that is true and loyal and noble. We have nothing but sorrow and sympathy for the vast majority of the people of Quebec. They are a quiet, simple, and uneducated race, and easily fall a prey to priests and disloyal politicians. No wonder the mongrel crew which leads the Quebec crowd feared the results if from 60,000 to 70,000 men went to Britain and France and learned what it is to be free of priest rule. The conglomeration of superstition and selfishness which now rules Quebec stood aghast at what might follow the return of these men to the province.

And I may interject here that it was this conglomeration that the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance went down to Quebec to woo last summer.

This explains the Priest-Bourassa-Laurier combination against recruiting and the Military Service Act. Let it be part of our work to help educate the people of Quebec to help themselves. The first result of Quebec's attitude in the war will be to sink her to the lowest depth of contempt among the people of the Dominion and the United States, and to see her pointed to as the "Coward Province." It will take either an immediate revolution among her people, the removal of priestly rule and the freeing of her schools, or generations of degrading servitude ere she emerges from her present miserable position.

From this day forward we must insist that just what Confederation gave Quebec is all she shall get in future. She has been the spoilt child of this Dominion. From now on her language must be barred from every other province. Favours must cease and the Civil Service of the Dominion be rid of every official who cannot speak English.

Aye, Sir, but here comes the milk in the cocoanut. Here is why the report is made. Here is why race is set against race, creed against creed, and province against province. Listen to this paragraph:

We repeat, with more emphasis than ever that the wider circulation of the Sentinel has become more and more a necessity if our

Order is to continue to grow and prosper and if Protestant principles are to be sown broadcast over this continent. We who are in the fight every day of our lives are constantly reminded of the immense value of the Sentinel in our battle against Rome. We urge every Orange brother to be a subscriber and to endeavour to get others to subscribe. A member who does not take the Sentinel cannot be quite so earnest and active a member as he would were he a careful reader of the paper.

We have not wearied you with details of all our work. There is not a day passes but we have to deal with various matters. We are human and liable to err. We have ever held the banner of Orangeism high and trust as the years go by that our cause will grow and prosper and be blessed of the Lord.

With our earnest prayer that victory may speedily crown the arms of our beloved Sovereign and his Allies and that the Kaiser and his war lords may be utterly routed, peace may be proclaimed in Berlin, and all the peoples of our world-wide Empire be enabled to sing with heart and soul.

(Signed)

H. C. Hocken, M.P., P.R.W.G.M. Ontario West.
Dr. Williams, P.R.W.G.M. Ontario West.
Duncan Munroe, P.R.W.G.M. Ontario East.
James Berney, P.R.W.G.M. Ontario East.
E. T. Essery, P.R.W.G.M. Ontario West.
Capt. T. Ashmead Kidd, G.M. Orange Young Britons.
George Boyce, M.P., P.R.W.G.M. Ontario East.
W. M. Fitzgerald, R.W. Grand Secretary of Ontario West.
A. A. Gray, G.M. of M.W.G.B.C. of B.A.
His Honour Judge Scott, P.M. W.G.B. of B.A. and P.R.W.G.M. Ontario West.
Rev. H. A. Fish, P.G.C. of B.A.
Jos. Horwood, P.C.M. (Overseas.)
Wm. Crawford, P.C.M.
B. Kirk, P.D.M.
Wm. Lee, M.W.G. Secretary of B.A.
His Honour Judge Evan H. MacLean, P.R.W.G.M. of Ontario East.
Wm. Banks, Secretary-Treasurer, 70 Dewson St., Toronto, Ont.
F. M. Clarke, R.W.G. Secretary, Ontario East, Chairman of Committee.

God Save our King.

Within the limits of Parliamentary expression, it would be impossible to use language that would fittingly condemn the contents of that circular and the men who are responsible for its production and circulation. While that is the fact, there is one feature of it upon which public attention should be concentrated until official action is taken to put an end to what is now a public scandal. You will observe, Sir, that two of the names signed to the nefarious circular from which I have quoted are those of Judge Scott, and Judge Evan H. MacLean. In view of the anti-Catholic sentiments to which they have subscribed and of the rancorous bigotry of the whole circular bearing their names, these men, I submit, should be at once given the choice either of resigning from the Orange Order or of resigning their positions of Judges on the bench. Imagine the chance of obtaining justice a Catholic would have in a court presided over by either of these judges! And if, in addition, the Catholic were a French-Canadian, just picture for yourselves what would be likely to happen to him!

In times past, we boasted of the impartiality of our courts, and we were accustomed to point to our judges as administering justice without fear, favour or affection. No boast of that kind can be made in connection with any court presided over by either Judge Scott or Judge MacLean while they entertain such opinions about their Catholic fellow-citizens as those to which their names are subscribed. Both of these judges were appointed by the present Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty); and while he may have been unaware of their characters in the first instance, he will have no excuse for not applying the proper remedy now that their unfitness to occupy judicial positions has been exposed.

Before dismissing this subject, I want to express my appreciation of the position taken publicly by the hon. member for Ontario North (Mr. Halbert), with regard to those who set race against race and creed against creed in this country. In his public speeches, the hon. member for Ontario North has said on a number of occasions that he used to think that the greatest criminal was the man who looted the public treasury, but that he has revised his opinion, and that he now believes the greatest criminal to be the man who raises racial and religious issues in Canada. I congratulate my hon. friend upon the soundness of his judgment; and as he has now reached the point of view that I have always held, I invite his co-operation and the co-operation of his friends in the task of smoking these vermin out of their holes, so that, by joint action, we may enlist the help of a sufficient number of decent people to destroy even the last specimen of these pests, and thus pave the way for those neighbourly relations which ought to exist between the different elements that make up the population of our common country.

To establish those relations of mutual respect and good-will the Liberal party struggled for many years, and more than once it went down to defeat; but with clear vision and steady purpose it held to its course, and National Unity is as truly the

key to its policy to-day as it ever was in the days that are past. Hence, Sir, I unhesitatingly affirm in this House that in the return of the Liberal party to power lies the hope for national unity in this Dominion of Canada.

Much of the discussion, Sir, to which you have listened in this debate has centered on the amendment moved by the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King). That amendment calls for a dissolution and an election. Speakers on the Government side of the House have challenged the arguments advanced from this side in support of the amendment. I now propose to offer them an argument used by a member of the Government which, in my judgment, affords the strongest possible justification for the amendment of the hon. leader of the Opposition.

Not long ago, the President of the Privy Council made a pilgrimage to the town of Port Hope. He spoke there, and he proved the case of the people against Union Government more convincingly than even an opponent of the Government could have done. In effect, the hon. gentleman told the people of Port Hope that he knew that Union Government was singularly unpopular everywhere, and then he proceeded to state the reasons for this unpopularity. Why, Mr. Speaker, he should have sought any reason beyond his own presence in the Government is something the ordinary man cannot understand. However, he did give another reason—the most extraordinary one a Canadian audience ever listened to. The Government's unpopularity, he said, was due to its shining virtues as reflected by its administration of public affairs.

Now, Sir, here is a distinct admission by the most moral member of the Government, that it no longer possesses the confidence of the country, and that it is merely holding on to office in the forlorn hope that something may turn up. In our political history never before has a minister of the Crown said publicly and so distinctly, that he knew that he and his colleagues were hanging on to office in defiance of the will of the people they are misgoverning. How his colleagues must have blessed him for that speech! It gave their whole case away. It placed them in the position of men who are too good for this world, and not yet ready for the next, and, as you know, Mr. Speaker, such ethereal creatures as that are liable to be roughly handled by the sinners who constitute the great majority at election times. No wonder, then, that the Toronto Globe and other papers like it are telling the Government to get out —to dissolve and hold an election. It is because this feeling is so widespread that I regard the amendment placed in your hands as most timely, and it is my intention to support it with my vote.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon. NEWTON W. ROWELL (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, this House was called for the despatch of public business, not to give an opportunity to an hon. member to gratify his personal spite as against another member of this House. Hon. gentlemen have left their homes, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and have come here to transact the nation's business in the hour of the nation's need; yet this House spent the entire afternoon in listening to an address from an ex-Privy Councillor, the whole subject of which was simply to gratify an apparently unsatisfied personal animosity against a member on this side of the House to whom he attributes some responsibility for the disappointment of his political ambitions in the year 1917. I had hoped, Mr. Speaker, if it were my privilege to take part in this debate, to discuss some of the important public questions now before the people of this country and demanding the consideration of the House. I deeply regret, as I am sure you all regret, that by reason of the character of the address delivered by the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy) it is necessary for me to take up some of your time at least in dealing with the matters which he has mentioned. I may, however, say that I think hon. members are to be congratulated on the fact that there is only one member of the House, who would make such an exhibition of himself as did the hon. gentleman.

I rise to reply to the hon. member not because the statements he made this afternoon demand an answer at my hands, nor to satisfy the members on the other side of the House nor on the Government side. The unsympathetic manner in which the remarks of my hon. friend were received by his own colleagues on his own side is the best evidence to the House and the country that the men who know him best trust him least. Nor is it necessary that I should reply to the remarks of the hon. member to the people who know me in this province or throughout the Dominion of Canada. My record in the public life of

this country is a sufficient answer to what the hon. member has said. Nor is it necessary that I should rise to reply to the people of this country who know the member for Russell. His record and his conduct are a sufficient answer to his own accusations. I rise because there are some people, no doubt, in this province and in this Dominion who may not know either of us, who may not know the record of the hon. member or of myself as well as the members of this House do, and by whom, therefore, my silence might be misconstrued if I did not pay some attention to the hon. member.

Every man recognizes that the good opinion of decent, honourable and public-spirited citizens is one of the most valuable possessions that any man can have—a priceless possession. Every man recognizes and values the good opinion of his fellow-citizens. But there are some men—and the members of the House will recognize them—whose hostility and opposition constitute the greatest compliment that can be paid to a man. I congratulate myself on having earned the hostility of the hon. member for Russell.

The hon. gentleman started out by telling us that he delivered a speech in this House in 1918. He did. He made an even worse exhibition of himself in 1918 than he did to-day. He made it at a time when this country was in the midst of a war; he made it at a time when this country required to combine all its energies and resources to back up the men overseas and to help to win the war. He made an inflammatory declaration and appeal in this House, not for the purpose of backing up our men overseas, not for the purpose of uniting the people of Canada in support of the war but for the purpose of dividing the people of Canada. If the hon. member had expended one tithe of the energy in helping Canada to prosecute the war and defeat the Germans that he has in his speeches attacking me he would have been rendering a real service to Canada.

The hon. member said that he rose in the House on that occasion before six o'clock and that, due to the courtesy of the Speaker and the leader of the Government, his speech was adjourned until the House resumed in the evening. That is perfectly true. I was here up to six o'clock but I was not here in the evening for the reason that I have stated before, but I repeat that the hon. member knew when he rose that he was going to spend a great part of his time in a personal attack upon me and yet he had neither the manliness nor the courage to give me notice of the fact so that I might have an opportunity of making answer in his presence and in the presence of hon. members of the House to the false statements that he was about to make, statements which he knew to be false when he made them. He said that he expected that I would rise in my place to a question of privilege when I returned to the House. Well the hon. gentleman had the opportunity last session of rising to a question of privilege in order to attempt to reply to me?

Mr. CAHILL: He did.

Mr. ROWELL: He did, but his inability to proceed because the rules of the House prevented showed how utterly absurd it would have been for me to attempt to reply to him.

Mr. CAHILL: Show some courage.

Mr. ROWELL: I will deal with my hon. friend in time; do not worry. At that time I inquired of the Speaker of the House and I found that the rule is perfectly clear, that a debate once closed cannot be reopened during the session, and that when a debate is closed it cannot be referred to in a subsequent debate. So it is clear that I was precluded by the rules of the House from dealing with the matter on that occasion. The member for Russell said my colleagues "let the debate go by default." My colleagues reported to me—hon. members in the House will appreciate the reason—that in view of the inflammatory character of the appeal made by the member for Russell their view was that if a reply was made in the same spirit it might involve an acrimonious racial and religious controversy in this House which would greatly aggravate the conditions in Quebec at that time; and it was their desire to avoid that. They permitted the debate to close in my absence, and I was a victim of the situation; I was unable to reply on that occasion.

My hon. friend has stated that although I did reply in December, 1918, in Bowmanville, and in September, 1919, in this House, I only dealt with some of the accusations he made, and the other accusations still stand undenied and unanswered. Mr. Speaker, that statement by the hon. member is but another evidence of his recklessness in regard to the truth. Let him turn to my address delivered at Bowmanville—he has a copy of it—and he will find that I said I was taking up but a few of the idle and false stories that had been circulated as samples of the character of

the whole; and speaking in this House last session I dealt with the matter in the same way. My hon. friend will find on page 415 of the Unrevised Hansard of 1919 this statement:

> I will not trouble the House with the other petty matters mentioned in the speech of the hon. member for Russell. They are as misleading and as false as the one with which I have dealt.

Yet in the face of these statements in both speeches, the hon. gentleman rises in the House this afternoon and tells hon. gentlemen that I did not deny his statements. I have practised in the Courts of the Province of Ontario for almost thirty years, and I speak with a consciousness of what I am saying when I state that in all my experience of witnesses in the box I never met one more reckless as regards the truth than the hon. member for Russell.

May I now take up some of these other matters. I will not take up the time of the House to go into them all; I will just take a few more samples so that hon. gentlemen may see the character of the statements made by the hon. member for Russell.

The hon. member started off this afternoon by saying that I had not answered the charge he made out that I had served the Ross Government for profit, or had found it very profitable to become solicitor in the re-organization of the great Soo Corporation. In the statement which he made on that occasion he said that in the course of four or five years I had added to my personal earnings, or profits a sum over $100,000. Well, Mr. Speaker, when I read that, it reminded me of the story of the death of Mark Twain. The report of Mark Twain's death was cabled across the sea and when the newspaper reporter went to his residence to inquire about it he was shown into the presence of Mark Twain himself. Asked about the truth of the rumour, Mark Twain said the report of his death was greatly exaggerated. The statement of my hon. friend is greatly exaggerated. I do not recall at the present time what the fees of my firm were during those years, but I will say to the hon. member that the greater part of those fees were not earned because of political association with the Ross Government or any other Government. My firm were appointed counsel to the Soo Corporation in July, 1904. The Ross Government went out of power in January, 1905, and when there was a Conservative Government in power in the province of Ontario, the greater part of these fees were earned by my firm as counsel for the Lake Superior Corporation. From the very fact that the Government had guaranteed a loan of $2,000,000 that company did have fairly close relations with the Government. In some respects it was dependent on the Government's good will; and I am not violating any confidence, I am simply stating a fact, when I say that when the Government of Sir James Whitney came into power, Sir James thought the position of solicitor for the corporation was a political appointment, and he sent to the president of the corporation the name of a Conservative lawyer in the city of Toronto whom he desired to have substituted for myself as solicitor for that corporation. Although the company was to some extent dependent on the Government they said "the choice of our counsel is a matter for the board of directors of the corporation. We are satisfied with the service that is being rendered and we intend to continue the same counsel." So, notwithstanding the representation of the Prime Minister of Ontario my firm was continued as counsel for the Soo Company. Now, if my hon. friend had said that in the practice of my profession, I could earn $25,000 a year I am not prepared to deny it. The fact is that I could in the practice of my profession earn that amount but I would, Mr. Speaker, like to ask this: If I could earn that amount in my profession and I came down here to serve my country at $7,000 a year, what evidence is that of my desire to profit at the expense of my country?

The hon. gentleman seemed to attach great weight to the fact that when I made a trip overseas some political friends contributed to the expense, and I think he mentioned in that connection three thousand and some odd dollars. Well, that again, like the report of Mark Twain's death, was greatly exaggerated. The amount was not so large as that, but it is true that some of the Liberals of the Province of Ontario did provide the bulk of the expenses of that trip. Why did they provide it? They said they believed I could do more valuable work in recruiting throughout the Province of Ontario if I had the opportunity of coming in touch with the actual conditions at the front—seeing the men in the trenches and the work they were doing, and then come back and appeal to my fellow citizens to support them. The only contribution I made was giving my time, I took it away from my profession—and the consequent loss such as any man must meet in absenting himself from his profession—but the expense was paid in that way. My only regret is that

some of the friends of the hon. member for Russell did not do the same thing for him. If he had seen the conditions overseas—the actual need of reinforcements to fill up the ranks of our gallant men and of making every effort to support them in their struggle against Germany, it is incredible to me that the hon. gentleman would have taken the course which he afterwards did in reference to the war.

The hon. gentleman also says that I sent a friend of mine, Colonel Deacon, up to bribe a citizen of London to desert the Liberal party on the promise of a position as Chairman of the War Purchasing Commission. That is just as false as the other statements of the hon. member for Russell. What are the facts? The hon. members of this House know the character of the War Purchasing Commission. Membership in it was not a position of emolument, it was an opportunity for service. The members of that War Commission were not paid a salary, they gave their services in an honorary capacity. When Sir Edward Kemp was appointed and went overseas as Overseas Minister of Militia there was a vacancy on the Board. It was not the position of Chairman because it was understood that Sir Hormisdas Laporte, who had rendered such splendid service would be made Chairman, but it was the position of one of the members of the Commission. What did I do? I am glad my hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) is in the House.

I consulted my hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) as to who in his judgment would be the best man to select from among the business men of Western Ontario who were Liberals as a member for this board. We discussed the matter together and agreed upon three names, as my hon. friend will remember. The first was Mr. Gordon McGregor, of the Ford Company at Windsor, the other was Mr. Gartshore of the McClary Foundry Company, London, and the third was Mr. Little of the Robinson, Little Company. My hon. friend and I agreed that if we could secure any one of those men as a member of the War Purchasing Commission—not in an office of emolument, but without emolument the Government and the country would be fortunate. I first asked Mr. McGregor if he would accept a position on that commission. He was not a supporter of this Government; on the contrary, he supported my hon. friend from North Essex (Mr. Kennedy), and if the latter gentleman was in the House he would tell us so, I have no doubt. Mr. McGregor was not asked if he would support this Government or not; he was asked if he would be prepared to serve Canada in that position. After giving the matter due consideration he was compelled to decline owing to urgent business demands. Then we approached Mr. Gartshore, who declined to serve for a similar reason. The third gentleman to whom the hon. member for Russell referred this afternoon was then offered the position. But the circumstances stated by him this afternoon in connection with that offer I can only characterize as a yarn concocted out of whole cloth. The sole object which animated my hon. friend from West Lambton and myself was to get one of the best possible Liberal business men in Ontario to take that important and responsible post in the public service.

Then the member for Russell referred to another matter. He stated that I had not answered his charge that my place in Parliament was practically bought by offering a seat in the Senate to the Hon. Senator Mullholland. I am sorry that my hon. friend is not in the House to-night. "He who fights and runs away may live to fight another day." But, Mr. Speaker, I desire to place my answer on Hansard so that he can read it if he will not hear it: If after the bluster of the past two years of what this giant would do to me if he had an opportunity, he has done his best this afternoon, I am prepared for him to return to the attack as often as he likes, but I can assure the House that anything he can say will be as false no doubt as the statements he has already made.

I would like to ask my hon. friend (Mr. Murphy) if he were present what he would say to these parallel cases: When the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) joined the Cabinet of the late Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier Mr. F. G. Forbes was the member for that constituency and was appointed to the Bench in order that Mr. Fielding might have a seat in this House. Would the hon. member for Russell say that Mr. Fielding bribed Mr. Forbes in order that he might get a seat in this House, or that the late Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier bribed Mr. Forbes for the same purpose?

When the late Hon. A. G. Blair entered the Government he had no seat. Did Mr. Blair or Sir Wilfrid Laurier bribe Mr. E. G. King, the then member for Sunbury and Queen's who resigned in favour of Mr. Blair, by a seat in the Senate. Will hon. members on the other side suggest that when Hon. Mr. Templeman came into

the House Mr. George Riley from Victoria, B.C. was bribed because he retired and was given a seat in the Senate in order to provide a place for Mr. Templeman? When the Hon. Mr. Graham entered this House did he bribe Mr. Derbyshire the member for Brockville to make way for him by the promise of a seat in the Senate? Did the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier bribe Mr. Derbyshire by a similar promise? When the Hon. Senator Beith did not accept nomination in Durham in 1904, but gave it to Sir Alan Aylesworth, was he bribed to do so? It is true he was not appointed to the Senate immediately, and some of his friends thought he was passed over, but in due time he was appointed. Will my hon. friends opposite suggest that Senator Beith was bribed? Then came a change of Government and Sir Robert Borden came into power. Dr. J. W. Daniel retired from St. John, N.B. and was made Senator to make way for Hon. J. D. Hazen; and Mr. George Taylor retired from Leeds to make way for my hon. friend, the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White); and Mr. George Gordon retired from Nipissing in order that the late Hon. Frank Cochrane might become Minister of Railways, were these members bribed to give up their seats? No hon. member will make any such suggestion. Every hon. member knows that it has been the custom and tradition in both political parties when an hon. member makes way for a Cabinet minister to recognize the public spirit of that member by appointment to the Senate or to the Bench, or to some other suitable public position.

Now, my hon. friend may say that that is not a wise policy nor a good practice. Well, if he will advocate a reform of the Senate and a complete change in the method of appointment, I for one will support him. Mr. Speaker, I am one of those Liberals who believe that the Liberal Party failed in its duty while in power in that it did not carry out its pledge to reform the Senate. I still believe that the Senate should be reformed and made more representative of the sentiment of the people, and I stand on the policy upon which the Liberal Party stood during all that period.

But the crowning piece of casuistry, Mr. Speaker, of which the member for Russell has been guilty is his reference to the "Secretarial Fund." Let me read to you, Mr. Speaker, the exact statement made by Mr. Murphy in the House in 1918 with reference to that fund. He then said:

> Now, Sir, what happened when the hon. gentleman entered the provincial field of politics? With his usual presence of mind he arranged with his friends to form a committee for the purpose of raising a fund to guarantee him against any loss while engaged in his work as Provincial leader. Mr. A. E. Ames, of Toronto, was chairman of the committee, and in addition to Sir Joseph Flavelle, the contributors included several other Toronto gentlemen. The fund itself was called the "Secretarial Fund," and I am informed that it varied in amount from $9,000 to $11,000 a year. Again, the exact amount raised in any one year is immaterial; the point it establishes is that as Provincial leader the hon. member for Durham was protected against any sacrifice while he retained that position.

[Mr. Rowell.]

I appeal to hon. members, just as I did last September, what meaning did you take out of that statement; and what meaning did the hon. member for Russell intend that you should take out of that statement? Exactly the meaning that you and the people of this country took out of it, namely, that out of that fund moneys had been paid to me to compensate me for my loss of time in connection with my work as Provincial leader.

The hon. member for Russell referred to the letter he wrote to Mr. Bowman, Chief Liberal Whip. Why did he not read the letter he received from Mr. Bowman? Mr. Bowman is a supporter of my hon. friends on the other side of the House. When he read the statement by the member for Russell, knowing how false it was, although he was not a political supporter of mine, he felt compelled to enter his protest against such a false statement. It was the same with contributors to the fund. Let me read a letter, Mr. Speaker, that the committee got from one of the most distinguished Liberals and one of the most influential supporters of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, in Eastern Ontario. His name is known from one end of the province of Ontario to the other. What did this contributor say in his letter to Mr. Ames, the chairman, in reference to this matter? I quote:

> After being in the South the latter part of the winter, I have read the speech of the Hon. Mr. Murphy on my return home, and, amongst other things in his attack on Mr. Rowell, I note with considerable interest and surprise that he states that the Secretarial Fund to the extent of nine to eleven thousand dollars a year was paid to Mr. Rowell.

The member for Russell did not say that, but that was the inference that was conveyed and the inference that this contributor to the fund drew from the hon. gentleman's remarks.

> As I know, you were chiefly instrumental of raising this Fund, and I think were the Treasurer. I would ask if Mr. Murphy is right in this. I cannot conceive that such a thing is possible, for, when I was asked to subscribe to this Fund, I was not only told it was a Secre-

tarial Fund, but actually for the purpose of paying Mr. Rowell's secretarial expenses, such as secretaries, postage, etc., etc.

While Mr. Rowell will wait his own good time, I have no doubt this point is one he should not fail to take up on the floor of the House, and, in the meantime, as a subscriber, I would like to know if Mr. Murphy is wrong.

Now, the member for Russell said this afternoon that in his letter to Mr. Bowman he had said that he did not say I had shared personally in the fund mentioned, but that it was to guarantee me against loss. Well, if it was to guarantee me against loss it meant that I would have to take money out of the fund, because I was losing in the practice of my profession on account of the time that I was giving to the work of leader of the Opposition. But I want to take the statement of the hon. member as it stands. According to his own admission he knew that I had not received one dollar out of that fund; yet he came to the House of Commons and with deliberate ingenuity frames a statement conveying a totally false impression and framed it in such a way that he thinks he can crawl out from responsibility when it is found out. Mr. Speaker, the man who with cool calculation, deliberately surveying a situation, believes that it is to his profit to lie and does deliberately lie, open and above-board and is prepared to take the consequences if he is found out—we may have no respect for that man, but we do not despise him. But the man who by ingenuity conveys an equally false impression and does it in such a way that he thinks he can escape the consequences of his falsehood, that man adds to the sin of falsehood that of cowardice.

Mr. SPEAKER: I regret to have to ask the hon. gentleman to retract the statement, which obviously refers to the member for Russell, with regard to deliberately concocting a false statement. The remark is certainly unparliamentary.

Mr. ROWELL: Mr. Speaker, I was putting a hypothetical case.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may not evade the rule by putting forward in the form of an hypothesis what he cannot put forward in a direct statement.

Mr. ROWELL: Then, Mr. Speaker, when the speech comes round for correction I will strike out the words.

Mr. SPEAKER (rising).

Mr. ROWELL: In deference to your ruling, Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Withdraw.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. ROWELL: I do withdraw in deference to Mr. Speaker's ruling. I want to keep within the rules of Parliament, although it is difficult to do so when describing the conduct of the member for Russell.

Now, then, the hon. member suggested—it is so small a matter that it is hardly worthy of note in passing—that some of my firm's legal expenses had been paid out of this fund. The extract he read to the House showed that that statement was untrue. May I refer for a moment to the report of the secretary which the hon. member read to the House. He appeared to get a good deal of entertainment out of that. Well, if it afforded him any comfort I am glad, because so far as I was concerned it was of interest to me, and I am glad he has drawn attention to it. But the point which I desire to draw particular attention is the reference in the report to the Young Men's Liberal Federation. The hon. member referred to that organization as being wholly independent of the Liberal party and conveyed the impression that that was the organization of which I was the head in connection with the work of the provincial Liberal party. If that is his view he is wholly mistaken. That organization was a federation of the young Liberal clubs of Ontario. The leader of the Opposition knows of the organization; other hon. members on the other side know of it. It was independent of the actual political organization, for this reason: The young Liberals of Ontario, the members of these clubs, desired to have freedom to express their own opinions on public issues. I believed that it was in the public interest that they should have that freedom; they preferred independence to any association with the political organization. But the point to which I particularly wish to refer is this. The hon. member said that the motto of this Young Liberal Federation was "service," and he seemed to get a great deal of pleasure out of repeating that word. He said it looked as if this was the organization of some Sunday school class having no relation to the Liberal party. Mr. Speaker, it is because a section of the Liberal party of Ontario, the section which could be influenced by the member for Russell, had wholly lost the spirit of service and were in politics as part of the game and for what they could get out of it, that the Liberal party received such a crushing defeat in Ontario on more than one oc-

casion. My hon. friend should learn the meaning of the word "service." I say it to the credit and the honour of the young men who were members of these clubs and who had as their motto the word "service" that when a few months later war broke out and the call went forth for young men to volunteer, the ranks of these clubs were depleted because of the numbers of their members who, inspired by the spirit of service, went forth to fight for their country. I can only regret that the member for Russell did not even during the course of the war learn the true significance of the word "service."

The hon. member made light of what he called the "Sunday school idea of service." Well, if that be the Sunday school idea of service, then I stand in this House for the Sunday school idea of service; for it is only the spirit of service that can save the country in such an hour as this, just as that spirit saved it in the critical days of the war. It was because that spirit of service did not animate the member for Russell and others that when the critical hour came and members of the Liberal party and others had to decide whether they would choose the ideal of service—service for the men overseas; service to their country—service to the cause for which we were fighting—there was a cleavage, and the men who stood for service joined together in the formation and support of Union Government. I do not wonder that the hon. member for Russell does not care for the word "service," neither voluntary nor compulsory, neither civil nor military.

The hon. member for Russell said that there were several other funds. I think, if I recall aright, there were two he mentioned; the prohibition fund and the campaign fund of 1914. Well, his knowledge is somewhat better than mine. So far as I am aware, there was only one fund, the prohibition campaign fund of 1914, which was the one fund for the two purposes, because that campaign was fought on the issue "abolish the bar." The hon. member for Russell said that he would like to see a list of the contributors to that fund. I have never seen the list myself. The fund was raised by a provincial Liberal committee in Ontario and was administered by them in connection with the campaign of 1914; but I can tell you this, Mr. Speaker, because it came to my knowledge, that while other Liberals in the city of Ottawa contributed to that fund and their names will be found on the list, the name of the hon. member for Russell will not appear there, for he declined to give a contribution to assist the provincial Liberal party in its campaign of "abolish the bar" in 1914. Therefore, I was not surprised when, in the June session of last year, we came to vote on the Government Prohibition Bill, the hon. member for Russell led the Opposition in rising to oppose the resolution which the Prime Minister moved in the House. Perhaps that is another reason for his opposition to me, namely, that he does not agree with my views on that issue as he does not on some other issues. He suggests that I received some compensation at some time out of the prohibition fund. Here he makes a direct statement. Well, that is equally false with the other statement. I never received a cent of compensation, direct or indirect, out of that fund nor out of any other fund for my personal service at any time whatever. I never received a cent of contribution for any address that I made on that question or on any other question at any time in my life. I am glad to say that I have always been able to afford—if you care to put the case on that ground—to render a measure of service in the causes in which I believe, without accepting any compensation for my service.

My hon. friend next finds something in which he takes a great delight. He says: Now, I have this man; he is a tax evader, and he says that I appealed from taxation in Toronto because I was living in Ottawa and my income as a Privy Councillor would be exempt in the city of Ottawa. If a Privy Councillor's salary was exempt under the law why was I not entitled to the benefit of the exemption. My recollection, however, is that the matter was taken up while I was in England by my office and they lodged the appeal, but may I add I did not know at that time that, under the agreement with the city of Ottawa, a Privy Councillor's salary was exempt from taxation. I do not believe it is a sound principle that either a Privy Councillor's salary or a Civil Servant's salary should be exempt from municipal taxation, and I am glad that I am a member of a Government which has negotiated with the city of Ottawa a new agreement whereby that exemption has been wiped out. No longer will a Privy Councillor's salary be exempt from taxation.

My hon. friend devoted much time to my North Bay address. I dealt with that matter at the last session of the House, and it is not my intention to-night to go over the matters I then discussed. Hon. members who wish to see my statement can find it in Hansard as of that date; but there are just one or two observations I wish to make in view of the remarks of the hon. member for Russell to-day. The hon. member stated

that he had a letter that I had written to somebody, I think, he said in the month of January, 1918, in which letter I, in effect, admitted that I had made a statement without any knowledge of the facts and that I was only then proceeding to investigate the facts. I am sorry the hon. member did not produce the letter, and he did not tell us to whom the letter was written. So far as I can find in my records, I can only locate two letters written about that time. It may be that either or both of these letters have come into the hands of the hon. member for Russell. If they have, I only regret that he did not read either or both of them to the House. But just to see what I did say on that occasion in reference to this matter, permit me to turn to one of these letters, because my statement on this point does not materially differ in the two letters. I received a letter which enclosed a clipping from my North Bay address, and I was asked as to the correctness of that statement, the writer stating that I had many Roman Catholic friends and he was sure I did not desire to say anything disrespectful to my Roman Catholic friends. I replied:

> I realize that many of my best friends are Roman Catholics, and I should deeply regret saying anything that would hurt their feelings, and particularly anything that was not fully warranted by the facts. I think the extract quoted hardly gives a fair view of what I said. I enclose herewith the context so that you may see just what I stated. If I am incorrect in the statement I should be very glad to know it, but my statement was based upon information received during the past two or three years from sources which I believe to be absolutely reliable. The position, which I was informed the members of those Orders took, was that this war was a judgment of Heaven against France for her apostasy from the Church and for the manner in which she had treated the Church.

Then, in discussing the matter further, I said:

> I shall make further inquiries about the matter and see what the result is.

If the hon. member for Russell had either of these letters before him, he had before him the statement that what I said at that time was based on information which I had received during the past two or three years, but in view of the letters which I had received that I purposed making further inquiries in respect to the matter. I only want to add this one further word in reference to it. As I said in the House last session, and as I said in Bowmanville the year before, at the time I spoke, I did not know that members of religious orders had gone over to France to fight in the war. I said that, had I known that, I would have paid them the tribute that I did to the other clergy of the Roman Catholic Church and which was undoubtedly their due. My view —and a fair reading of my statement will show it—was that I was not referring to the men who had gone overseas but to those in the province of Quebec who had remained behind. But I said then, and I repeat now, that if my language was capable of the construction that it applied to the men who had gone overseas, I regret it, because I would be the last man in the world to say anything disrespectful to or anything other than the warmest word of appreciation of men who had gone overseas to serve their country as these men did. But I should like to add this one word, that I am sure it is a matter of regret to all the members of the House that, with these magnificent examples before him of heroic patriotism on th part of members of religious orders in Quebec, the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy) did not become a veritable Peter th Hermit, going from one end of the country to the other to rouse the people to follow the example of these men who went overseas. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Russell only magnified their service and their sacrifice when he thought he could gain some political advantage and kudos for himself at the expense of a political opponent.

I shall not attempt to follow the hon. member through all the meanderings of that rambling and lengthy address of his. It is a case where the mountain laboured and brought forth a mouse. But I must mention one or two other matters.

The hon. member for Russell referred to loyalty to colleagues. I could hardly believe my ears when I heard him speaking of loyalty to colleagues, and I am sure there was more than one member seated either beside him or behind him who must have been astonished when tney heard those words from the hon. member for Russell. Hon. members on the Opposition side are not ignorant, and hon. members on the Government side are not ignorant of the situation that has developed. The hon. member for Russell is a veritable political Jack-the-Ripper. When he cannot find an hon. member on this side of the House on whom to practise the peculiar art in which he professes to have such skill, he turns to hon. members on his own side of the House. No hon. member on the other side of the House enjoys in larger measure the confidence and esteem of members on both sides of the House than the chief Opposition Whip, the hon. member for Chateau-

guay-Huntingdon (Mr. Robb). Everybody knows that the hon. member for Russell has been after his scalp. Why, Mr. Speaker? Because the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King), the Chief Whip (Mr. Robb), and the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe), and other hon. members on the other side of the House want to make that section of the Liberal party a national Liberal party, but the hon. member of Russell is determined to keep it merely a religious group. It is even reported that he does not stop at the Chief Whip and others but challenges the supremacy even of the leader himself, and I have heard that the threat has been made that if he cannot have his way he may leave the party and join the United Farmers. Mr. Speaker, I do not know what crimes the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) and the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) and those who sit around them have committed, that they should deserve such a fate. We all know the No Man's Land down there which they have established between themselves and the official Opposition, and I can imagine that if the hon. member for Russell started to move his seat down that way, No Man's Land would soon be barricaded with benches and barbed wire to protect the farmers' group from receiving his assistance.

Mr. M. CLARK: Keep your squabble to your own end.

Mr. ROWELL: That is what I am trying to do, Mr. Speaker. I am trying to protect my hon. friend from this addition to his ranks.

Mr. M. CLARK: We do not need any protection.

Mr. ROWELL: Speaking of the question of loyalty to colleagues the hon. member for Russell stated—and he read into my speech a statement which is not there—that I had said or words to that effect, that certain statements made by the hon. member for Marquette in Council indicated a position which he afterwards changed. There is no such statement in my speech. There is nothing in my whole speech which would justify such an inference. The hon. member for Russell knows if he read Hansard that when such a statement was hinted at by an hon. member on the other side of the House, it met with a very prompt and vigorous denial. No statement made by me was a disclosure of any confidence of Council, and the hon. member for Russell must have known that, if he read Hansard.

It is just on a par with the other matters he mentions.

His childish talk about the Grand Trunk, the Peace Treaty, and matters of that kind I shall not go into, nor shall I attempt to follow his ramblings through various other matters that came up in the course of his speech. In connection with a number of them, there will be plenty of opportunity later on in this House to discuss the real merits of the case. There may be differences of opinion on the question of the labour clauses of the Peace Treaty. If there are, there will be an opportunity in the House for hon. members to express their honest convictions, and I shall reserve what I have to say on that subject until that occasion.

9 p.m. It may be that some hon. members on the other side of the House have repented of the approval given to the League of Nations. If so, when the Bulgarian Treaty comes up as the Covenant of the League is repeated in that Treaty, there will be an opportunity for my hon. friends to express their views on that occasion. I shall, therefore, not take up the time of the House in discussing it to-day. The hon. member for Russell also referred to the Mounted Police. There is a Bill before the House, and there will be estimates, relating to the Mounted Police, and I shall be glad to discuss the whole question of the Mounted Police either on the Bill or on the estimates. There is nothing that the hon. member has mentioned that I shall not be prepared to discuss at the proper time and give the House full information, and make a defence, so far as any defence is needed, though I think none is needed of the position of the Government in connection with these matters.

But there is one thing I cannot pass over. The hon. member for Russell referred in a sneering way to the calling together of the patriotic women of Canada in a women's conference in the city of Ottawa in the early part of 1918, when the heads of the principal women's patriotic organizations from the Atlantic to the Pacific, met in conference in this city in order that they might devise plans for more effective co-operation with the Government in the prosecution of the war. These patriotic and public-spirited women of Canada are made the butt for the jests of the hon. member for Russell. I cannot believe that in those jests he voiced the sentiment of any member on the Opposition side except his own.

He also referred to the calling together of the Labour Conference. We shall have

an opportunity of discussing that question when the Labour estimates come before the House, but I want to say that the Union Government took no wiser step than when the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) included in the Cabinet one of the recognized leaders of labour in Canada and further I believe the Government took a wise step when they invited the leaders of labour from all parts of Canada to come to Ottawa for a conference with the Government in order to establish the most harmonious relations possible between labour and the Government in the prosecution of the war. That policy of co-operation with labour has been pursued by Union Government from the day it was formed down to this date, and I submit with confidence that the magnificent position which labour has taken in Canada throughout the war, and the comparative industrial peace we have in this country as compared with practically every other country, is in no small measure due to the really sympathetic attitude of this Government towards the cause of labour in Canada and its desire to co-operate with labour.

The member for Russell referred to the Department of Health. The hon. member, Mr. Speaker, suggested throughout that I was unfair to the Roman Catholics and the French Canadians. What I have stated before, I repeat here to-night: I challenge any man to point to any statement I have ever made reflecting upon the French Canadian people of this country; I challenge any man to point to any statement that I have ever made reflecting upon the Roman Catholic church. The most important appointment I have been called upon to recommend since I became a member of the Government has been that of Deputy Minister of Public Health. Who was appointed to that position?—a French Canadian and a Roman Catholic—not because he was a French Canadian and a Roman Catholic but because, surveying the whole field with a desire to choose the best possible man to serve the people of Canada in that important post, I came to the conclusion that Dr. Amyot, the present Deputy Minister of Health, with a splendid record overseas, with great professional achievements to his credit, was the best man in Canada for the post. So long as I am in public life, so long as I am called upon to administer public affairs, I shall seek in all appointments, in so far as the Government has any voice in them, and in all my dealing with the people of this country, to consider and deal with every man on his merits irrespective of his race or religion.

The hon. member announced in opening that the reason he had made his speech was to vindicate the members of his church. I have too much respect for the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic church to believe that the hon. member for Russell had been commissioned for any such business. I do not believe he speaks with any right or authority on behalf of the ecclesiastics of that church. But I have no hesitation in saying that if he did speak with authority, there are not enough ecclesiastics in that church, or in any church, or in all the churches of Canada combined to induce me to depart from the path of duty as I see it in the administration of public affairs.

The member closed with some references to Union Government and the amendment before the House. I have already taken up a longer time than I had intended and I will not discuss these matters further, except to say that Union Government was formed in an hour of grave, national crisis for a great national purpose. It was formed for the war and for reconstruction after the war as the programmes presented to the people showed. What were its achievements during the war? By reason of the strength of sentiment behind the Government, by reason of the compulsory Military Service Act which they had at their command, they were able to reinforce our troops at the front and keep them up to strength. Nay, more, they were able to keep every battalion at the front one hundred men over strength; they were able to add to our machine gun equipment and personnel; they were able to add to our engineers and to all the forces that made the corps a real effective fighting unit, so that when the critical time came, when the hour struck for the great advance on the 8th August, 1918, the Canadian armies in association with the Australian troops struck the blow, and started the movement which culminated in the rolling back and decisive defeat of the German forces and which finally led to the victory of the allied forces on the western front.

That was made possible by the unanimity of sentiment of the Canadian people on the war issue and by the power of the Government to secure the necessary reinforcements to back up the troops overseas. If Union Government had no other reason for its existence the achievements of our heroic troops in 1918 will always be the justification, the vindication, and the glory of the

men and women throughout Canada who formed and supported this Government.

What our troops achieved on the field of battle, our representatives at the Peace Conference secured in the council of the nations. It is a great record. It has been ably presented to the House. I wish I had had the opportunity of expounding some of its features rather than dealing with these small personal matters which have distracted the attention of the House for the greater part of the day.

I leave the matter in the judgment of my fellow members. I would be prepared to leave it to the judgment of hon. members on the other side of the House. I leave it to the judgment of the people of this country. I claim no special virtue, no special privileges. All I can claim is that to the measure of my ability, in the hour of my country's stress and need, I have sought to do my duty as God has given me the light to see it.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Quebec East): Mr. Speaker, I desire to confine the few remarks I intend to make to the amendment moved by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) and I shall reserve for other occasions the discussion of the few subjects which are mentioned in the speech from the Throne and such other questions as are of great interest at the present time to the people of Canada. Being a man of peace, I feel still less inclined to interfere in the conflict between my hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Murphy) and the hon. the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell). Of course, as my hon. friend from Russell has shown this afternoon, successfully, I believe, the President of the Privy Council is a man of many activities but I think that his importance does not justify my taking up any more of the time of the House in discussing his personality. May I tell him that I have read many of the speeches he made in 1917 or thereabouts. I am sure that when he recalls some of the statements he made then he would to-day rather that they had been unmade. They will stick to him. They are like the shirt of Nessus that clung to the body of Hercules and they will cling to him as long as he remains in public life in Canada.

I desire to offer to the mover and the seconder of the Address my most sincere congratulations. The hon. member for London (Mr. Cronyn) has made a speech possessing qualities and delivered in a manner we would like to admire very frequently in this House. After all, attractiveness of speech only adds to the power and strength of argument. Many of the statements made by my hon. friend from London show that he has been rocked in the cradle of Liberalism and it is a matter of regret, and a painful sight to us, to see him in such bad company. I hope he will not remain there very long, for it is hard to compromise with the devil. As to my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. McGregor), his wrong political principles are firmly rooted and his case is desperate, although I congratulate him for the excellence of his speech.

The leader of the Opposition has made a case which, though we are at the end of this debate still stands unanswered. Every hon. gentleman in this House, notwithstanding denials to the contrary, knows that this amendment embodies the wishes and the practically unanimous opinion of the people of Canada at the present time. The first thing we must do to help the solution of our national problems, the first step towards re-establishing the normal affairs of this country, is the restoration in its entirety of responsible Government and the election of a representative Parliament. In order to be effective, in order to ensure the proper and normal representation of this country, or of any democratic country, Parliament must reflect and be the image, must return and must reflect the peculiarities of the nation: It must be the expression of the general will and the conscience of the people. Parliament is the instrument by which the will of the people is executed, therefore it must represent the views of the majority of the people; and every citizen has a sacred right to his proportionate share in the representation. When the majority in a Parliament no longer represents the majority of the people in the country, the decisions of that Parliament carry no influence and have no weight. Those principles are so elementary, they are at the basis of the proper working of constitutional government to such an extent, that they cannot be challenged; and I am sure that every member of this House agrees with me in so far as these premises are concerned.

Mr. BURNHAM: May I ask the hon. gentleman if he considers that the members of the Liberal Party do not represent the constituencies which they stand for?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I will answer my hon. friend in a few minutes if he will be good enough to wait. Who will dare say, Mr. Speaker, that the present Government re-

presents the majority of the Canadian people? It does not represent, it does not possess and enjoy the confidence of an appreciable portion of the Canadian people at the present time. Why, the Government which is supported by the majority of the members of this House is afraid to meet the Canadian people. It has let, and is letting, the elections go to its opponents by default. The habits of the ostrich are instinctive in many human beings, but they have never been the means of noteworthy success. The only comfort my hon. friends opposite can derive from electoral results was in the case of Assiniboia, and they have referred to that election in most of their speeches. Indeed my hon. friends seem to have a deplorable lack of humour. It is a piece of delightful irony to hear them mention that election as a blow at the Opposition. There was a constituency which elected a supporter of this Government in 1917 by a majority of over 5,000 votes. The Government kept that constituency without representation for a few sessions, and then when it was compelled to issue the writs it had no candidate in the field to represent its views. True, a Liberal candidate was defeated by my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Gould) who, I am told has always been a supporter of the Liberal Government. But, Sir, what is one of the main arguments which are used by the group of which that hon. gentleman (Mr. Gould) is a member? Their strongest, and apparently most effective, argument—erroneous though it be as a statement of fact—is that the Liberal party are not vigorous enough in its Opposition to this Government, that we have too many points of resemblance with hon. gentlemen opposite. Surely if the Liberal candidate in Assiniboia was defeated because his political views were not far enough removed from those of the members of the Government then the Government have little ground to hail his election as a victory, a moral victory, for them. Of course they are getting panicky and men in a panic grasp at shadows. Why should not my hon. friends opposite be candid and frank with themselves and members of the House? They still quote statistics of the election of 1917 to substantiate their claim that they have the support of this country. I understand my hon. friend from Leeds (Sir Thomas White) advanced this argument to support his speech yesterday. But, Sir, we are not living in 1917. We are Canadians of 1920 and we must discuss political questions and facts in the light of conditions as they are to-day.

Mr. WALLACE: How many members supporting Union Government would be elected in the Province of Quebec in 1920?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Not one. No longer will the Government and its supporters be allowed to evade facts and responsibilities by self indulgence in the monotonous repetition of war cries. Why did the hon. gentleman mention the large majorities secured in 1917 with the help of a doctored franchise?

Mr. BUREAU: And badly doctored too.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The constituency of Assiniboia, in 1917, gave to the Government a majority of over 5,000; in 1919 it gave not a single vote to the Government. The County of Glengarry-Stormont unanimously elected a supporter of this Government in 1917; my hon. friend from that riding (Mr. Kennedy) was elected in 1919 by, I believe, about 5,000 majority.

Mr. SMITH: What was he before politically?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I know he is a United Farmer of Ontario now, but I judge by the glow of conscience which I see on his face that he was formerly a Liberal. The County of North Ontario elected the late Colonel Sharpe as a supporter of this Government in 1917, by a majority of over 1,600, in fact, he polled twice the number of votes that were given his opponent; this year my hon. friend, the new member for North Ontario (Mr. Halbert) was elected by a majority, I believe, of 200 or 300 votes.

Mr. SMITH: Not quite.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I will take off a few votes if it pleases my hon. friend. The County of Quebec East in 1917, gave 600 votes to the Union Government; in 1919 it did not give one single vote to that side, the two candidates vying with each other in their opposition to the Government.

How many hon. gentlemen opposite would be returned if the amendment of my hon. Leader were to carry? I do not wonder that the prospect of an election should be so abhorrent to gentlemen whose parliamentary life is limited by and based upon the life of this present Parliament. Three by-elections are to be held presently, and there are now Liberal candidates in the field. Has the Government a candidate in any of those constituencies? There is none in Kamouraska at the present time. I most cordially invite my right hon. friend the Acting Prime Minister (Sir George Foster) to inaugurate in that splendid country the campaign of political education which he told us the

other night he was about to open. There are no finer and more courteous people in the world than the good electors of Kamouraska, and my right hon. friend would certainly get a fine welcome from them, though I could not give him much hope as to the degree of support they would give to his movement. The Government have no candidate in St. James at present—perhaps they may have one shortly. They have no candidate in Timiskaming, though the Conservatives of the division have nominated a straight Conservative candidate—nobody would consent to run as the candidate of this worn-out, abnormal and unpopular Government. I have no doubt that that Tory gentleman will be defeated, but even if he were elected, would that be a victory for the Government? He does not represent the Government in his candidacy, he represents the party led to-day by the Hon. Robert Rogers, who said a few days ago that the members of this Government were a lot of second-hand dealers, tinkers and jobbers.

We have to come to this point, Mr. Speaker, that the Government does not replace the Ministers who are withdrawing because their successors could not be elected in any constituency, and as a result whole provinces are no longer represented in the Cabinet. The threat that this Government may hang on for another year or two years, as was insinuated by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) the other night, is a challenge to the people of Canada, it is a challenge to democracy; it is a challenge to the proper and normal working of our constitutional Government—I will go a step further and say that when ministers disappear and cannot be replaced, such a threat is a challenge to Providence. And it is always dangerous, even for men stronger than my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, to defy the Almighty.

One of the speakers on the other side stated that the question raised by the amendment was a question of "ins" and "outs." This hon. gentleman should realize that whoever succeeds the present Government—and the succession cannot be very long delayed—will have a terrible mess to clear up and that nobody is very anxious, from a personal point of view, to take the succession. This Government has made matters easy for their successors in one respect only: that in almost all fields the latter are bound to shine in comparison. But the hon. gentleman is right to this extent, that the difference in the point of view as to this Parliament having no right or mandate to exist any longer—a difference which must be very great as between members on the other side of the House and the members on this side of the House and the other citizens of the country—is the normal difference between the men who look on from without and those who share from within. But perhaps this attitude of the Government was to be expected. The instinct of self-preservation is strong in all created things, and governments are not more free from it than the men of whom they are composed. However, they cannot deceive anybody—not even themselves,—and their voice during this debate was rather uncertain and nervous, being at times like the voice of a scared child who in the dark forest sings in an attempt to keep its spirits up.

The hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat) said that the present undeniable hostility of the people towards the Government was temporary and would soon pass away. Is this the opinion of the Government? Is this the cause of their present humiliating attitude? Do they believe that this great, steady, long, continued movement of the public mind is going to stop? Do they expect any change in the public estimation of their misdeeds and omissions? Are they waiting until such a change occurs? If so, they resemble the man in Horace who lay on the bank of a river expecting every moment that it would pass by and leave him a clear passage, not knowing the depth and abundance of the fountain that feeds the river, not knowing that it flows and will flow on forever.

I have referred to my hon. friend from Parkdale (Mr. Mowat). I am not surprised at the stand he takes on the present amendment. Looking the other day over the files of the Toronto newspapers for the year 1917—you will see, Mr. Speaker, that we have had so many bouquets thrown at us of late that I thought the reading over of certain literature would provide the antidote which would prevent the poison of pride overwhelming one, and I did not know at the time that my hon. friend from Russell would read his little circular this afternoon. I happened to see a report of the proceedings of the convention which selected my hon. friend (Mr. Mowat) as a candidate for the constituency of Parkdale. There was a letter from the Right Hon. Prime Minister beseeching the good Conservatives of Parkdale to select my hon. friend; and then one of the Ministers—I believe it was the Minister of Railways (Mr. J. D. Reid)—arose and spoke to the delegates. He told them that it was necessary in order to impress the country that this was a real Union Government that a Liberal should be se-

lected as the Government candidate for one of the Toronto seats. The president of the Tory Association then made a little speech. He said: All right; we are going to make the sacrifice, but remember, it is only a loan. So, valuable as my hon. friend is in this House, he is only a borrowed article. His contract will expire with the life of this Parliament, and these magnificent buildings will be deficient forever of one of their finest adornments.

Sir, as the leader of the Opposition eloquently said, we shall have unrest in Canada; peace and order will not be restored until the Canadian Parliament is brought into harmony with the Canadian people. It is indispensable to public safety that this should be done without any further delay. Everybody is longing for the time when things will come back to normal. Let us start at the most conspicuous point; let our politics, let our public life, come back to normal. This Government cannot pretend much longer to unite this country by dividing it. I do not now speak of the past. I respected the men who differed from us in 1917 through patriotic and conscientious motives; I would not have respected them if, feeling as they did feel at that time, they had acted otherwise. But I repeat, Sir, that I do not now speak of the past, and I emphatically state that any man who today proclaims this a Union Government is maintaining a sham and supporting hypocrisy. Why, Sir, having arrayed province against province and race against race, they have succeeded by their disastrous policies, by violating their pledges, by breaking faith with their own supporters and dividing classes against classes, groups against groups, and occupations against occupations, in separating into fragments what was, under the illustrious leader who is now in his grave, a great united people.

No Government in the history of this country ever represented in lesser degree a united Canada. For the first time since union of Upper and Lower Canada one of the two great branches of the Canadian family is practically not represented in the administration of the affairs of the country.

Mr. SMITH: Whose fault is that?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I will tell my hon. friend. It is indeed a tragical joke to apply the word "Union" to the work of disruption which the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) has been unfortunate enough to achieve. It has been urged by gentlemen on the other side—and I am free to admit it—that the Prime Minister has endeavoured to afford some sort of redress to an awkward situation. But under the present conditions, in view of the circumstances which preceded, accompanied and followed the accession to office of the present Government, no true and worthy representative of those to whom I now have reference can, with any sense of dignity, become one of its members. Some gentlemen opposite have said that the Government is not responsible for that anomaly; that those of the Canadian people who refused to elect supporters of the Union Government cannot complain of being unrepresented. They are indeed quite right as to the utter impossibility of the people of whom I now speak electing a member of the present Government. Sir, it only goes to show that the situation is abnormal and unnatural. In order that we may resume the sane, safe and healthy conditions of our public life and of the civilization established by the builders of the country, by the great men of the past, the members of the Government must realize that they are an obstacle to our national progress and are blocking the way to the unity of Canada and to a fair and normal working out of the constitution.

Mr. WALLACE: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend has put questions to me which are really not of sufficient importance to justify my allowing him to interrupt my remarks.

This Government was elected in 1917 for a special purpose; it has now no further mandate to carry on the affairs of the country. What is the present task of Parliament? To place the national Budget on a stable foundation; to work out new plans for the promotion and regulation of trade; to cope with the problems of inflated currency and depreciated exchange, and to establish satisfactory working relations between capital and labour so that national production may make headway against industrial disorganization and general want. But the present Parliament was elected on an issue that had no bearing upon the work that is to be done. It has no mandate to formulate a programme or to execute one when it is decided upon. In refusing to accede to the clamour of public opinion, to the request that they relinquish the reins of office, the members of the Government and their supporters in the House are breaking faith with thousands of electors who voted for Union Government upon the understanding and subject to the pledge that such Government was formed for one purpose and one purpose only, and would automatically go out of office with the coming

of peace. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) and other hon. gentlemen to the contrary notwithstanding, such a pledge was given on all the public platforms of the country. Even members of the Government made it clear to the electors. I have here a few statements which will bear out my contention in that respect. I take from the Globe of Tuesday, October 23, 1917, the report of a meeting in Winnipeg, at which the Minister of Immigrartion (Mr. Calder) spoke: I am glad to see him in his seat. Here is the report:

It was on that understanding they had come in. He was not deserting Liberalism, nor the principle for which Liberalism stands. They were not absorbed nor submerged by the Conservative party. They had simply consented to Union for the purpose of this war, and reserved their views and opinions outside of the war. Union had been achieved only by each side agreeing to sink for the time being purely domestic problems.

The Minister of the Interior spoke at that meeting, and this is what he said, according to the report in the Globe:

No man or woman is asked to reverse or abnegate convictions on fiscal or other subjects. The accepted basis of union was the only basis on which Union was possible under present condition, and our appeal is that the people of Canada unite on the same basis on which the members of the Government have united, and get behind this union and stay behind it until it achieves its end.

In the town of Sarnia a meeting was held which was addressed by the former Minister of Public Works, now chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners. I take the report of that meeting from the Globe of October 25, 1917. This is what that gentleman, then a member of the Government, said at that time:

This Government is formed for a definite purpose and for a definite period. I am in it as a Liberal for that purpose and for that period, and for that purpose I intend to give the best that is in me.

I am in the Government to do what I can toward winning the war. I went in freely, and if there are things happen of which I cannot approve I can get out just as easy. This is not a Conservative Government; it is not a Liberal Government. (Mostly Conservative, interrupted a voice). This is a war-Government. Its purpose is to carry on the affairs of this country in a non-partisan way until the war is won. After demobilization the contract is concluded, and each man can take the course he thinks best. (You'll all be Tories then, exclaimed another.)

Mr. BUREAU: He was wrong.

Mr. LAPOINTE: He was wrong as regards some of the gentlemen, but I am afraid he is right as regards a few.

Does someone say I would become a Tory? asked Mr. Carvell. Well, I don't believe it. (Laughter and renewed cheers.) There is only one thing for a man to do in a crisis like the present, and that is to do what he thinks is right.

What about the electors? A meeting, largely attended by Liberals of the province of Ontario who supported conscription was held, I think, in the city of Hamilton. I take the following from the report of that meeting in the Globe of November 3, 1917:

Ex-Mayor J. G. Kerr of Chatham introduced the following resolution, seconded by Mr. F. L. Fowke of Oshawa:—

"That, whereas since the notice calling this convention was sent out, a Union Government has been formed, in which Liberals throughout the Dominion have joined, this convention, recording its belief that the formation of a Union Government for the duration of the war was highly desirable and in the best interests of Canada and believing that thereby the share of Canada in the conduct of the present world war will be best served, and the Government of the country most effectively and satisfactorily carried on during the period of the war expresses its approval of the action of the Liberal members of the present Union Government in entering same."

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne), whom, I am sorry, is not in his seat, spoke at a meeting at Hamilton. These are his words as reported in the Globe of November 23, 1917:

I prefer to take my Liberalism and my patriotism at this juncture from men like Hon. W. S. Fielding in Nova Scotia, or men like Mr. Fred. Pardee in Ontario, together with every Liberal Provincial Prime Minister save one in Canada, Hon. Mr. Ballantyne declared, rather than take it from Bourassa, Lavergne, Lemieux and company. (Prolonged cheers).

I should like to ask my hon. friend from whom he takes his Liberalism to-day? He does not seem to take it from my distinguished friend, the hon. member from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding). He does not seem to take it from my esteemed deskmate, the hon. member for Lambton West (Mr. Pardee). Surely he does not take it from the nine provincial Premiers who are all supporters of the leader of the Opposition. From whom does he take it? Perhaps, from the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen), whose brand of Liberalism I do not trust very much. The President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) spoke at Durham, and these are his words as reported in the Globe of November 28, 1917:

"In all the many nations at war," Hon. Mr. Rowell declared, after relating a few overseas incidents, "it has been found impossible for any people to put their own energy into the war as long as they are divided by party lines, and the whole object of the Union Government is that the nation may stand united in this crisis. After Prussian militarism has been defeated

we can go back to settle our own domestic affairs by party methods, if we so desire."

The President of the Privy Council was not so emphatic as the others. He is an old fox, although I do not wish to refer to the fox which had lost its tail at the battle. But I have still better documentary evidence. I hold in my hand a printed circular which was distributed in the trenches and in all the military camps in 1917, and a copy of which was given to every soldier who registered a vote at that election. That circular, which was sent and distributed by the Government, reads in part as follows:

DOMINION OF CANADA,

SOLDIERS' ELECTION.

Comrades, this is our election, because the only issue is selective conscription. Without its immediate enforcement there can be no rest or relief for Canadians at the front. The Union Government is neither Grit nor Tory. It is composed of the following gentlemen:

I do not wish to read the whole circular, but I desire only to impress upon the House the fact that every soldier was told, before he registered his vote, that there was only one issue and that was selective conscription. Thousands of electors, the young manhood of this country, voted for this Government, because they were told that the only issue was selective conscription; that it was purely and exclusively a soldiers' election held for one purpose only, and the mandate they were asked to give was for that purpose alone and would expire when such purpose was achieved. Furthermore, those hundreds of thousands of electors were not given an opportunity to vote for a man of their own choice to represent them in Parliament; they were not afforded the advantage of voting for men whom they considered qualified to discuss questions of interest to them and to the country. They voted simply for a Government without any regard to the candidates. In many instances they did not know the candidates. They were asked to vote for a Government which would be entrusted with a mandate to enforce a certain war policy and nothing else. This mandate has expired. This policy has disappeared from the political field. Is it fair to the men who voted in such a peculiar and unprecedented way, to use and abuse for other purposes the special mandate which they gave to a special set of men, many of whom are no longer members of the collective body for which the soldiers' votes were registered.

Sir, there are issues at hand that will cause a clear cleavage between progress and reaction, between Toryism and reform. The very fact that the resources of Canada as a result of our war effort have been strained as they have been, and that we have a huge national debt, compels us to face grave and great problems and the two traditionally opposite sides cannot but face each other when the settlement is effected, and one or the other must give way. It is impossible for gentlemen of different ideas to agree on these great problems. They cannot sit together and be true to their principles. No gentlemen who has not altogether renounced his liberalism can remain in this Government to-day or support it. The hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat) has stated that the real Liberals are on that side of the House, and he said he was saving Liberalism by remaining there. Sir, when he makes those professions publicly before the country, while continuing to support the present Government, he is saving Liberalism in the same manner and to the same extent and degree as another gentleman, who two thousand years ago contributed to the salvation and redemption of the world by publicly kissing his Master to betray Him to the Roman soldiers. I am willing to admit that in the multitude of arbitrary and reactionary measures that have been passed by this Government some Liberal policies may have been adopted on minor points. It was Theodore Roosevelt who once said of an American politician, he was so wicked he could embrace a good principle if it helped him. On all vital issues, on all issues that had to be definite and would be controversial, we have witnessed a policy of indecision on the part of this Government. We are told that the country is in a state of unrest and that this is no time for change or the adoption of any definite policy. The argument was made by the hon. member for Leeds (Sir Thomas White) yesterday. Yet in 1911 when the Liberal Government sought to enact a treaty of reciprocity for the purpose of affording relief to the great farming community of this country, and went down to defeat on that issue, we were met by the cry: Let well enough alone; the country is too prosperous and peaceful for a change. My hon. friend from Leeds was a leader in that campaign, and now in 1920, when the country is convulsed from one end to the other, the very same gentleman says: Would you alter our policy in such agitated times as these? Such is the dilemma of a vicious Tory government and selfish interests—if the people are turbulent, they are un-

fit for reform, and if they are quiet they do not want reform. After every meeting of supporters of the Government at which policies were to be enunciated, it is officially reported that they have unanimously come to the decision that no decision should be taken. Hon. gentlemen opposite are simply asking for time. The hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) wrote in the Evening Journal yesterday that he was going to vote against the amendment of the hon. leader of the Opposition just for the purpose of gaining time, for he has no confidence in the Government. Ninety per cent of the political energies of the members of the Government are wasted on expedients to patch or piece out the political machine as often as it breaks down.

The right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) is sick and absent, and we all regret it. I think it was unfortunate and most unfair to charge the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) with discourtesy in alluding in his amendment to the illness of the right hon. the Prime Minister. The hon. leader of the Opposition was the first man to express the sympathy of the House with the right hon. gentleman in his illness. On the very opening day of this session, speaking right after the right hon. the Acting Prime Minister (Sir George Foster), who never said a word about the right hon. the Prime Minister in his speech, the hon. leader of the Opposition spoke as follows:

> Sir, may I join my right hon. friend in giving expression to other sentiments which we experience in common on this historic occasion? It is not more a source of regret to supporters of the Government than it is to hon. members of the Opposition that the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) is prevented, because of the impaired condition of his health, from being present at and participating in these opening ceremonies, certain, as they are, to live in the memories of all who are privileged to witness them. It is gratifying to us, as it will be to the people of Canada, to know that the change of scene and thought, and most of all, the freedom for a time, from vast responsibility, which the Prime Minister is at present enjoying, have not been without their beneficient effects; and that restoration of health, which we all hope may be speedy and complete, appears now to await him. Still, we regret his absence, and we miss his presence.

We all regret the unfortunate illness of the Prime Minister, but we shall not allow hon. gentlemen opposite, who for years have prevented the free discussion of their misdeeds and extravagant administration by sheltering themselves behind the glory and the sacrifice of our brave Canadian soldiers, to screen themselves to-day behind the weakness of a sick man. The Government has no right to exploit the illness of the Prime Minister, and they are most unfair to him when they try to do so. We all hope that his health will speedily be restored, but my duty to this country compels me to state that I object emphatically that Canadian policies—the solution of reconstruction and other national problems—should also travel around the world with the Prime Minister on Viscount Jellicoe's ship, or rest with him in Florida. Canada cannot afford to waste another year, and still less two whole years.

10 p.m.

The hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) asked the House the other night what was wrong with the Government and with the body politic. So far as he could see, everything was all right. The hon. gentleman has a short memory. Only a few weeks ago he went to the city of Kingston and virtually pleaded for a new alignment in the political field. Why is he advocating a new union if everything is all right to-day? I have in my hand the Montreal Gazette containing a report of a speech of the Minister of the Interior and it reads as follows in part:

> I am asked what it is proposed to do. The air is filled with clashing demands, conflicting criticisms and contradictory appeals. One extremist calls for one thing, another extremist for another thing. The extreme labour man wants labour domination; he wants the one big union and all that it involves. The extreme protectionist wants a high tariff. The extreme free trader wants no tariff at all. The extreme Socialist wants the nationalization of everything. The extreme individualist thinks we have nationalized far too much already. The extreme farmer partisan wants an agricultural dynasty. He believes he will make this country a land of Canaan by a system of free imports, by buying more goods from others.
>
> What I say is, let all moderate men get together. There are sane and moderate labour men, thousands of them, the vast majority. Back of this restlessness and discord we have a sane business community. We have manufacturers of moderate views. We have hundreds of thousands of steady and thoughtful agriculturists, thoughtful citizens who read from experience as well as from books, men of patriotic principles, just as big a proportion of such men as in any class in the nation. Let these men and these women get together. Let them not be stampeded. The hope of this country is to be found in such a union, and such a union is right now taking place. It will draw strength from every group. It will gain in vigour from attacks. Its numbers will multiply as the danger becomes clearer. It will hold the ship steady, and it will bring us through.

Let me ask my hon. friend what is wrong with him and his friends? Is it not enough to make angels weep to hear the Minister of the Interior classifying himself amongst the moderates of this country? He was the

father, and the godfather, of the most arbitrary and despotic legislation and Orders in Council which have been executed and enforced by this Government. He is very clever and has many high qualities, but he is the last man in the world I would trust to adopt a moderate course in the political field. Again I ask, if everything is right in the Unionist family, why form a new union, why this appeal for a new alignment? If everything is right and if nothing is wrong, why should a close friend of the Prime Minister and a strong supporter of the Unionist party, Senator McLennan, launch a new political party under the name of the National party? Why should all these gentlemen try to dress or redress, the Unionist child with more fashionable clothes?

But, Sir, the Unionist house is divided against itself. We on this side of the House are witnessing with equanimity and calmness the disintegration and decay of that unnatural organization. One part wants to remain Unionist; another wants to be purely and simply Conservative or Tory; the Minister of the Interior wants a new Union; Senator McLennan wants a National Party; and my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) who, apart from being a farmer, is a medical man, the other day attended at th birth of a new party under the name of the National Progressive Party. Yesterday the hon. member for Leeds (Sir Thomas White) not only attended as a medical man but was the generator and creator of a new party under the name of the National Liberal Conservative party. I shall not be surprised at all if before the end of this debate some practical joker on the other side stands up and advocates the formation of the National Liberal-Conservative, Progressive, Reform Farmers' party — they would all, except the Farmers, come from the same mother, to wit: the Tory party.

Facing all these groups and factions, fighting one another in a hopeless struggle, the Liberal party stands united, vigorous, reorganized, ready and prepared for political action. The good old cause, as our late lamented leader called it so often—the good old cause, vanquished or triumphant, insulted or victorious—is still the good old cause with us. Liberalism is the application of the eternal principles of justice to all classes, elements, interests and trades. Liberalism means evolution, along reasonable and progressive lines. But, as Burke said, innovations are not necessarily reforms. The Liberal party holds the middle course between dangerous, violent changes that would bring disaster to our institutions and obstinate resistance to progress and the spirit of the time. The Liberal party stands between capital and labour, between the weak and the strong, between the individual and the corporation, between the big interests, so dear to the heart of the hon. member for Leeds, and the plain citizen like you and me, Mr. Speaker. It stands between conflicting interests and classes, it stands between that class which is the Canadian Manufacturers Association and that other class which is the Canadian Council of Agriculture, having as its only aim and ambition to do only what is fair and just to all and to each.

All the organized forces of selfishness are attacking it and questioning its motives and its aims. The extremists dislike it extremely, and, Sir, when I hear on one hand, the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cochshutt) denounce us as dangerous free traders, and on the other hand, the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), Mr. Musselman of Saskatchewan, or Mr. Wood, of Alberta claim that we are only protectionists in disguise, I take it as conclusive evidence that we are discharging the true and normal functions of Liberalism holding the sane and safe middle course.

When I read in the Ottawa Journal that I am, in common with friends on this side of the House coming from the province of Quebec, a reactionary and an obscurantist, as was stated in an editorial last week, and when almost at the same time I am branded in that other Unionist Tory paper, L'Evenment of Quebec, as being a wild radical, just as bad as my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition and almost as dangerous as my hon. friend the member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar), which is still worse, I take it as an indication that I am but a plain and unadulterated Liberal, and I do not mind the abuse.

I have just mentioned the name of my hon. friend from Brantford. The hon. gentleman in the course of his speech the other night expressed regret that I was then absent from the House, because he was anxious to know whether my removal from Kamouraska to the constituency of Quebec East has had any effect on my views with regard to the fiscal policy. I understand the anxiety of my hon. friend from Brantford; I understand why he is so nervous at the present time. He has had many events in his province lately that he does not like, things he considers as plagues—he has had a Farmers' Government, smallpox, and prohibition, and now he is threatened by a reduction in the price of

ploughs. He ventured the assertion that my views must be modified as a result of a change in the constituency which I represent in the House. Mr. Speaker, I challenge my hon. friend to quote one word of mine, uttered at any time, in support of an absolute free trade policy in this country. For the purpose of revenue I have always stated, and I state to-night, that we must have a tariff, and we must have it much more to-day because of the great war debt that we have to pay. But let me tell my hon. friend that he has missed his guess. I was in favour of a lower tariff when I represented Kamouraska; and I am in favour of a lower tariff when I am representing Quebec East. I was in favour of a policy that would reduce the price of ploughs to the farmers when I was in Kamouraska, and I am in favour of that policy to-day when I represent Quebec East. I was in favour of the policy expounded by my right hon. leader who is now dead, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, three weeks before his death, when he spoke before the Eastern Ontario Liberal Association. That speech on the fiscal question stands as his political will. By that policy enunciated by my late leader, and by the policy which was adopted at the Liberal Convention last summer, I stood in Kamouraska and I stand in Quebec East. I am even ready to go and discuss that policy in Brantford if my hon. friend will give me the opportunity. He may rest assured that I do not, and never will, modify my principles and opinions according to conditions of time or place.

Now, Sir, I wish to say a word on the question of the new election law which is going to be introduced and enacted. The leader of the House does not like the references that are made to the War-time Elections Act. It is a worn-out subject, he says, that has been fought and discussed over and over again and should be left aside altogether. Let me tell him that the discussion of this famous piece of legislation will be of permanent interest as long as the Parliament which was elected by virtue of such Act remains in office. There is an old proverb that says, "When the spring is muddy the stream is muddy, too," and the stream in this case will flow on as long as the present Parliament lasts. All I wish to say is to express the hope that the new Bill will not reproduce and embody any of the bad features of that legislation. All British subjects by birth or naturalizationo are entitled to be represented in this Parliament and to exercise all the privileges of citizenship. If you want our naturalized citizens to feel for Canada more than half patriotism you must make Canada more than half a country for them. The monstrous doctrine of collective responsibility which makes men hate and revenge themselves not only on the evildoer or the guilty but on all those of the same name, race, or colour, was a pernicious product of the war mentality, and must be discarded and destroyed if we are to have sanity, peace and progress in this country. The question to my mind is not only one of justice; it is a question of safety. It is neither wise nor prudent to deprive any class of our population of their right to the ballot. It is cheaper, after all, to lift men up than to hold them down, and the ballot in their hands is far less dangerous to society than a sense of wrong in their heads. I hope we shall have a fair and honest franchise, followed by a fair and honest election.

With regard to the coming elections some hon. gentleman opposite used as a justification for voting against the amendment of my leader the argument that there should be a re-distribution before the elections take place for the purpose of giving a larger representation to the farming community of Western Canada. Those gentlemen are not serious. Firstly, such a re-distribution cannot be made before two or three years. And they do not know—have they not read in the Ministerial press, that it is the intention to do away with the custom of having a different unit of representation for the urban and rural constituencies, so that by increasing considerably the number of representatives in the cities it will be possible for them to drown the voice of the farmers? Have they still some faith in the pledges of this Government? Moreover, Sir, the estimated figures quoted by some gentleman as to the probable increase in the population of the various provinces are wholly misleading as far as Quebec is concerned, if the statistics of the Provincial Government are correct, as I have no doubt they are. The increase in the population of the province of Quebec is much larger than the figures quoted in this debate indicate, and Quebec being the pivot of the representation our friends from the West would not get the increase of representation which they seem to expect. You see, we do not increase our population in Quebec by artificial means such as Government regulations or immigration policies. Our process of increase is the old law of multiplication as prescribed by the Creator. Quebec does not import her population, she makes it, and that may be the

reason why our population is sane and safe.

There is another subject I desire to refer to and which should be an additional argument in favour of the amendment before the House. A great Imperial Conference is going to take place this year for the purpose of deliberating upon and considering the constitutional relations of the Empire and the various Dominions. I submit that it is necessary that only a Government with a popular mandate, that only a Parliament representative of the majority of the Canadian people, should be entrusted with the duty and task of representing Canada and speaking for its people at this very important gathering. This weak, impotent, leaderless Government has no right to assume to speak with the great voice of Canada at that Conference, has no right to engage our future or pledge our destinies to any extent.

Last year when speaking on this subject I strongly urged that no question affecting Canada's future should be discussed at any Conference without having been first submitted to the Parliament of Canada, and that our delegates should go to that Conference with a clear mandate and with no other rights or missions than those agreed upon and conferred by this Parliament. I am glad indeed that the opinion I then expressed has received the support of hon. gentlemen who have spoken in the course of this debate. During the last few years Parliament has been treated in this respect with scant courtesy. These great problems must be considered from a purely Canadian point of view. We are prepared and willing to do our part amongst the nations of the world, but our main policy is and will remain the policy of Canada first; we are and shall remain one hundred per cent Canadians, and will not allow anybody to change our status for us without our participation.

My last words, Sir, will be an appeal to all the members of this House to listen to the voice of the country which is heard from the Atlantic to the Pacific asking them to support the amendment of the leader of the Opposition. The Government has always represented itself as being a war Government—as being purely and simply a war machine. This Parliament was elected as, and has been always stated to be, a war Parliament. The war is over. The Government have demobilized everybody else; I ask them to-day to demobilize themselves.

Hon. MARTIN BURRELL (Minister of Customs): Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to take part in this debate until the conclusion of the speech of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King), when he put his amendment and challenged the whole administration of the Government of which I have been a member since its inception in 1917.

I wish to express, in common with other speakers who have preceded me, the gratification that we all feel on coming into this beautiful building. I do not know that any higher compliment could be paid to the building or to its designers than to say that judging from the feelings of all the members and the great satisfaction they have expressed on getting into these new quarters, we all feel that we can at least enter a building that shows beauty and strength somewhat in comparison to the strength and beauty of the parliamentary institutions which are carried on on this north half of the American continent.

I wish also to say a word in passing in reference to the speeches of my hon. friends, the member for London (Mr. Cronyn) and the member for Pictou (Mr. McGregor), the mover and seconder of the Address. I have been a member of this House for twelve years, and have necessarily therefore heard the speeches of a great many movers and seconders of the Address, but I cannot recall in the whole of that time any speeches which have been permeated with a finer spirit. The address of my hon. friend from London was not only characterized by great breadth, but also by a full recognition of the problems that are facing this country to-day, and contained valuable suggestions towards their solution, and both as to matter and manner was an admirable speech from beginning to end. I can only say that my hon. friend from London is a type of representative that we sorely need to have and to keep in our public life. I would not say any less than that of my hon. friend from Pictou. He gave a sane and thoughtful presentation of the problems of war and of the problems that have come to us with the conclusion of peace, and his solution for those problems are worthy of consideration. I was particularly interested in, and I think it would be well for hon. members to read and re-read, what he had to say about the soldier questions which now confront us.

Sir, there was one thing that struck me as particularly pleasant about those speeches, and that was their absolute freedom from political rancour; a generous spirit breathed through them. I also would like to say that it is a pleasure for this House to notice that the same generous spirit characterized the speeches of the

leaders of that small group at the further end of the Chamber known as the cross-benchers. I heard with great pleasure my old friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) give that fine eulogy on the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden). It was not less appreciated by members on this side of the House and indeed by many on the other side, when my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar) paid a similar tribute to one who is literally a "casualty of the war." I would like to add that it gave us all on this side gratification to hear my hon. friend from Red Deer pay that fine tribute of his to a political opponent in the old days, the right hon. the leader of the House at this present moment (Sir George Foster). He did it in a manner worthy of the best traditions of this House.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, that I could speak in the same appreciative tone of the attitude adopted by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. I noticed that when he commenced his speech he said:

> It would be strange, indeed, if, under the spell of the noble and dignified proportions of this Chamber, we were not all impressed with the spirit of the Canadian people in rising out of the difficulties of the past.

I must confess that when he proceeded with his speech I thought he was freeing himself from the spell of the building with remarkable success, and the further he proceeded the more completely he freed himself, until when he came to his amendment he was absolutely free from any such spell.

And if I can say this of the speech of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, I can surely say it with greater force of that of the member for Russell (Mr. Murphy), who made one of the most extraordinary speeches that I have ever heard since I became a member of this House. I think the best thing to do with that speech would be to absolutely forget it. But I would call attention for a moment to his closing statement: That the Liberal party was established for the promotion of neighbourly relations, mutual respect and good-will. If that is so, I never heard a speech so singularly calculated to thwart the purposes for which the Liberal party was established.

The hon. minister (Mr. Rowell) who was the subject of that attack needs no defence from me; he made a pretty good defence for himself, I think. As one of his colleagues, I have only to say that he has the fullest esteem and confidence of his colleagues as a valued member of the Government. I would commend to my hon. friend from Russell, as to other hon. members who

are apt to indulge in rancourous debate and acrimonious personalities, the words—which I cordially endorse—with which my hon. friend from Marquette closed his speech the other day. He said:

> If we as Canadian citizens seek only what is good, noble, honest and true, and look only for what is best in one another, I have no fear for our future prosperity and welfare, nor need, I think, any of us.

Now, Sir, my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition is a young man and a Canadian, he has worked at industrial problems not only in this country but in another country, and I think it unfortunate that the style of his speech should have been what it was. He seemed to have a strange misapprehension of the spirit of the last three or four years as shown not only in the world generally but in this country particularly. He seems to have forgotten that men are no longer cleaving in the selfish way they did years ago to the old party system and shouting the same old acrimonious party battle-cries. I think if he had realized that more he would have changed the tone of his address and have discarded some of the methods which characterized the unrestrained party methods of years ago. When he referred to the members of this Government as having only the desire to hang on to office, he surely must have known that he was not speaking the truth. He must have known something of the strain that Ministers have undergone during the frightful struggle of the last few years. He certainly must have known that so far as material rewards go we have had no reason to hang on to office. So that it is a matter of regret that a gentleman starting out as leader of a once historic and still, in a sense, big party, should descend to this line of argument,—speaking of his opponents as men only capable of hanging on to office, of violating popular rights, and of banishing freedom. These are old cries that are very much out of place in these days.

My hon. friend lamented the loss of faith in our institutions and in ourselves that exists in Canada and generally throughout the world. I can only say that in his speech he himself, as the leader of a great party, adopted a very poor method of restoring it. I am not so pessimistic as my hon. friend. It is true that the millenium is not here; that the results of the war have not been as happy as they might have been in the establishment not only of a speedy peace but of something approaching a finer spirit of brotherhood all over the world. Nevertheless, while there may not be on

the part of the people the same ready assent to formulas and conventions that there was, and while there may be an impression that people are getting loose in their moorings, I as a Canadian do not believe for a moment that the millions who have gone through this awful struggle, who have displayed unselfishness and courage and self-discipline during these years of war, have faced the realities of life for nothing, nor will they fail as a great and steadying influence in our future progress.

My hon. friend did himself scant justice when he complained of members of this Government being continually away and suggested that we in Canada should primarily attend to our own affairs. He complained that a thing like the Grand Trunk agreement had not been brought down, too much attention being given in the meantime to external matters. Well, he only had to wait a day or two before he got the Grand Trunk agreement. And surely my hon. friend of all gentlemen in this House should be the last to complain on this score. It is true that we have to attend to Canadian affairs first, but can we say that Canadian affairs are not in a very real sense bound up with world affairs at this time? My hon. friend should not be a little Canadian. He has been a member of different commissions. He was a member, I think, of a commission to inquire into immigration from India and the vexed problems connected with that subject. He was a member also of a commission to deal with troubles in Japan. He has spent some time in the United States studying great labour and industrial problems. He, therefore, of all men should be the last to complain. Does he say at a time when the after-problems of the war and the steps to be taken following the conclusion of peace had to be decided, Canadian Ministers were not in their proper place when they were amongst those by whom the solution of these things had to be brought about? I think that my hon. friend has not taken very good ground on that point. If I could stretch my imagination sufficiently to imagine him as Prime Minister of this country,—and it would be a difficult thing to do—I would think that in that capacity he would take a somewhat broader view. As one illustration of the prestige which our country has attained among the nations of the world, I may point out that when the one representative for the British Empire was to be appointed on the Saar Valley Commission, a body to govern the Saar Valley for a period of fifteen years, the British Government asked that Canada name that representative. That suggestion has been met and a Western man has been selected, a high type of Canadian, who has since been made Chairman of the whole Commission.

My hon. friend says that we are suffering at this time from the inability of the Government to meet the needs of the country. I do not know to what extent my hon. friend has followed the problems of the last few years or the manner in which the Government has dealt with them. As my hon. friend has no responsibility so far as governmental office is concerned, he feels that he is free to criticize. But he has been a member of a government; he is now leader of an Opposition. He will appreciate that saying of M. Diderot: "Il est si difficile de produire même une chose médiocre; il est si facile de sentir la médiocrité." This Government has produced constructive legislation which is not by any means of a mediocre character. It has had to deal with immense problems and has settled them satisfactorily. At a meeting in Ottawa the other day my hon. friend welcomed the advent of women into the political life of this country, but he did not think of giving credit to this Government for introducing that great reform, the enfranchisement of women. There are other things that he might have had in mind so far as the accomplishments of the Government are concerned, but these have been so ably dealt with by the member for Pictou (Mr. McGregor), the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) and others that I shall not do more than touch very briefly upon them.

I should like to refer to one thing which at least many of the people are giving the Government due credit for, but which my hon. friend seems to pay little attention to namely, the exceptionally successful work initiated and carried on by the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Meighen) in connection with the settlement of soldiers upon the land. If that is not appreciated by my hon. friend, at least it is appreciated in other countries. Although the Act has been in force only one year, more than 15,000 men have been settled upon the land under its provisions; loans amounting to $57,000,000 have been approved and 35,000 returned men have received qualification certificates. Without dilating upon the subject, I may say that in what has been done in this respect we are 100 per cent in advance of Great Britain, the United States, or, in fact, any other of the countries that were engaged in the war.

My hon. friend has said a great deal about unrest. So far as I am able to judge, there is less unrest in Canada than there is in any other part of the world. The problems that have been so acutely before the people of all countries since the war have been just as acute here, and they have been met. I say without fear of contradiction that in the volume of our trade; in the small extent to which we have been troubled by labour difficulties; in the successful solution of such problems as the railway question and other important matters, no country in the world has greater cause for gratitude than the Canada in which we live.

It is interesting and not a little amusing to watch my hon. friend's attitude with regard to the Farmers' party. My hon. friend has shown some alarm with regard to the formation of this Farmers' party. He says that the Liberals are not opposed to the farmers. He argued at a recent meeting that in so far as the farmers had any virtue, any qualifications such as were enumerated by the member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) just now, they were in reality Liberals. Evidently he looked forward hopefully to the time when he could amalgamate the Farmers' party with his own. Well, I think the member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark) would say that a man once bitten is twice shy. He was for many years a member of the Liberal party. During all that time he preached pretty strongly the economic doctrines which he believes in—and he thought that within the folds of the party which my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie King) leads to-day, he was a kind of voice in the wilderness.

I do not think it is likely that he will join it in the very near future, but it is somewhat amusing to this House to see the way in which the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) has cornered the group of cross-benchers in this particular amendment. My hon. friend, at a Liberal gathering in the city recently, challenged the Farmers' party on this motion, and on what they will do, he said, on "the fundamental question as to the attitude they will take towards the Government". He is not concerned about great questions of policy or great economic questions, but he is deeply concerned as to what attitude they will take in regard to the desire to put out of power the Government which is now in office. I am not surprised that the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark) laboured somewhat in his reasons for supporting the amendment, and I would think his friends on the cross-benches would have been entitled to vote with the members on this side against the amendment of the leader of the Opposition. The hon. member for Red Deer had a fundamental difference with the leader of the Opposition and his party in 1917, and I can understand the reluctance with which he would join with him in any kind of a vote, much more in a vote of this sort. We on this side, much as we may differ with the hon. member for Red Deer, are never likely to forget the loyal and consistent support that he gave to the war when he was a whole-hearted member on this side. A certain famous divine, Archbishop Magee, used to say that there were three kinds of speakers in the world—the men you can listen to, the men you cannot listen to and the men you cannot help listening to. I would put my hon. friend in the last class, namely, those you cannot help listening to. I should be sorry, as I think many of us here would be, to lose my hon. friend from this House. If he votes for this amendment and if the amendment were to carry and an election follow, we might lose him. The hon. member for Red Deer has been somewhat franker than some of his friends who are voting for this amendment. My hon. friend in his speech said:

> So far as a desire for an election is concerned, ... any hon. member who is pining for an election is fonder of adventure than I am. . . . . The doctrine of self-preservation is the first law of nature.

If I can infer anything at all from that, I can infer that my hon. friend does not want this amendment to carry, and he has a pretty shrewd idea that it will not carry. He justifies his attitude and his support of the amendment, as does the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar), on grounds of public policy, namely, that the Union Government had only a mandate for the war, also that there are now before the country issues which require an appeal to the country for a fresh Government. It is not necessary for me to point out to this House, or to members who have sat in it for a long time, that this is not a mere formal vote of want of confidence, but that, as a matter of fact, it is an arraignment of the present administration and couched in language so partisan and unfortunate that I do not wonder that the group of cross-benchers, including the hon. member for Red Deer, are extraordinarily reluctant to swallow the dose prepared for them by the leader of the Opposition.

For a short time, and hurriedly, I should like to refer to the speeches made by the

hon. member for Marquette and the hon. member for Red Deer. The hon. member for Red Deer referred to his fellow-member as his leader. I do not know whether he is his leader or his pupil, but, I should rather be inclined to think, the latter. At all events, they preach the same doctrine, and they justify the establishment of a third party on the ground of their common desire for the abolition of tariffs which they saw no hope of abolishing through the instrumentality of either of the old parties. Before touching on the economic views advanced by my hon. friends of the cross-benches, I should like for a few moments to turn to what has been said as to the new farmers' political organization being a class movement and as such not in the interest of the State as a whole. This morning's paper had rather a significant item to the effect that there were seven hundred canvassers going out from the United Farmers of Manitoba to canvass the whole of the farmers of Manitoba for funds with which to carry on a campaign for capturing the citadel at Ottawa. Well, that is fairly good evidence, I think, that this is a class movement. Certainly, the dominating spirits of this movement in the West are men who have appealed to the class to which they belonged, initially to those who are purely grain growers, and embracing perhaps a large number of those who are farmers and practically at that time all in the West, and they have used from time to time some sound arguments, some very specious arguments, and some, I think, we must admit, rather unfair and very misleading arguments in their appeal to their constituencies and in trying to point out the alleged injustices under which the farmers were suffering and the remedies which were to be applied. Political action, political methods, party organizations have been preached and practised. In Ontario, if the report is correct, methods of organization have gone so far that they have actually countenanced by prearrangement resignations in the party of those who are nominated if they should attempt to break away from the party, and the organization is to be used for the distinct purpose of aiming at control of federal affairs. In British Columbia a similar energy has been shown in the attempt to organize the United Farmers of British Columbia. This attempt has not met with quite so wide a response, and perhaps, for obvious reasons, because conditions in British Columbia in respect to matters which I have touched on, are not those of the Prairie Provinces. The president, however, of the United Farmers of Alberta, at a convention held the other day at Victoria, B.C., made this statement, that when the United Farmers of British Columbia went to the polls as one man, they would become the economic force that nature destined them to be. It is quite evident that although differences of opinion exist, there is not the ground for the same response that was given in the Prairie Provinces. The hon. member for Red Deer the other day in his speech made this remark:

> —The farmer of all men—and particularly the Western farmers—are certainly free from any charge of selfishness in so far as their policy goes, because the first thing they ask Parliament and the Government to do is to take off all duties on the things they produce, in order that the general consumers of Canada may have the benefit of wholesome and cheap food. That is not class selfishness surely.

I am afraid I cannot follow my hon. friend in his argument. He is perfectly aware of the fact—and I am not criticising the ground upon which my hon. friends base their action—that the main product of the Western farmer is wheat which has to find its market in the world market unprotected, and it is perfectly natural for him to feel that, if his product has to meet without protection its price in the world market, everything else in the way of tax should be removed from the things he buys. You can call that self-interest or you can call it selfishness; but what it seems to me our friends in the prairies fail to realize is this, that the abolition of tariffs goes a good deal further than this. In the West as elsewhere there are selfish and sectional protectionists; there are selfish and sectional free traders, and if men of extreme views of this kind insist on pressing their views, and could press them to a point where they would obtain power to put them into effect, they would simply jeopardize the whole state structure. As the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) pointed out in his able speech yesterday, any kind of economical policy that has to be carried into effect in this country must be absolutely national in its character, and not sectional.

What are the doctrines and political ideals which my hon. friends from Marquette (Mr. Crerar) and Red Deer (Mr. Clark) and the rest of the cross-benchers are advocating? I shall quote the exact words of my hon. friend from Marquette so as not to be misunderstood. He said:

> It will take a long time indeed to convince the farmers of Western Canada that there is any virtue in the principle of protection, especially in a customs tariff.

Further on he said this:

What is the purpose of a tariff? It is designed to benefit a particular section of the people, it operates in no other way and consequently the operation of this protective system in our fiscal policy which has obtained largely for the last forty years, has conferred upon a special class a privilege that in my judgment is not compatible with a true democracy.

My hon. friend from Red Deer expounds his views in these words:

As far as my opinion goes, I do not believe in tariffs at all. They are an iniquity, and the sooner we get rid of them the better.

My hon. friend from Red Deer holds his views on economic questions, as we all know, very strongly indeed. We may not agree with him. Perhaps I would not be going too far if I were to say that he is inconvincible on these questions. I do not believe that in his cherished hold of the doctrines which he has advocated so consistently for so many years he has an adequate conception or an adequate appreciation of world conditions. He scoffed at the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) the other day for referring to Lincoln's views on tariff matters. He said that simply because protection had been preached for so long it did not follow that it was any good. He pointed out that the Fiji Islanders have practised cannibalism for a good many years, but he could not see that there was any virtue in cannibalism simply because it had been practised all that time. It may be interesting to put on record Lincoln's exact words in reference to this matter. They are contained in his address to the people of Illinois in 1843, when he was a candidate for President. He said:

Some of them boldly advocate direct taxation, and all the rest—or so nearly all as to make exceptions needless—refuse to adopt the tariff, we think it is doing them no injustice to class them all as advocates of direct taxation. Indeed, we believe they are only delaying an open avowal of the system till they can assure themselves that the people will tolerate it. Let us, then, briefly compare the two systems. The tariff is the cheaper system, because the duties, being collected in large parcels, at a few commercial points, will require comparatively few officers in their collection; while by the direct tax system the land must be literally covered by assessors and collectors, going forth like swarms of Egyptian locusts, devouring every blade of grass and other green thing..... By the direct tax system, none can escape. However strictly the citizen may exclude from his premises all foreign luxuries, fine cloths, fine silks, rich wines, golden chairs, and diamond rings,—still, for the possession of his house, his barn, and his homespun he is to be perpetually haunted and harassed by the tax-gatherer. With these views, we leave it to be determined whether we or our opponents are more truly democratic on the subject.

I do not suppose for a moment that my hon. friend from Red Deer would accept Lincoln as a very able exponent of economics, but the point I wish to make is that Lincoln at all events was a sane, strong, big man, and we therefore, in these more modern days who may share the belief that the tariff is the main way in which we can carry on the fiscal policy of this country, and do justice to all, may not be blamed for feeling satisfaction that we had so sane a man as Lincoln on our side years ago. My hon. friend drew comparisons with the United States, and went to the extreme length of saying that President Wilson in the United States tariff of 1913 was almost a slavish follower of Sir Robert Peel. I am afraid I cannot follow my hon. friend to that extent. He added that in that tariff about thirty per cent of the whole of the imported articles into the United States were free of duty. That statement, of course, may be accurate, but may I call 11 p.m. the attention of my hon. friend to this fact. While it may be true that thirty per cent of the 657 articles are on the free list, he must not forget that as regards a very large number of those articles it matters little whether they are on the free list or not, because they are almost negligible in character. I turn to the tariff of the United States and read a few articles at random that are free. Here are some.—Curling stones, curry and curry powder, cuttlefish bone, Dandelion roots, Divi-divi, Dragon's blood. Take those under the letter "J"—Jalap, jet, joss, junk. Under the letter "M" we find—Manna, manuscripts, marrow, marshmallows; and under the letter "S" Silkworm eggs, skeletons, skins of hares. Under the letter "T"—Tumeric, turpentine and turtles, and so on.

I don't suppose it matters whether these articles are free or taxed. Thirty per cent of the articles may be on the free list, but I think my hon. friend's deductions are somewhat misleading. I am quite well aware that a large number of articles were put on the free list of the United States in 1913, but there are still many very important articles which are not yet free. On woollen clothing, for instance, there is still a tariff of thirty-five per cent in the United States, the same as here, and all cotton clothing is subject to a duty of thirty per cent. With respect to those articles on which the tariff is lower or is abolished altogether my hon. friend and his friends will not forget that years ago they were taxed as high as 80 and even 100 per cent and bore that high tariff for years until it had practically eliminated all competition and there was built up such a powerful machinery that no

competition need be feared. My hon. friend knows, because I am quite sure he is as familiar with these things as I am, that if we adopted the policy which he and his friends would advocate to their logical extreme, it would absolutely mean the transplanting of a large number of our industries into the United States, and would tend towards making Canada as was truly said in 1911 simply "a hewer of wood and drawer of water" for the United States. We would supply them with the raw material, and they with their large amount of skilled labour would work it up into the manufactured product, reaping thereby about three-quarters of the benefit. We see what is going on in the United States to-day. We have seen the frantic appeal in the United States Senate and Congress that Canada shall not go on manufacturing her pulpwood into pulp and her pulp into paper. They are urging in the strongest possible way that we ship the whole of our raw material to the United States and let them do all the manufacturing of the material themselves.

Without wearying the House with this, I wish to deal for a moment with the case of England because my hon. friend is very fond—and I am not blaming him—of turning to England as exemplifying the ideas for which he stands; but I sometimes think that here again he is rather misleading. I think that those members of the House who have not followed what England has been doing in the last few years in regard to tariff matters may be surprised to find that the tariff iniquity is very far from having been abolished in the land which my hon. friend comes from and for which he has, and rightly, so warm a feeling in his heart.

I quote from a book which I have in my hand and which is the Trade and Navigation Returns of the British Government for December, 1919. England has been held up to us as a model of free trade and we have been led to believe that the principle of free trade is being carried out and that the amount collected by tariffs is negligible. But members of the House will be rather amazed when I give them the cold facts as set out in these official figures. These are matters which are not purely luxuries and in some cases we see that the duties collected are of an absolutely protective character. We will start with chicory, including roast or ground, on which there is a duty of £2.2s. per hundredweight and 6d. per pound. From that they collected a very considerable revenue—remember these are straight customs duties. They collected a revenue amounting to over $1,000,000 from cinematograph films. They have a duty on clocks and watches of 33-1/3 per cent from which they collected many millions of dollars. That is distinctly protective in its character and we must regard clocks and watches as more or less necessities. On cocoa there is a duty of £2.2s. per hundredweight which gives a revenue of something like $15,000,000. Coffee they tax to the extent of £2.2s. per hundredweight and 6d per pound which gives a revenue of something like $3,000,000. When we come to the subject of fruit, they have customs duties on dried fruit, or otherwise preserved without sugar and other fruit as well which amounts to over $4,000,000. They have a duty on matches, practically the same as our own, and also an excise duty and they extract from this source a revenue of no less than $4,627,000. There is a duty on motor cars and motorcycles of 33⅓ per cent in "free trade England", and if that is not protection I want to know what is protection. On that item alone they collect something like $5,000,000. They have also a duty of 6d, or practically twelve cents, per gallon on motor spirit or gasoline from which they collect no less than $15,000,000. There is a duty of 33⅓ per cent on musical instruments. I will not touch on the question of spirits on which they have heavy duties but I will come down to an article that is used by rich and poor alike—sugar—on which they have duties up to 5½ cents a pound as against our less than 2 cents a pound and on which they collect no less a sum than $41,148,000. They have a duty on tea of 24 cents a pound as against our 10 cents on which they also collect a very large amount indeed—something like $38,000,000. They have heavy duties also on tobacco; in fact so heavy that they collect $329,000,000 from that source. The result is that, not counting the excise at all, the total customs duties collected in 1919 in free trade England amounted to $743,775,000.

My hon. friend of course looks back with great veneration to Mr. Cobden whose name he often mentions in this House and who stands forth as one of England's big men. I do not think he will dispute that Cobden and his followers actually expected to see the day when England would be the workshop of the world and that she would receive cheap food from the rest of the world to supply her operatives. Cobden certainly never anticipated, never realized, the disastrous effect of this particular policy on one

of the great national industries, namely, that of agriculture, in the old country. The figures that I have quoted will show not only that a tariff for revenue is in operation but that the protective principle also is in operation. Let me illustrate it in other directions. I have not time to go into the details of what has been done in connection with wheat, bread and flour during the past few years in England. My hon. friend of course knows that by fixing a guaranteed price of wheat for years, which is still in operation,—and a greater price is being clamoured for now with, I think, some success—and by fixing the maximum price of the four pound loaf at 19 cents, the British Government not only gives a protection to the farmers but gives practically a gratuity to the consumers to the extent of millions upon millions of dollars which is taken from the general taxpayers of the country. I am not criticizing their action or questioning the wisdom of adopting protective measures of this kind. I would venture to say that with the increasing pressure of the farming community in England still higher protection will be adopted. I might point out to my hon. friend and his friends also that in their handling of the dairy products of England there has been in operation the protective principle, for which I am not criticizing them. They have had such a control of the imports from this country and such a control of the production of their own dairy industries in Great Britain that it has given, what I think they are justified in giving, such a measure of protection to the dairy industries in that country that they will not be wiped out and jeopardized as the whole agricultural industry was jeopardized when the crisis arose and which they had to face during the past four years in the old country. I need not point to another direction in which they have adopted the protective principle in England. I refer to the question of livestock. Under the very thin disguise of a health measure one of the strongest forms of protection to the cattle industry of Great Britain has been maintained by an absolutely unjustifiable embargo against the cattle of the United States and especially of Canada where not the wildest straining of the facts could elicit anything but the cleanest bill of health in regard to our cattle, and in regard to which they have hardly attempted to veneer their action by denominating it as a health measure. Admittedly it is intended to be a protection to their own agricultural interests. I do not think that in view of the facts I have stated, England's march towards abolishing all tariffs or the element of protection of its own industries has been so rapid or complete as the member for Red Deer would have us believe.

My hon. friend referred to the victory achieved by the Right Hon. Mr. Asquith recently as a triumph of the economic principles for which he stood. I think the facts, if we knew them, would rather be that another man running in the constituency of Paisley holding the same economic principles that Mr. Asquith holds but not with the powerful personality and great traditions that pertain to Mr. Asquith's name, would have met a very different fate. I am glad, as every man is glad, that any English constituency would return a statesman who has served his country so long and so ably as Mr. Asquith has done.

I was rather surprised and a little interested when my hon. friend from Red Deer in his speech from Friday last in giving an illustration as to the evils of protection asked us to follow the example of the men in the trenches. I will quote his exact words. He said:

> Let me make an appeal to these gentlemen to use all their endeavours to grow into the same stalwart type of Canadians that stood in the trenches and asked for no protection and the farmers of the West who ask for no protection.

I think that of the men whom he mentions for the purpose of illustration he could not have made a more unhappy choice than when he referred to the man in the trenches as the man who was not asking for protection. I think he would find that the man in the trenches when he was getting the benefit of some high explosives from the German positions would send up a flare for the artillery in his rear to give him protection. Or if there was the likelihood of an aggressive movement from the German front he would want to have the protection of all the barbed wire he could get, and rightly so. What did the adoption of the helmets used in the last years of the war mean but protection? What was the object of every form of manoeuvre and device that could put the forces of the Allies in better condition than the German forces but protection, and protection of the sanest and soundest character. I do not think a more unhappy illustration could possibly have been drawn than the illustration my hon. friend advanced in that respect.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to keep the House much longer for I know the hour is late and we are shortly to vote on

the amendment before us. The farmers' party, as represented by the group at the other end of this Chamber, are apparently going to support the amendment. I can only regret it. They are certainly not going to support that amendment for the same reasons that the leader of the Opposition and his friends are going to support it, because they have not manifested any particular hostility toward the policies that were put into effect by this Government, or the principles for which this Government stands, apart from this particular tariff question. In fact I think my hon. friend from Marquette and my hon. friend whom we highly esteem from Red Deer, and their associates were with us on this side of the House when great problems were undertaken, and I think successfully undertaken. They, I think, will not only have sympathy with the difficulties which we encountered and the way in which they were surmounted, but will admit that, apart from this particular measure of tariff reform, which they think we are not hastening to as quickly as they anticipate, they have no very strong cause for voting for this particular amendment especially in the way in which it has been framed. It is quite a different matter with my hon. friends opposite—certainly in the case of the leader of the Opposition because when addressing Liberal friends in this city the other night he put the matter this way: "If we do not win on Parliament Hill in this particular amendment by carrying it, we will carry it from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and we expect the people of the country to rise up with us and demand that this Government get out of office." That is all he is aiming at. It does not matter what the Government has done or what it stands for—and he seems to comprehend very little of what it has done—his chief anxiety is to get this Government out of office so that he and his friends may take its place. Well, as citing a fairly independent and pretty sane opinion from the West on this matter I might direct my hon. friend's attention, and especially the attention of the hon. gentleman who last spoke (Mr. Lapointe), for whom we have a warm regard, let me quote from a paper which has a very considerable influence in the West namely the Manitoba Free Press. In its issue of March 3 last, that newspaper says:

> Members of the present Dominion Parliament were elected for a five year term, and they are under no moral obligation to vote for Mr. King's amendment providing for an early election. If a majority of them want an election they will, of course, support Mr. King's resolution, and no one will question their right to make such a decision. On the other hand, if their decision is adverse, they are equally within their rights in deciding, so far as the decision rests with them, they will continue to represent their constituents for the period for which they were originally elected.
>
> Should the House of Commons reject Mr. King's amendment, as it no doubt will, it does not follow that there will be no general election until the present Parliament completes its term. The right of the Administration to consult the electorate in its discretion is inherent in our constitution, and an appeal to the people by the Government during the present year is regarded by all political observers as well within possibilities.
>
> A House of Commons elected during the present year, while it may be more representative than the existing Chamber, would fall far short of being truly representative of Canadian opinion at the present time. Election on the basis of the present constituencies would leave the West under represented to at least the extent of twenty members. The West has never had its full representation in the Canadian Parliament. By accident or design it has always happened that a general election is held on the eve of redistribution, the effect of which has been to keep the western representation always far below its proper strength. Further, the cities are, under the present scheme of representation under-represented to a degree that is not longer defensible, and it is quite clear that there must be extensive adjustments in this respect, which ought to be accompanied by the adoption of proportional representation for at least the urban areas.
>
> It is a quite arguable proposition that upon the whole the interests of Canada will be best served by putting up with conditions as they are for another two years until it will be possible to have a proper redistribution of seats which will do the West justice; will give the cities at least a percentage of the additional representation to which they are entitled; and will provide a more accurate method of election. With these reforms it will be possible to elect a truly representative Commons, which is not attainable under existing conditions. A general election now means that a truly representative Parliament could not be elected until 1925.
>
> Inasmuch as it is already quite evident that in the next Parliament there will be a contest between the policy strongly backed by the West and an alternative policy, which will draw its strength from the East, it is desirable that the West should have all the members to which it is entitled. The fact that under a proper redistribution the West will gain at least twenty more members, while the East will lose ten, may have some bearing upon the demand that is being heard in the East, and which Mr. Mackenzie King voices for an early election.

Now, Sir, in closing, may I say that I hold the opinion, as many people do, that the plunging of the country into a general election at the present time would not be in the best interests of Canada. In spite of what my hon. friends argue, and in spite of what they present to this House, no man would deny that under the present war conditions, with conditions such as they are economically, industrially and socially all over the world to-day, and to a greater or

lesser extent in Canada, to plunge this country into the chaos of a general election would not be wise in the interests of the country or in the interests of any individual party. My hon. friends need not cherish the belief that this Government and its supporters are afraid to meet the country at any time. They are not afraid. My hon. friends seem to entertain some dissatisfaction, not only with so many Liberals joining this party in 1917, but feel an acute distress that those hon. gentlemen are still staying with the Ministry at the present time. I would like to say to my hon. friends that when this Government does go to the country my belief is a policy will be enunciated which will not only justify the strong grounds upon which my hon. friends from the Liberal party joined the Coalition in 1917, but will also justify in the fullest way the continuation of their adhesion to this party and what it stands for before the people.

If when this Government does go to the country the people should choose to put in another Government, I cherish the belief that whatever Government does come into power will undertake the administration of this country in the sane constitutional methods to which we here, at all events, are so strongly adhering, and that those elements which would rather reverse all the constitutional principles for which we on both sides of the House have stood for so long will have such a severe lesson taught them that they will realize that no party, however violent or however influential, can divorce from the minds of true Canadians the determination to cherish the institutions and to maintain the constitution for which they have stood so long. However, when that appeal is made, I believe, as I stated before, that this Government, which has met the conditions of the war and the problems which have arisen out of the war with courage and success, will have no difficulty in justifying their stand to-day and in bringing back to this House a party that will successfully carry on the affairs of this country for many years to come.

Mr. ROBERT H. HALBERT (North Ontario): Mr. Speaker, after listening to the cross-firing which we have had for several days it requires considerable courage on the part of a new member to make what is called his maiden speech. As a new member I was greatly interested in the able addresses of the hon. members who have spoken, although, Mr. Speaker, some remarks have been made which I think in the interests of Canada would have been better unsaid.

I was pleased with the deserved tributes paid by previous speakers to leaders, both past and present, of His Majesty's Government and of His Majesty's loyal Opposition.

The subject of the designing and carrying out of the design of this magnificent building in which we have the honour to meet for the first time has been pretty well exhausted by men capable of doing justice to the subject and needs no further comment from me. In fact, the ground has been so well covered that there is very little left to be said. The reference made to the war and the Peace Treaty and the deserving tribute paid to our boys whose manly courage and work well done overseas made the Peace Treaty possible, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, is heartily endorsed and concurred in by every member of this House; but there are some matters mentioned in the address from the Throne and in the course of this debate upon it to which I wish to draw your attention, as you will notice that some do not appreciate any too well the fact that in four of the by-elections just held the electors of all shades of politics, callings and professions, sent men to sit in the cross-benches whom they believed would represent them and not misrepresent them; and just here, Mr. Speaker, permit me, representing, as I do, the federal riding of North Ontario, represented previously in the House by the late lamented Colonel Sam Sharpe, to pay tribute to his memory by saying that he was a man who was held in the highest esteem by the electors of his riding, revered by his men overseas and, I believe, Sir, was esteemed and admired by his fellow members of the House of Commons, of which he was a member for some years.

Reference has been made to the farmers' organization as a "class" movement and it has been said that all classes should be represented. We believe so, too, and that is why we are here representing rural constituencies. We are here, Mr. Speaker, as a protest against class rule and class legislation. The Organized Farmers stand for British fair play, equal rights to all and special privileges to none. We are here to assist any Government that will give us sane, honest, economic and progressive legislation; and Government not subservient to the Big Interests, but truly representing the ideals and aspirations of the great masses of the people. As some hon. gentle-

men apparently do not want to believe that we are not advocates of class legislation, permit me to read one clause from our constitution in reference to that matter:

> By endeavouring to suppress personal, local, sectional, national, political, partisan and class prejudices, and thereby to promote the best interests of Canada as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, attention has been drawn to the unrest in this country. No doubt there is unrest and a great many people believe that the present Government has outlived its usefulness and would like to see a Government in power that would pay more attention to ascertaining the real will of the people and carrying it out than to territorial boundaries and winning an election. If Canadian politics are to be saved from utter disgrace and if the bloodshed which has taken place in other countries is to be avoided we must have sufficient faith to trust democracy with democratic methods. If our grievances are to be settled by ballot—which I think should be—people must be allowed to use the ballot, and, what is more, the gerrymandering of present day partyism must be absolutely abandoned. When autocracy interferes with the channels of public expression it causes unrest and invites direct action.

Canada is essentially an agricultural country. Its chief asset is the soil, the foundation upon which all the superstructure stands. While we admit that the products of sea, forest and mines are known to be great, yet the possibilities in plant and animal production far exceed them all in magnitude and importance. The products of the mines are taken, never to be restored; the forests to be perhaps partially renewed after many years; but the farm production where intelligently carried on has been secure without depleting to any appreciable extent nature's storehouse of resources.

The manufacturing industry, it is true, has come to play an important part in the nation's progress, yet a great many of them are dependent on farming for their raw material, and a great many of them must look to the rural districts for the great bulk of the market for their finished product. Therefore, the progress in agriculture in Canada is a national concern. It affects every one, and everything possible should be done to make agricultural life attractive and remunerative so that labour and capital will be attracted to the land instead of away from it as it is at present.

Mr. Speaker, every one who has the true interest of Canada at heart desires to see the present unrest satisfactorily settled. This can be done by an honest effort on the part of all. To my mind, one of the greatest causes of the unrest lies in our tariff laws, which affect to a very great extent the high cost of living; but, Mr. Speaker, as you have intimated that will be discussed in the Budget debate, I will not discuss it at the present time, except to refer to what has already been said with regard to re-establishment of the returned soldier.

In connection with the re-establishment of the returned soldier it has been urged that he should go on the land. We hope to see a good many returned soldiers go on the land. But when they do so they find that the tariff affects them very materially so far as the cost of the implements of production is concerned. It has been said that a large amount of the money necessary to pay our war debt has to be taken out of the top six inches of the soil. You ask the returned soldier to go on the land and to take out of the top six inches of the soil enough to pay for the canned goods he eats as well as for the shells he fired when over in the trenches fighting for democracy. Well, suppose he does that for a number of years and eventually succumbs under the heavy burden, what does the tariff do then? It collects from the heirs a percentage by way of taxation even on his shroud, on his coffin, on the screw-nails that fasten down the lid of his coffin, and on the shovel with which the grave digger digs his grave. No doubt the same people who impose these tariffs may be lamenting the fact that they cannot follow him over the Jordan and put a tax on his royal robe.

With regard to the amendment of the hon. leader of the Opposition, I may say that while I do not agree with the wording of it, I shall support it because I believe that the present administration has not the confidence of the people, as the by-elections just held go to prove. If their record is as good and their policy as popular and pleasing as they would try to make us believe, they should be anxious to go to the country and get the endorsation of the people to carry on. The question is not who will be in power, but who will give the people the best legislation in the interests of Canada; and of that the people should be the judge.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other matter mentioned in the Address about which I wish to speak before taking my seat, and that is the Franchise Act. We who have been born in Canada sometimes fail, I

think, to realize the great heritage which we enjoy in being born Canadians.

> Breathes there the man, with soul so dead,
> Who never to himself hath said—
> "This is my own, my native land!"

The war has taught us many lessons and none more forcible than the need of true and unadulterated Canadian citizenship. We are all aware that most nations have been formed from different elements, as their flags are formed of silk or wool of different colours sewn together. Stone and brick are not the same, yet both are employed in making this magnificent building in which we now meet—a building that the people of this generation will be proud to hand down to future generations. Both stone and brick are employed in building the most lasting and the most solid monuments. What is needed to unite them? A little cement, that is all. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have in our country people of different tongues, from different lands, and of different ideas. The thing that is needed to cement them together is the gospel of Canadian citizenship—the establishment in this country of the true brotherhood of man. We shall not bring about a united Canada by throwing stones at each other. Our boys died for a better and more democratic Canada. It is our duty to build up a united citizenship, loving liberty from whence springs peace and harmony, in a country inhabited by people of different nationalities and religions. I am willing to work with any man, regardless of colour, race, creed or nationality, who has the true ideal of Canadian citizenship and is willing to work with me for the welfare of this country and to help make it the best country in the world to live in. And yet, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to say that we have in this country even to-day, even in this enlightened age, men who are fanning the flames of discord, jealousy and antagonism. I once thought that the man who looted the public treasury was the greatest enemy of our nation. But to my mind there is one man who is even worse, and that is the man who, whatever the reason may be, stirs the fires of racial and religious passion, thereby setting in motion agencies that are the greatest menace and danger to our public weal to-day. Such agencies should be crushed and crushed so mercilessly that they will never again arise from the oblivion into which they should be forever consigned.

Mr. H. C. HOCKEN (Toronto West): Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a few observations at this point chiefly because I think that my hon. friends on the other side would be disappointed if I did not. What has been said this afternoon will, I am sure, lead them to expect me to say a few words.

The attack that has been made upon the President of the Council (Hon. N. W. Rowell) was so thin, so stale, and so vindictive that it will leave no impression on the country unfavourable to the President of the Council. That kind of thing always reacts on the man who is responsible for it, and I am sure that that will be the case in this instance.

The attack on the President of the Council was due to his criticisms of some of the religious orders in the war. As to the accuracy in detail of what he said I have no knowledge. But in support of what he said at North Bay I desire to quote a very eminent and brave French-Canadian, who for many years was a much admired citizen of my own city, a man with whom I enjoyed very pleasant social relations, I refer to General Lessard. Here is a report of something that he said during the progress of the war:

> There is a general complaint that the lower clergy of the Province have not lent an attentive ear to the voice of the higher Episcopal authorities so as to bring its message in regard to the duty of the French-Canadians at the present time to recruit the race as a whole.
>
> He pointed out the grave responsibility that the lower clergy assumed in putting a damper on the appeal of the hierarchy to its children. As far as he himself was concerned he expected a more wholehearted co-operation from the clergy in conformity with the great influence which it exercises on the destinies of the French-Canadian. He might say the same thing about their leaders—those who directed opinion in Quebec. It was long enough that politics had been a bar to the complete spirit of union necessary to rouse up the French-Canadian people to rally to the great cause.

I desire to read also a paragraph from a letter written to Colonel Obed Smith, a Liberal, by a French-Canadian who was serving at the front, about the time of the disturbances in the city of Quebec. It reads:

> 'The question should be handled with steel gauntlets,' he says, 'Ignorance is rampant in my native province. The blame is on the shoulders of the Fathers of Confederation, who allowed two official languages. A dual language begets separate schools, they beget ignorance. It may require a small army to enforce the radical changes after the war, but we shall have it. The indifference of Quebec in this struggle will be a powerful lever in the hands of a bold leader.'

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: What is the name of the miscreant who wrote that letter?

Mr. HOCKEN: The letter was given by the writer to Colonel Obed Smith.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Who wrote the letter?

Mr. HOCKEN: A French-Canadian at the front.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Anonymous?

Mr. HOCKEN: No, Colonel Obed Smith was a man who was serving and who had a good deal of prominence in this country. Therefore, there is a good deal of support for what the President of the Council (Mr. Rowell) said and for which he has been criticised so severely on at least two separate occasions.

The hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy) produced a document from which he read a number of extracts. I am familiar with the literature of the Orange Association, and this bears none of the earmarks of that organization. I venture to say that this document from which he read was printed in either Nova Scotia or Quebec; a document something of this kind has been sent out, but to what extent it is garbled, I do not know. I can, however, say this for myself and for the names of those Past Grand Officers that appear on the document; I did not sign such a document, and I have no reason to believe that they did. As to the position taken in this document with regard to schools, with regard to the war, and with regard to the association of which I am a member, I am prepared to defend the substance of everything that appears there. I want to point out to the House that in this debate I am not the aggressor; I am doing as every true Orangeman ought to do, standing on the defensive, defending his principles and convictions as straightforwardly as it is the practice of members of the association to do. I will endeavour to do that, Sir, without saying a word that should give my hon. friends opposite who disagree with me in matters of faith any just cause for offence.

My course, since I came into this House —and this is my fourth session—has been one of conciliation. I think I may fairly say—and my hon. friends opposite will agree with me—that I have not sought any occasion to stir up racial strife or to express any opinions that I thought might be offensive to any one of them. At the same time, I do not purpose sitting in my seat and hear the institution with which I am connected attacked without making a reply. This document refers to the language question which has been the bone of contention between Quebec and Ontario. It arose shortly before the war and was the occasion during the war of a very serious agitation in certain parts of Ontario as well as in Quebec. The charge was that the province of Ontario had proscribed the French language. That is not so. I have before me regulation 17 which says:

> Where necessary in the case of French-speaking pupils, French may be used as the language of instruction and communication; but such use of French shall not be continued beyond Form 1 excepting during the school year of 1912-13, when it may also be used as the language of instruction and communication in the case of pupils beyond Form 1, who owing to previous defective training, are unable to speak and understand the English language.

Further than that, upon a report of the chief inspector, the French language may be used for communication and instruction up to the fourth form.

I think that is a reasonable regulation, especially when we all realize, as has been admitted even by the counsel for the French-Canadian Educational Association that, under the constitution of this country, there is no obligation upon the province of Ontario to allow French to be taught at all, and when so many believe that it is impossible in the primary schools to teach two languages successfully.

Mr. CANNON: When was that proved?

Mr. HOCKEN: I say that is the general belief in the province of Ontario.

Mr. CANNON: That is a wrong belief.

Mr. HOCKEN: It is the belief of that eminent Episcopal Divine, Bishop Fallon, of London, and I am in his company when I say that in my belief two languages cannot be taught successfully in the primary schools. We make provision in the secondary schools for the teaching of French, and practically every child that goes into the secondary schools studies French.

Mr. BELAND: Has the Bishop to whom the hon. member refers ever learned French?

Mr. HOCKEN: I have never tested him, so I am unable to answer that question.

Mr. CANNON: If it is impossible in the primary schools of Ontario to teach both languages, English and French successfully, how is it that both languages are taught successfully in Quebec?

Mr. EDWARDS: They are so much cleverer than we.

Mr. CANNON: I think so.

Mr. BEST: Sit down. You started it; take your medicine.

Mr. CANNON: Let the hon. member answer the question.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member for Toronto West has the floor, and I hope he will be permitted to continue his speech without interruption.

Mr. CANNON: I put him a question, and I think my question is legitimate and I would like to have an answer.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is within the right of the hon. member to answer the question or not, but he should at least be given an opportunity to do so.

Mr. HOCKEN: If it be the case that in Quebec the children are so bright that they can learn two languages in the primary schools, that is not the case in the diocese of London, because that was the very basis of the objection of Bishop Fallon to the continuance of bilingual schools. If a child going to school in Quebec is taught during the greater part of the day in English, he gets a conversational knowledge of his own language in his home, and greater success may be attained that way than in our province where he would never hear the French language outside of school. But it is impossible that we should give the greater part of the time to teaching French in Ontario and at the same time fit the children of our provinces to fight their way in life. But this regulation was based upon the report of Dr. Merchant, a copy of which I have, and you will find set out in that report that there were 268 schools in Ontario in which it was impossible for an English-speaking child to get an education in his own language. They had to go to schools where they were taught wholly in French, and their parents had to submit to the choice of sending their children to a school that was conducted in French entirely, and where the catechism of a faith in which they did not believe was one of the principal subjects of study, keeping their children away from school altogether, or selling out at a sacrifice and moving to western Canada. That was the condition of affairs that the people of Ontario said they would not tolerate.

The people of Ontario would not tolerate it, and so they took the necessary steps to have their children learn the English language. The fathers of these children inherited their lands from the United Empire Loyalists, and thousands of them sold out and went West solely that their children might get a chance in life. If this had been simply an accidental movement, instead of an attempt to fill up the province of Ontario with French-speaking people and get control of one section after another, it would not have gone as fast or as far as it did. The French have come into the counties of Ontario without ten dollars in their pocket and have been able to buy a 100-acre farm, until finally, one after another the school sections would come under the control of the French, and from that time the school became a French-language school instead of an English-language school. At the time regulation 17 was adopted, there were 268 sections in that condition.

Behind this is the claim that the whole of Canada should be colonized and dominated by the French people. That was stated even by so eminent a man as Sir Wilfrid Laurier in an address in the city of Quebec. He is quoted by the The Toronto Star of June 24, 1912, as saying that not only the province of Quebec but the whole of Canada should be claimed by the French-Canadians as their country.

Mr. CANNON: Why not?

Mr. HOCKEN: Behind that claim is this: that the French language shall have the same status in every province as it has in the province of Quebec.

Mr. CANNON: That is the constitution.

Mr. HOCKEN: No. I should like to read the opinion of Hon. Senator Belcourt, who was specially delegated to prepare a reasoned opinion of the law upon the subject. He said:

> The true fact, regrettable as it may be, is that for the federal domain and the provincial domain of Quebec, there is but the constitution which defines equality of both languages at the Dominion Parliament, at the Quebec Parliament, before the Federal tribunal or courts, and also before the courts of the Province of Quebec is the French language on an equal footing with the English language. Section 133 of the British North America Act which proclaims equal rights of the French and English before the Federal House, the Federal courts and before the provincial house of Quebec and the provincial courts, and in section 93 of the same Act which gives to each province the exclusive power to legislate in matters of education, constitute the sum total of the rights officially recognized in favour of the French-Canadian people of the Dominion of Canada; these are the only rights recognized in favour of our race; they are the only rights which cannot be stripped from us without the intervention of the Imperial Parliament; they are the only rights which the constitution and the law formally guaranteed to us; they are the only rights which the law will permit us to exact and about which it gives us the means whereby to exact the same.

I hope my hon. friend will accept the reasoned opinion of Senator Belcourt. That was also admitted by Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Mr. CANNON: If I understand Senator Belcourt's opinion properly, federally speaking, the French and English languages are on an equal footing. Is not that the case?

Mr. HOCKEN: No. They are on an equal footing in the federal courts, and in the Houses of Parliament, but not in the schools. It is just as well to have this matter out now we are at it. There has been a movement vigorously and energetically pressed, to surround the province of Ontario with a French population which would enable the French to secure about twenty seats in the legislature, and thus dominate the policy of the province.

Mr. CANNON: Why not?

Mr. HOCKEN: Why not resist it, if we do not agree with the principles that prevail in your province? Father Hamon, the head of the Jesuit order, has admitted that this movement is going on. He wrote a book on French-Canadian aims and ambitions in which he said this:

None of the obstacles met have checked the settlement of the valley of the Ottawa and of the Province of Ontario. And yet, for the French-Canadian, is not Ontario a country different from theirs, both in religion and language, and even in politics, in that, at least, which relates to local interests? In spite of these difficulties, in spite of a tenacious English element, hostile to the invasion and seeking by all possible means to prevent it, the French-Canadian pushes towards the end for which he set out. The French-Canadian infiltrate themselves everywhere in those counties of Ontario which divide it from the province of Quebec, and continue bravely to march toward the West .

Mr. CANNON: That is their right.

Mr. HOCKEN: Yes. To continue:

The policy of the church is to guide the movement, plan and forward settlement, and especially the parish system, the parochial school, and the religious and national societies.

Mr. CANNON: That is their duty.

Mr. HOCKEN (reading):

——Then to watch and wait for providential developments, that she may mass and lead the people for the effective overthrow of Protestant error and paganism.

Mr. EDWARDS: That is their hope.

Hr. HOCKEN (reading):

——The French-Canadian race is God's chosen people to save North America and to restore its population to the bosom of the church of Rome. Is this a dream? No, it is more; it is an everyday issue.

Mr. HOCKEN: As far as the people of the Protestant section of Ontario are concerned we have just as much right to oppose that movement as the hierarchy of Quebec has to encourage and promote it?

Mr. CANNON: Who is preventing you?

Mr. HOCKEN: Nobody yet. We are doing the best we can to resist the movement, but we have not succeeded quite so well as we would like.

Mr. CANNON: Would my hon. friend allow me a question?

Mr. BEST: Keep quiet over there.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) has asked permission to ask a question of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken). Had the hon. member for West Toronto retained the floor, the hon. member for Dorchester would certainly not have had that right, but as the hon. member for Toronto has taken his seat the hon. member for Dorchester is perfectly justified in asking his question.

Mr. CANNON: Will the hon. member for West Toronto give me one example where the Catholic church in the province of Quebec has impeded or tried to impede any Protestant movements in the province of Quebec?

Mr. HOCKEN: I do not live in the province of Quebec.

Mr. CANNON: Happily for us.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: We do not grow your kind.

Mr. HOCKEN: In answer to my hon. friend from Dorchester I could give many instances, and I may do that later. Just now I am trying to give my reasons why the institution which I represent as one of its officers, resists the extension of the French language into the province of Ontario, believing it to be inimical to the interests of the English-speaking people of that province, and contrary to the constitution. I am supported in that by some of the most eminent members of the Roman Catholic church. There are clergymen in this city, as well as the Bishop of London, who say that this is being done by the bishops and the French hierarchy.

There is another reason why we do not want this to go on because the aim is to extend ecclesiastical government to the province of Ontario. The province of Quebec is ruled by the ecclesiastics. The people must take their politics as well as their religion from the bishops. We do not want

that kind of thing in Ontario, because we have discovered that when clericals rule a country there is always restraint upon freedom. It is even worse, Mr. Speaker, when this restraint is imposed by the members of a faith whose religious leaders have the power, according to the belief of those who follow them, to open or close the doors of heaven. The Protestant preacher has his own personal influence and nothing more, but the bishop of the Roman church has the sacraments and that makes a good deal of difference. My hon. friend dissents from my statement that in politics they are governed, as they are in spiritual matters, by their clerical leaders. Let me give an instance to prove my point. It is a well known fact that if a newspaper publishes matter which is offensive, or thought to be injurious to the interests of religion in Quebec, that newspaper can have the ban put upon it, and it can be closed up. It has to suspend publication. That happened to one of these papers some years ago.

An hon. MEMBER: How many years ago?

Mr. HOCKEN: I cannot give you the exact year but I remember the case very well. It does not apply to newspapers only but to pamphlets. A man cannot write a book in Quebec that declares for freedom in politics without having to take it back.

An hon. MEMBER: Ah.

Mr. HOCKEN: Ah; I will give you a notable instance of that. I will tell you all about it. The most interesting I have to present is that of a book or pamphlet written by the Hon. L. O. David. The writer's object was to uphold the proposition, that the priests ought to confine themselves to the spiritual domain, and as his reason for so saying he quoted from history to show that whenever they meddled with secular affairs it was to their own hurt and that of the province. Starting by laying down "that bishops and priests are men subject to error" he went on to point out how, in his view, they erred in 1837 and at each subsequent crisis when French nationality was in jeopardy. Professedly a devout Catholic, Senator David deplored this, blaming the mistaken course of the priests to ignorance of public sentiment. "The truth," he declares, "reaches them (the priests) with difficulty through the fumes of the incense which envelops them," and he warned them to awake from their sleep of false security and escape the storm which menaced them by leaving politics alone.

The little book, which was issued in September, 1896, was condemned by the bishops in a joint pastoral in January following. After stating the book had been submitted to the Holy Office at Rome and been formally condemned "with the approval of the sovereign pontiff," the rule is laid down that no layman "has authority to judge, condemn, or approve of doctrines or writings. . . It is, by your bishops and the priests, who are united with them, that you are to receive the teachings of the Holy See. . . . to be with the Pope you must not be in opposition to the bishops."

Mr. CANNON: Will the hon. gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. HOCKEN: No, not just now. The judgment against this book was that every person having a copy should destroy it and that any copies in the hands of the author should also be destroyed. Senator David said:

> When I wrote the little book I had no idea of the storm I was raising. I thought I was doing the clergy a service in speaking out the thoughts that I could not drive from my mind. After the last general election I noticed a growing feeling against clerical interference in politics, and simply gave it publication. They may condemn me; they may excommunicate me. I cannot help that, but I shall remain a Catholic—that is my religion, and they cannot take my faith from me.

This is the significant paragraph to which I am trying to lead up. He said:

> I thought when I wrote my book that, as a British subject, I had a perfect right to do so. If not, there is something wrong, for I feel that, as a French Canadian and a Catholic, I should have the same rights in politics as my English-speaking brethren.

A more lamentable confession by a public man has seldom been made than that he is not allowed to exercise his own judgment in writing a book criticising the political activities within his own province. If that does not prove my case that there is an ecclesiastical government in Quebec I do not know what more would be required. We do not want that in Ontario. We do not want the peculiar laws established by the church in Quebec. We do not want the tithing system. Down in the county of Prescott, although there are no such laws in this province, a county judge gave a judgment that the tithing laws of Quebec operated in the province of Ontario and he compelled a man to pay his tithe for the building of a church. That is introducing something into Ontario which we object to.

Mr. PROULX: I do not think that was the purport of the judgment. It was not

that the tithing system of Quebec was in force in Ontario but it was that when a man enjoys the services of a priest he ought to pay for them.

Mr. HOCKEN: If my hon. friend can see any distinction I would like to know it. If this man enjoyed the services of a priest he ought to pay for them but my point is that he should not be compelled by law to pay for them because there is no such law in Ontario and it is a law that we do not want in Ontario.

Mr. CANNON: Will the hon. gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. HOCKEN: No, not now.

Mr. CANNON: It is significant; the answer must be hard.

Mr. HOCKEN: It is so late that I would rather not be interrupted. There are many other things of that kind that I do not propose to go into but I want to explain why it is that we object to these things.

Now why should the French desire to engraft these laws on Ontario? It is to get control of that province. That may be a perfectly legitimate ambition; they have the right to do so if they can; but I submit that they have no right to condemn us for resisting such a policy when we do not believe in it. If the French Canadians desire that kind of Government in the province of Quebec well and good, let them have it; but they should keep it there and not try to drag it into the province of Ontario. How does it come, Mr. Speaker, if there is not a settled purpose by powerful and wealthy organizations to get control of Ontario—why is it they infiltrate into Northern Ontario and do not go into Northern Quebec? There is a lot of good land in the northern parts of Quebec, the people of that province could go and live under their own laws and under their own peculiar institutions. Nobody in the province of Ontario has ever suggested we should go down and interfere with their local autonomy. They can have any kind of government in Quebec that they desire, but we are not going to have it brought into the province of Ontario if we can prevent it. A prominent public man told me that he got on the Transcontinental train at Quebec, about a year ago, and it was occupied by a number of colonists and for a distance of many miles fresh colonists at intervals boarded the train. Not a single one of them detrained in the province of Quebec; they were all billed for the northern parts of Ontario. They go there to develop their own institutions and to overcome the institutions that we have established there at the present time. I repeat that the French Canadians have a perfect right to do that, they have a perfect right to go into the province of Ontario, but we have an equal right to fix the terms upon which they shall come. This policy to which I have reference is one that politicians are working out for their future aggrandizement and they are looking forward to the time when the peculiar institutions of their province will be spread over the province of Ontario.

Another matter to which reference was made in the circular in question was the war. We were aggrieved at the action of Quebec in the war, and it could not be otherwise. I am not going to rub it in, but I want to state our case. We were fighting for France as the ally of our Old Motherland, and we thought that surely the people who claim French descent, and had French blood in their veins, would do as much for their Mother country as we were doing for our Mother country. Especially, in our opinion, should that have been the case, when the very existence of France was at stake—

Mr. CANNON: What about England?

Mr. HOCKEN:—much more so than that of England. England had a navy that could resist invasion, but the very existence of France hung in the balance in that war. And we expected our French Canadian fellow citizens to join us at least in proportionately equal numbers to go to her defence. Now they did not do that, and it surely cannot surprise my hon. friend opposite—

Mr. CANNON: Not from you.

Mr. HOCKEN:—that in the province of Ontario, and in the city of Toronto, some resentment should be felt on that account. We had not, perhaps, so much right to respond to the call that was made from Europe as the men from the province of Quebec. I remember, Sir,—as I stated in this House once before—an old friend of mine, and a faithful follower of the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier as long as he lived, who used to come to my office and say that if there should be a war in which England and France would fight together that would be the thing that would unite Canada. We agreed that if such a thing should ever occur—

Mr. CANNON: Were you consulted?

Mr. HOCKEN:—that would certainly bring the two races in this country together; and if those who my hon. friends opposite represent had taken the part they should have taken there would have been in our province and in every other province, an open door to every ambition they had. Sir, in practically every home—certainly in every Orange home in Canada—there was the deepest anxiety and there were broken hearts over the boys who were fighting in the trenches, many of whom had laid down their lives in France and in Flanders. Go to the West and the records of the Institution that I, as an officer, represent, will show that in some cases practically every eligible member of the Institution in a particular section was off on the firing line. In the city of Toronto there were more Orangemen went overseas voluntarily out of approximately 30,000 members than there were out of the 1,800,000 French Canadians in the province of Quebec.

Mr. CANNON: Will my hon. friend let me ask him a question?

Mr. HOCKEN: Not just now.

Mr. CANNON: How about the Orangemen who armed themselves against England before the war.

Mr. HOCKEN: Mr. Speaker, I am discussing Canada.

Mr. CANNON: Discuss the Orangemen for a while, be honest.

Mr. HOCKEN: I am doing so. Let me say to my hon. friend that when the war did break out in no part of the British Empire did the men respond as cheerfully and as numerously as they did from the province of Ulster.

Mr. CANNON: Not any better than anywhere else.

Mr. HOCKEN: The Ulster Brigade, and the Ulster people had nothing to be ashamed of in the war. They went out and laid down their lives just as freely as the Canadians did, and they performed good work. Mr. Speaker, I ask you, and I ask this House, if it is any wonder that men who sent their members out, as this organization did—sent more out of one city than were sent by the French Canadians out of the whole province of Quebec, numbering probably 1,800,000 of that race—is it any wonder that there should be resentment on our part, and is it surprising that sometimes strong language was used in that connection?

[Mr. Cannon.]

Mr. CANNON: What about our part?

Mr. HOCKEN: There has been a good deal of talk about the insults that were levelled at Quebec but I do not want to go into that.

Mr. CANNON: You have been into that already. Do not worry about that.

Mr. HOCKEN: The course adopted by the members of this institution was exactly in line with their record ever since 1912. Every time rebellion has raised its head in this country, or invasion has been threatened, the men who belonged to this organization were the back-bone of the force that put it down.

Mr. CANNON: Edward Carson.

Mr. HOCKEN: In 1837 the rebellion in what is now the province of Ontario was put down by the members of this Institution; and they bore a large part in the fights in 1866 at Ridgeway and Fort Erie. Yes, and they went up to Fort Garry in 1870, and in doing so they committed a crime in the estimation of my hon. friends opposite. They took their part in the fight there, and they had to go up again in 1885 when the rebellion was revived. The members of this organization went out to South Africa by the thousand in the Boer war of 1900, and again in 1914 almost to a man went to the Front, the members of the Orange order who were eligible for such service. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that men who have served Canada in that way, men who have played a noble part in the terrible crisis that we have gone through deserve respect of the country and are entitled to credit for the patriotic services they have rendered.

Why is that, Sir? Because they are trained in loyalty to the British Empire. They have in the past resisted every attempt to dismember the Empire, and they will be true to their convictions in that regard as long as they exist.

My hon. friend will remember that in some places an Orangeman is spoken of as a bigot. Nothing could be further from the truth. Orangemen are the most tolerant body of men in the world. Civil and religious liberty is nowhere so universal as in those places in which this institution is strong. In no province and city of this Dominion are the people of the same faith as my hon. friends opposite given more freedom than in the province of Ontario and in the city of Toronto. Why, Mr. Speaker, the people of Toronto contributed $260,000 to carry on the work of the Knights of

Columbus— an organization composed entirely of men of the opposite faith, and I suppose three-quarters of that sum came from the pockets of Protestants. Is that intolerance, is that bigotry? And yet such is typical of the organization.

Do hon. gentlemen forget that the Orange organization has invariably stood for its principles and convictions regardless of the personnel of our Governments? In the days of Macdonald and Cartier the Orangemen of Ontario were supporting them. Why? Because, Mr. Speaker, Macdonald and Cartier had a policy that was approved by the members of that institution—a policy for the building up of this country as a part of the British Empire, and they supported those two leaders as faithfully as did any of their fellow Canadians.

They did more than that, Sir. When Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the late leader of the party across the floor first became Prime Minister he had no stronger supporters in the province of Ontario than the members of this institution. In the City of Toronto, his opponent, the late Sir Charles Tupper, was not allowed to speak. The men who prevented him from speaking were members of the institution which I am trying to defend here to-night, and they worked energetically for the return of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the party that he represented. They did that, Sir, because his party expressed their convictions, and they have done that in every instance from the time the institution was founded ninety years ago to the present day.

I venture to say that had it not been for the members of this institution in the City of Montreal, my right hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) would not have been elected. They did not do that, Mr. Speaker, in any hope of reward, they knew they had nothing to expect from the Minister of Justice, but he stood for the things in which they believed. And I submit to this House, Mr. Speaker, that there is nothing finer in a citizen than that he shall stand for convictions that he honestly holds. If he does that he is a man to be admired; if he does not, he is not a good citizen.

My hon. friends opposite may think that the Orange order is a Conservative organization.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. HOCKEN: Well, what about their supporting the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier; what about their defeating Sir Rodman Roblin in Manitoba if the order is a Conservative organization? Orangemen went solidly against Sir Rodman Roblin, and he admitted from the windows of his newspaper office, the night of his defeat that his overthrow was brought about by the desertion of his old-time Orange friends. I state that, Mr. Speaker, to emphasize the fact that these men stand for their convictions as good citizens ought to.

I could go on, Mr. Speaker, if I so desired and make some reference to another organization—the Knights of Columbus—an organization of just the same kind as the Orange Order.

Mr. BUREAU: Why don't they fuse?

Mr. HOCKEN: They are both patriotic and religious; their only difference is in their religious faith. I have here the Congressional Record, and I find in it the oath taken by the Knights of Columbus of the third degree. I have the right, I presume, Mr. Speaker, to put this upon Hansard, but I am not going to do so.

An hon. MEMBER: How fickle.

Mr. HOCKEN: I will tell you why. My friends in the Knights of Columbus deny the accuracy of this oath. I am not able to prove that it is correct, and as it is not my practice to use anything here or elsewhere unless I can substantiate it, I am going to try to convince my hon. friends that I desire to be fair with them and with all they represent.

Mr. Speaker, the Orange Order is a bulwark of the constitution—a powerful force for orderly government and evenhanded justice. The late Mr. Justice McMahon, himself a member of the same religious faith as my friends opposite, had an opportunity during the course of a trial presided over by him to have all the ritual and obligations of the order put before him, and he gave it as his unbiased opinion that any institution founded upon the principles therein stated was one that ought to be supported, and one that must be a benefit to the community.

In closing, Sir, I just want to say that if the Roman Catholic church will cease to be a political institution—will surrender its claims to temporal power and confine its activities to spiritual things, there will be no need for the Orange Order. But until that time comes the order will exist and will grow in strength and power, because we do not believe in the union of temporal power with spiritual domination, and as long as the Vatican maintains that it has the right to rule the world, and in the final analysis to be the sole judge, it must get resistance from Protestants and from members of the Orange Order.

There are just one or two reasons why the Order should continue to exist, Mr. Speaker,

but I will only give you one reason. It is because there are such men in public life as the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy).

Mr. CANNON: And yourself.

Mr. HOCKEN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Russell, while Secretary of State, filled the Printing Bureau with so many men of his own faith that they were bulging out of the windows. At the time that the investigation was made into the conditions prevailing at the Bureau, there were on the staff four hundred more men than were needed for the carrying on of the service rendered by that Department. As long as we have men in public places who will favour one class as against other classes, we must expect resentment and resistence.

The member for Russell has done more than any one in Ottawa to build up this institution in which he does not believe. He made some reference to the Sentinel. Well, the Sentinel speaks for itself. It appears regularly every week: it is increasing in influence and in circulation. One of its subscribers and readers, and one who, I hope; profited by it a good deal, was the late Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier. It is read in almost every episcopal palace in Canada, and in view of the fact that it has such readers there would appear to be sufficient ground for my hope that before long I shall have as subscribers the member for Russell (Mr. Murphy) and all my hon. friends from the Province of Quebec.

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Verchères): Mr. Speaker, at this late hour I will not occupy much of the time of the House—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: —but I can assure my hon. cheering friends that I will take the necessary time. I shall not repeat the arguments that were put forward by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) and the others who spoke in support of the amendment to the motion for an Address in reply to the speech from the Throne.

Before making my argument, which will be an historical argument in favour of the early dissolution of Parliament, I wish to join the other members who have offered their felicitations to the mover (Mr. Cronyn) and to the seconder (Mr. McGregor) of the Address. But at the same time, Mr. Speaker, I must again this year protest against the seconder of the Address being an English-speaking rather than a French-speaking gentleman. As to the other speeches made by hon. members on your right, may I be permitted to mention just a few typical remarks?

The hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat) made a very frank and honest remark—the most honest, I believe, he ever made in this House—when he said that the reason why he did not go back to the Liberal fold when the war was over was because there was no coal in the bin and the larder was empty. That remark was quite superfluous; we knew all along that his reason for not coming back to the Liberal party was a "stomachal" one.

A somewhat similar typical remark, I observed, came from the member for Yukon (Mr. A. Thompson), who stated emphatically that he did not want an election. Sir, some people have an uncouth way of making their sores and their fears conspicuous.

The other two typical remarks to which I wish to direct attention were made by the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Meighen), and may be found on page 161 of Unrevised Hansard. The member for Marquette (Hon. Mr. Crerar) had stated that he would give the votes to aliens and make them fight. The Minister of the Interior made reference to this assertion, and the member for Marquette said, page 161:

> It was the judgment of the military authorities of the United States. They enrolled these men and the casualty lists, when they came back to the United States, contained many foreign names.

The Minister of the Interior replied in this way:

> I am informed on authority of the highest character that the military men of the United States did not allow them in the front line. But, I would prefer to take my example, even in matters of the late war, from the British Empire, rather than from the United States.

Very good; but not a week, a day, or an hour afterwards, but something like two minutes afterwards, the Minister of the Interior took his example, not from the British Empire, but from the United States. On the same page he is reported as follows:

> The principle that the hon. gentleman attacks, right or wrong, has been more the subject of debate and has been more thoroughly reviewed on this continent than any other principle ever presented to a free people for one hundred and twenty-five years. Its first sponsor on the American continent was the father of the American Republic, George Washington. Was he the friend and ally of special privilege and the enemy of the common people? The second statute that he placed on the statute books of the United States, after it became a nation, was a statute embodying in very pronounced form the principle that the hon. gentleman

impugns. Its next prominent sponsor (indeed very, very few opposed it), was the founder of the other great political party in the country, Thomas Jefferson. Coming nearer to our own time, the man who laid the foundations of the present tariff policy of the United States in general form was the man who emancipated the slaves in the United States, Abraham Lincoln. Abraham Lincoln was an adherent throughout his life to the principle that the hon. gentleman attacks. Was he either the servant or the ally of special privilege? Was he the enemy of the common people of his country? Can such an allegation be levelled at Theodore Roosevelt, whose principles were just the same?

Well, Sir, is this in accordance with the minister's previous assertion that he would prefer to take his example from the British Empire? Not quite; but the reason is very clear to me. In the one case it suited his argument to cite England as an example; in the other case to cite England as an example would have destroyed his argument. So that the minister displayed his ultra-loyalism when it would be effective, but hid it very carefully away when it might have been harmful to his argument, showing the suppleness of which he is a past master.

The hon. minister also referred to his "successful" trip to New Brunswick and to the "successful" part he took in the Victoria and Carleton election. I will not chide him on the success of his trip, but I cannot let the incident pass without bringing to the attention of the House the fact that the candidate whom he, with the Postmaster General, Hon. Mr. Blondin, and the Minister of Labour, Hon. Mr. Robertson, supported, was the notorious Colonel Melville, who organized wholesale perjury during the last election at St. Johns barracks, and who tampered with the franchise in an effort to defeat the will of the electors of Chambly and Verchères. I have nothing to add, Sir, but simply to cite the French dicton: "Dis-moi qui tu hantes, je te dirai qui tu es."

I wish also to reply briefly to the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken):

I am informed that at the first sitting of this House in the month of March, 1918, when the hon. member did not protest in the House against the nomination of the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Boivin) as Deputy Speaker, he was censured by his lodge. It is evidently for fear of being chastised again that he has tried vainly for half an hour to-night to answer the grave and irrefutable charges brought forward by the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy). His answers are in the same spirit as the articles written in the Orange Sentinel.

My hon. friend read a letter purporting to be from a French Canadian, an anonymous letter, published evidently in his paper to enlarge its circulation, as all letters published in that paper are. I should not say that all the letters are anonymous, because I find a letter signed very courageously by a gentleman who does not give his proper name, but signs himself "a Royal Purple Marksman." My hon. friend stated also that he never raised any race cry in this House and claimed that he was a most tolerant man. He reminds me of the ancient dragon with two heads, one blowing cold and the other blowing hot. He very seldom raises a race cry in this House, that is true but he edits a race cry in his rag. I take the edition of the 11th of March, the last number, on the front page of which there are twelve articles, every one of which, with one exception, is a race cry. The first article is entitled, "Our Point of View" and it is an attack on the French people of Ontario in regard to the school question. The second article is entitled: "Rome, the Bible and the Public School." The third article is entitled, "Possibilities in the New Plan for Ireland," an attack on the Catholics of Ireland. The fourth article is entitled, "The Pope and the Turk"; other articles are entitled respectively, "A Clerical Grafter", "The Vatican Mission", "Irish Land Purchase", and "Evading the Facts",—the last being an attack upon Toronto Saturday Night for defending the Irish Catholics of Ireland. I fail to understand why my hon. friend states that he is very moderate, and that he is not taking his full share in spreading racial prejudice in this country.

My hon. friend also stated that he had a great fear of the immigration of the French-Canadians into Ontario. He did not state the ground for his fear; he will not state it, but he knows it. The reason is one that was given to-night by the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe), namely, that the increase of our population is by nature and not by artificial processes. The fear of my hon. friend is that the love that the French-Canadians have for cradles and children might interfere with the love that my hon. friend's brothers have for kennels and Pomeranians. My hon. friend also stated, in order to show that his brothers are broad-minded, that the Orangemen elected the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty)—and I am sorry that the Minister of Justice has left his seat—in St. Anne's. I will give the House an example

of the love the hon. member for Toronto West (Mr. Hocken) has for the Minister of Justice. This is a letter published in the Orange Sentinel of January 29, page 3:

The House Leadership.

Sir,

I am sorry to read that C. J. Doherty will be House leader during the coming session. That news would be more in its place under a heading like this: "Just one more slap in the face for Protestants". Is there no other man in the Union party capable of taking Borden's place? I lost my two nearest neighbours by supporting Union Government when they went into power. I would do it again under the same circumstances, but under no condition could I support that party now. Who is running the country, Borden, Doherty, or the Pope? Could we expect much less from either of the latter two? Why does Borden still bend under pressure from Quebec after the rest of Canada told him at the last election that he could run Canada without the French? What did he do under conscription any more than drain the protestant farms of the last of its manhood? I do not think he will be proud of the fact or results at the next election. Remember—

And this is probably the reason why the hon. member does not want an election.

Remember, I am not sore over having to part with a son, as I did not have any, and was physically unfit myself.

This Orange brother evidently made a tremendous sacrifice for his country. To continue:

But I sympathize with those that had sons. All this while the French looked on or hid in the timber. Why were they pardoned? Was it to cheer up the boys who fought, bled and in many instances died for them? I can't agree with you in having any further use for R. L. Borden. Give us a Leader who can stand alone, not one that looks for a prop from the French. Surely there are such men among Protestants who could fill Borden's place. Kindly enlighten me if I am on the wrong track, although all I have ever done to merit the granting of this favour, is paid my subscription (none too prompt at times) and read the paper regularly and found much information of great importance and help. Keep up the good work according to your views. Raise the price if necessary, for I am sure no person could reasonably complain, even if we can't always see the same as you. Though not an Orangeman I fully agree with the principles.

David J. Jones.

The hon. member is responsible for everything published in his newspaper, responsible, perhaps, to Jones too, but he did not answer this letter. Let me now come to the amendment.

One reason why I rose to-night in support of the amendment of the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) was to give the House an historical argument regarding the early dissolution of Parliament. History is a subject which is very useful to men who study political questions. My second reason is that, being a descendant of one of the first settlers of Montreal, I am very fond and proud of Canada, and I deplore the fact that some people in this country are under the impression that the history of Canada started in 1867. Some even think it started only when the Western provinces came into Confederation. I never felt so miserable as one day last year when an hon. member asked me, "Who was that man Cartier whose centenary they are celebrating in Montreal?" The period which I wish to bring to the attention of the House is from the year 1841 to 1847, covering the passing of the Act of Union of 1840 and the elections following the passing of that Act.

For a thorough understanding of the underlying currents existing before 1841 it is necessary to describe briefly the turmoil into which Canada was plunged from 1760 to 1840 by the autocratic rule, not of England, but of its governors and their entourage. In Upper Canada the autocratic creed was represented by the Family Compact, composed of men who kept for themselves all the high and remunerative positions, as well as the wealth of the country in the granting of lands and who were bitter opponents of the reformers who were preaching and figthing for responsible government. Those who wanted to protest were ostracized. Robert Gourlay was arrested in 1818 for preparing a petition to the Mother Country, and, although acquitted, and although a thorough Scotchman, he was deported by the Government of that time. William Lyon Mackenzie because he had stated that "the powers claimed by the Tory executive were nearly as arbitrary as the iron rule of the Czar of Muscovy," was charged with a breach of the privileges of the House and expelled from Parliament. Five times he was re-elected by the electors of York, and five times he was forcibly prevented from taking his seat, the autocrats of that time ruling that "they could not prevent the electors from electing whom they please." Evidently they were not aware of the refinements of the War-time Elections Act, "but that they could by a mere resolution pass judgment on the eligibility of the persons elected to sit and vote." Colborne and Sir Francis Bond Head, enslaved by the elements who mistrusted the people, refused to apply the principles of responsible government, and the dissatisfaction of the masses came to a head in 1837 with the result that we all know. It brought the

1 a.m

Rebellion, which was crushed with unnecessary severity.

In Lower Canada the same elements were playing the same havoc with the liberties of the people. Here a population of 65,000 people were left without their leaders who, after the cession of 1760, and especially after the Treaty of Paris on February 10, 1763, went back to France, and the people were left at the mercy of greedy speculators and profiteers who were granted the lands, and who dominated and ground down the people with the complicity of the governors. In 1774, the Quebec Act, which was framed by England to redress some of the grievances of the Canadians, was jeopardized in its effects by the rapacity of the same element. The Act of 1791, framed by Pitt, created a Legislative Council and, for the first time, an elective House. But that was again nullified by the despotism of Craig and his Tory favourites who controlled the Council, and a bitter fight ensued. The war of 1812 with the United States stopped politics for a while and again, as in 1775, the French Canadians fought the Americans and saved the colony for the British Crown. The victory of de Salaberry at Chateauguay was the most conspicuous fait d'armes of the whole war. But Toryism was only sleeping, and reforms necessary to the existence of responsible government, such as no taxation without representation, the independence of the judges, the control of subsidies, the exclusion of public employees from both Houses, the reform of the Legislative Council, the responsibility of the government members to the Legislative Council, were all refused. At last, the famous Ninty-two Resolutions were formulated, embodying all these revendications, but were unfortunately rejected and, as in Upper Canada, the only logical sequence followed, the rebellion of 1837-38, with all its immediate unfortunate results. I said "immediate" unfortunate results purposely because, although one might judge severely the actual occasion of the uprising both in Upper and Lower Canada and condemn some deeds of the patriots, no one will deny now that responsible government and the political liberties we have enjoyed since 1848 are due in great part, if not altogether, to the patriotism and courage of William Lyon Mackenzie and Louis Joseph Papineau. Be that as it may, these simultaneous upheavals opened the eyes of Great Britain, and Lord Durham was sent to Canada with full powers to investigate and report respecting a form of government for the provinces. His report contained a detailed statement of the causes of the rebellion, recommended the introduction of responsible government and the union of Canada under a single government. He stated in that report that the two provinces were to be consolidated with the definite purpose of submerging the French Canadian nationality and this was so true that in the enlightened province of Ontario to which my hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Hocken) has referred, there is a school book on the history of Canada which is read probably by every pupil in the schools. It is written by W. L. Grant and at page 208 I find the following:

> What remedies did Durham propose for the evils which we have described?
>
> 1. Extinction of the French nationality.—The first was that the French Canadian language and customs must be extinguished by being ringed round with a circle of English speaking majorities.
>
> 2. The two provinces must be united in order to swamp the French.

In the report of Lord Durham itself there is the following:

> I recommend that the alteration of the character of the province ought to be immediately entered upon, and firmly, though cautiously followed up; that, in every plan which may be adopted for the future management of Lower Canada, the first object ought to be that of making it an English province; and that, with this end in view, the ascendency would never again be placed in any hands but those of an English population as means of anglicizing French Canada. I advocate the gradual substiution of the English for the French language. I have little doubt that the Frenchmen, when once placed by the legitimate course of events and the working of natural causes in a minority, would abandon their vain hopes of nationality.

The French Canadians took advantage of that doubt. The same school which in 1840 wanted to deprive a large part of the French Canadian population of their constitutional rights still exists as we can see from speeches, such as that which was made by the hon. gentleman who preceded me, in the year of our Lord 1920. Let me remind these gentlemen that like the soul of France, the soul of French Canada is immortal and like all just causes the stronger the attacks upon her the stronger will remain her surviving vitality. Lord Durham failed to realize, as my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) fails to realize, the permanence and virtue of our nationalism. He returned to England and Poulett Thomson, who later became Lord Sydenham, replaced him as governor. He was entrusted with the duty of having the Act of Union ratified by the Canadians. It had passed the British Parliament but

to become law it had to be ratified. He at once convened the local council in Lower Canada with which Lord Durham had replaced the Assembly. It was not elected but although not representative it insisted upon three sine qua non conditions before entering the Union. The first condition was adequate and proportionate representation for the two provinces; the second condition was that united Canada was to assume, not the whole debt of the two Canadas, but only that part of the debt of Upper Canada which had been incurred for works which had been beneficial to both provinces, and the third condition was that both languages would be official. Lord Sydenham then went to Upper Canada and the Government of this province only consented to the Act of Union on the condition of equal but not proportionate representation, that the whole debt of the two Canadas would be assumed by the United Canada and that the French language would be abolished. This arrangement was absolutely against the conditions laid down by Lower Canada. The French Canadians, assisted by the broadminded English speaking citizens of Lower Canada, at the time protested and an address containing 40,000 names was sent to the Imperial authorities. But Lord Sydenham sent a false report to England stating that the two provinces had ratified the Union. Although the Act of Union was opposed in the House of Lords by Lord Melbourne, the Duke of Wellington and Lord Ellenborough, as well as by Lord Brougham, the Count of Hardwicke and Lord Gosford, it was finally voted. It is very interesting to read what these most eminent and fair English statesmen said on the subject. Lord Ellenborough said:

> It is the most fraudulous and unjust measure ever presented to Parliament; the Act will not attain the ends in view of its promoters because, what is its real practical object? It is not to give liberal institutions to Lower Canadians, but to disfranchise the French population. You are placing the great mass of people of Lower Canada under the absolute domination of Upper Canadians, and a small minority of Lower Canada. You are punishing by disfranchisement a whole population for the fault of a small portion of that population accomplished two years ago. If you wish to deprive the French Canadians of a representative Government, it would be far better to do it frankly and openly than to try to establish a permanent system of Government on a basis that the whole world will qualify as an electoral fraud.

Lord Gosford, Ex-Governor of Canada, said this:

> I cannot fail to entertain the view that the Act of Union is one most unjust and tyrannical, depriving the Lower Province of its Constitution, and delivering it into the hands of those, who without any cause, have shown so much hatred towards her; because this Act will drown the Lower Province. You are giving to 300,000 or 400,000 souls the same representation as Lower Canada with 700,000 souls. Then you are imposing the debt of over 5 millions of the Upper Province on a province that practically has no debt. I must declare again that the origin of this Act is a financial intrigue. I maintain that the great majority of both Canadas is opposed to this Act. I cannot consent to an Act based on injustice.

But, Sir, these protestations were of no avail. As mentioned in Lord Gosford's speech, financial interests in London—I nearly said the financial ring of Toronto—wanted the Act passed. The six millions debt of Upper Canada was owed to Baring and Company bankers of London, and one of the associates of this banking house was the Finance Minister of the Government. (He had the Royal National Trust.) The Act was sanctioned on the 23rd of July, 1840. It established a Legislative Council of 20 and a Legislative Assembly of 84—42—for each province. Parliament was elected for four years. The English language was the only official language. It changed the division of the counties, fixing new electoral divisions, and gave the executive only, the initiative of money grants. This Act, Sir, I repeat again was most unjust to Lower Canada. The equal representation was unjust, part of the French population was disfranchised by new electoral divisions giving two-thirds of the representation to the English population because populous French counties were united, while English counties, less populated, kept their limits, and a member was allowed to small cities of few thousands. As an example of inequality of representation let me cite some figures. The city of Kingston with a population of 6,292 had one member, and the county of Huntingdon in the Province of Quebec with a population of 36,204 had one member. The town of Cornwall with a population of 1,407 had one member, and the county of Dorchester with a population of 34,817 had only one member. The town of Niagara with 2,287, the town of London with 2,078, and town of Ottawa with 3,000 had one member; and the counties of Dorchester, Two Mountains and Beauharnois with respectively 34,817, 26,835 and 28,746 had one representative. As you can see, Sir, five towns with a population of 15,064 had the same number of representatives as five counties with a population of 153,461.

Two other clauses, unjust to both provinces, were the one giving the Executive

only, the initiative in money votes, and the one imposing a Civil List of £75,000 without the control of Government. On the 5th February, Lord Sydenham proclaimed the Union Act and called the hon. W. H. Draper, of Upper Canada, the Chief of the Tories of the time, to organize a Union Government. They tried to bribe Sir Louis H. Lafontaine the Liberal leader, to join the Government, but he refused stating that he did not understand responsible Government as they did, and that he could not endorse the policy of Union which had not been approved by the people of Canada. The Cabinet was finally formed and it included five members from Upper Canada—Draper, Sullivan, J. H. Dunn, Harrison and Baldwin, who resigned as soon as he saw where he was; and three from Lower Canada, Ogden, Daly and Day.

The writs were issued on the 19th of February, Lafontaine, Morin and Neilson in Lower Canada, and Baldwin, Price and Hincks in Upper Canada joined hands and organized against a Union Government.

The speech of Lafontaine is a remarkable piece of oratory. His opposition to the Act of Union is condensed in the following words:

> Another question of no less importance is the Act of Union of the two Provinces. It is an act of injustice and despotism because it was imposed on us without our consent; because it deprives Lower Canada of her legitimate representation, because is deprives us of the use of our language in the Legislative proceedings, notwithstanding the Treaties and the word of the Governor, because it forces us to pay without our consent a debt which we have not contracted, because it allows the executive to take possession illegally, under the name of the Civil List, without the vote of the representatives of the people, of an enormous part of the revenues of the country.

Lafontaine exchanged views with Baldwin and Hincks and they united their efforts. The Government would have been overwhelmingly defeated if it had not resorted with the aid of the Governor to the most unconstitutional and shameful practices. The Governor had introduced in the Union Act a clause which allowed him to change the limits of the cities fixed by the old laws. He and Draper made use of this clause for the disfranchisement of the electors in many ridings. By a proclamation the greater part of the population in Montreal and Quebec were deprived of their votes. Here is their excuse. Writing to Lord Russell in March 1841, Sydenham said:

> There were attached to the cities both of Montreal and Quebec, very extensive suburbs inhabited generally by a poor population unconnected with the mercantile interests to which these cities owed their importance. Had these suburbs been left within the electoral limits, the number of their population would have enabled them to return one, if not both, of the Members of each city. I was compelled in fixing the limits of Quebec and Montreal, to transfer to the county a large portion of the suburbs of each.

Professor Morrison of Queens University referring to this action of the Governor says:

> The actual result of his action was to secure for his party four seats in the very heart of the enemy's country and the French Canadians, naturally embittered, resented the Governor's action, which had practically disfranchised many French votes.

In the county ridings, the Governor, in order to favour Government candidates, fixed the polls at the extreme limits, far from the centres. In the county of Terrebonne, for instance, the polling station was fixed at New Glasgow, which was in the wilds at that time, it taking two days to make the trip from Montreal; and when Lafontaine and some of his electors arrived at the poll they were received by a mob armed with pistols and sticks, and paid by the Government of the time to win the election.

Mr. BUREAU: A regular war-time election!

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Then the Government added to this, most shameless corruption and patronage, and resorted to violence not only in Terrebonne but in other counties, and serious riots occurred in Upper Canada as well as in Lower Canada. Amongst the nineteen Unionists elected in Lower Canada, six were elected through violence in the counties of Beauharnois, Vaudreuil, Rouville, Montreal county, Chambly and Terrebonne; three through the disfranchisement of the suburbs, and seven were public employees. Robert Baldwin, who had been elected for York and Hastings, gave one of his seats to Lafontaine, a courtesy significant of the broadmindedness of the great Reformer, which was returned in 1843, when Baldwin was defeated in Hastings but was offered and accepted the seat of Rimouski in the province of Quebec.

Sir, I shall not try to describe to you the administration of the Tory regime which remained in power until 1848, with the exception of the short recess in 1843, but it was the most autocratic regime that ever ruled in Canada until the advent of the Union Government in 1917. The Government of that day was always on the verge of collapse, but kept its supporters in line by promises of positions. Enormous sums

of money were voted for the public works of Upper Canada, while practically nothing was voted for those of Lower Canada. The same favouritism displayed itself in the distribution of Government jobs—a minister by the name of Viger, defeated in two counties, nevertheless retaining his portfolio. The Prime Minister tried to bribe prominent Liberals, such as Caron, by offering them seats in the Cabinet. The servile majority of the Government presented a seat to a gentleman by the name of Robinson, although illegally elected according to a report of a Committee of the House. Orders in Council replaced Parliamentary legislation—in a word, it was the clear rule of those who had not the confidence of, and who had no confidence in, the people.

Then the reaction which inflexibly follows the spirit of autocracy brought forth came to a head, sweeping and complete. Lord Elgin realizing that the Government was not representative, after the resignation of Sir Henry Draper on account of ill-health, and a year of misrule by Sherwood and Daly, dissolved the House and issued the writs, and on the 5th December, 1847, an election was held, with the result that Baldwin and Lafontaine came to power and gave to Canada an Administration which was called by all historians the Great Administration of Canada. Lafontaine and Baldwin, the Liberal of Lower Canada and the Reformer of Upper Canada, the true conquerors and defenders of responsible Government, had a clear vision that in order to make this country great and prosperous the paramount essentials were a thorough understanding, mutual concessions, equality of privileges, a fair compromise and a substantial unity between the two races.

I said at the beginning of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, that history always repeats itself. The elections of 1917 and the administration of public affairs since then is a repetition of the elections of 1841 and the regime that followed until Lord Elgin dissolved the House. Allow me to sum up. The Act of Union of 1840 and the Military Service Act of 1917 were both engendered by the Tory spirit and directed against French-Canadians in order to win the elections by stirring up the English-speaking population against their fellow-citizens. Both Acts were adopted without consulting the people, both Acts were pressed, one by the financial interests of London, the other by the financial ring of Toronto, so well described by my hon. friend the Minister of Immigration. In both cases a Union Government was formed.

Sir Henry Draper tried to induce the liberal chieftain, Sir L. H. Lafontaine to join them, Sir Robert Borden tried to induce Sir Wilfrid Laurier to enter his Cabinet, but both refused for the same reason—their respect for the liberty of the people.

Realizing that their policy is unpopular and that they will be defeated at the polls, the Government of 1917, like the Administration of 1841, determined first of all to win the elections, have no scruples in tampering with the franchise and resorting to shameless patronage and corruption and using the race cry to the limit. In 1841 it was the fixation of the polls at the extreme limits of the counties like in Terrebonne, the skilful and deliberate disfranchisement of the suburbs of the big cities, the unjust gerrymander of the counties, and violence and intimidation. In 1917 there was also some fixing of the polls and a scarcity of ballots, as in Edmonton, for instance, a skilful and more modern placing of votes by codified telegrams and otherwise, the disfranchisement of thousands of electors by the War-time Elections Act, a complete loss of memory when the oath of residence was required, the bribing of conscience by bribes as valuable as lieutenant-governorships, and a few expensive advertisements in the newspapers.

Later on the Draper Administration allowed Viger, who had been defeated in two counties, to keep his portfolio; the present Administration has been equally generous to the Postmaster General. A gentleman by the name of Robinson illegally received a seat from the Draper Government after his election had been declared illegal by a Committee of the House; an analogous privilege is granted in 1918 to the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Thompson). The Government of that period has only one son of Erin in his Cabinet; his name is Dominick Daly, and Professor Morrison calls him the perpetual secretary, faithful among the faithless and faithful because of his lack of political feeling, combined with the need of a salary; for fear of being discourteous or unparliamentary I will not express my opinion about the position of a Minister of the Crown who draws an emolument on account of his physical debility and feebleness.

Mr. DOHERTY: I am sure that the hon. gentleman would not knowingly state an untruth. In so far as he states that a Minister of the Crown is drawing an emolument on account of his debility and feebleness, he is stating that which is not

true. I do not say that he knew it was not true, but he should know it now.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: According to the rules of the House I have to accept my hon. friend's statement, but everybody knows that there is a Minister of the Crown who draws a pension as an ex-judge of the Province of Quebec. I may be mistaken, but if I am well informed a pension is given only to a servant of the public who is not in a position to retain his office on account of illness, debility or feebleness.

Mr. DOHERTY: The hon. gentleman will permit me? If he will read the statute he will see that a judge who has served fifteen years is as matter of right entitled to his pension, without regard to his state of health. I may add for the hon. gentleman's information that his late leader the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who was Prime Minister when the pension he speaks of was granted, fully and openly and frankly admitted that to be the fact.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: However; the Draper Government is the most anti-democratic and nefarious Government of that period. It has not the confidence of the people; it completely ignores Lower Canada so far as public works and positions are concerned, but keeps its partisans in line by promises and fear.

Are the terms "nefarious" and "anti-democratic" strong enough for the present Government, which also is not representative of the people; which ignores the rights of the Province of Quebec in the matter of public works and positions, as is clearly shown by the appointment of James Murdock to the Board of Commerce, Hon. Lorne Webster to the Senate, Sir William Hearst to the International Waterways Commission, and which holds its partisans in line by promises, as the warm refuge of the Railway Commission can easily prove?

Finally Draper resigns on account of ill-health. There is a fight for his succession. Sherwood and Daly succeed in winning, but their existence is short. Lord Elgin, realizing that the Government has no longer the confidence of the people, dissolves the House; Lafontaine and Baldwin, representing Liberal principles in their broadest sense, assume the reigns of Government.

With the persistent rumour that the Prime Minister will have to resign on account of ill-health comes also the rumour of a merry battle for his succession. Who will be the modern Daly and Sherwood? Will it be the best-dressed gentleman of the House, the âme damnée of the financial ring of Toronto? Will it be the ever smiling and debutant Minister of Finance? Will it be the mysterious and silent ex-Liberal who enjoys a trip to Quebec or to New York once in a while? Will it be the High Executioner from the West, the hon. gentleman with telegraphic proclivities? Or last, will it be the unctuous sin-hound of Canada, the nursing sister of the League of Nations? I could not tell you, Mr. Speaker; I am not in the lap of the Gods. Will the amendment carry? Or, if it does not, as a similar amendment did not carry in 1847, will His Excellency the Governor General, following the footsteps of his predecessor, dissolve the House? I do not know. But I do know that the period of Government based on the mistrust of the people is due for a solid tumble; that the hour is pregnant with the reaction that inflexibly follows such periods, and that an opportunity will soon arise for the people of Canada to put again into practice the democratic and harmonious principles inspired by our departed leader, whose living spirit is still the undimmed guiding star of Canadian ideals.

Mr. JOHN A. MAHARG (Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, I am not so sure that what I have to say will be altogether as entertaining or will stir up quite as much discussion as some of the speeches to which we have listened this afternoon. But it may stir up the minds of some of those who are responsible for the fiscal policy of our country—I assure you that it will not stir up any racial or religious animosity.

I did not intend to take any part in this debate, but in view of remarks made by one or two of the ministers and also by one or two of the members on the other side, I decided that I would make a brief contribution to the discussion.

The Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Meighen), during the course of his address, saw fit at least to attempt to cast a discredit on the new movement which has been named for the time being by the member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark) the "National Progressive Party." The Minister endeavoured to the best of his ability to show that this was purely a class movement. He gave no attention whatever to the platform laid down by those who are responsible for the movement, claiming that the fact that it was inspired by the agriculturists proved, regardless of everything else, that it was a class movement. I was reminded of the words of one of our coloured porters addressed to a passenger who was insistent upon standing upon the platform of the railway coach.

He informed this gentleman that that platform was placed there to get in on and not to stand on. That is obviously the reason why the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) did not dwell at any length nor place much significance on our platform, as apparently platforms in the past have been used to get in on and not to stand on after the election was over. I can quite understand the minister's attitude and pardon him for entirely ignoring our platform.

I should like to direct the attention of the House to some of the remarks of the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White). The fact that the appearance of the ex-minister in this House has been somewhat spasmodic since he retired from a position in the Government seems rather strange to me, and possibly it may strike other hon. members similarly. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) and the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark) had stirred things up somewhat, and evidently an S.O.S. call was sent out and the ex-minister appeared on the scene very promptly. During his remarks he also endeavoured to make this appear as a class movement. In this respect, I am afraid he was not very successful, as some of his ideas advanced later on in regard to the future formation of parties somewhat lessened the force of his argument that the new movement was a class movement. I may touch on that matter a little later on. Possibly the most significant thing was the thought that was aroused in the minds of some as to just who was speaking while the ex-minister was addressing the House. You speak of class legislation, Sir, but I make the assertion that class representation was never more clearly placed before the House than by the ex-Minister of Finance yesterday.

Mr. GLASS: Explain.

Mr. MAHARG: Who spoke through the ex-Minister of Finance? Who spoke through the same gentleman in the year 1911, although he was not then a minister of the Crown? And what were the results? My answer to those questions is that the big interests of Canada spoke in this House at the time the ex-Minister of Finance was speaking. I am delighted that the hon. gentleman saw fit to come all this distance and give us one of his periodical visits and also give us a little bit of advertising. We have no objections to that whatever. The more advertising we get, the better we like it; we have nothing whatever to hide, and the more they advertise us, the better satisfied we shall be.

What was the result after the 1911 election? I said that the Big Interests spoke at that time. In what condition did we find the country during the year 1913 and the early part of 1914? I do not wish to dwell on that as the subject is not a pleasant one; but we all have a very vivid recollection of conditions in the country at that time. And what would the result have been had not war broken out and made a change in conditions, a change that the fiscal policy of Canada could not make and, if continued, will not make in the future? The war is over now, and I hope we are not going back into the same old rut, although it is quite evident from the speech of the ex-Minister of Finance that that is where he intends we shall go. The hon. gentleman said some very significant things, things that at least give us food for thought; and if I might judge from the expression on the faces of some hon. gentlemen very close to the Government on the other side, they were not entirely enamoured of some of his statements. I wonder if any particular S.O.S. call was sent out from this House. I wonder if those generally supposed to be on the lookout for things that will benefit the particular party that they support were very anxious for the speech of the hon. gentleman. I venture to assert that it was not the astute politician refered to by way of telegrams a few minutes ago by the last speaker, nor the more astute politician who now occupies the position of Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) who sent out the S.O.S. call. Possibly they may have, but I am very doubtful. The hon. gentleman (Sir Thomas White) came, however; he delivered his message, and we are grateful to him for doing so.

The more light that is thrown on the new movement the better we like it; and my request to them is that they will oil up the dynamoes at once, keep them well oiled, increase their voltage to the very limit of possibility, and then turn on the searchlight. Turn it on if you will in such a way that the labourer may get a view of what is in our platform. Turn it on also that the labourer's wife, when she goes to make her purchases, may see what is contained in our platform. Turn it on in such a way, if I might just mention one or two articles, that she may be able to discover what is taking place, that she may see that the apples that she purchases for her kiddies are taxed very heavily, and that the grape fruit, a more expensive luxury which does not very often visit her table, is on the free list. Turn the searchlight on the silks

that enter our country and let her see the duty that is paid on them, and at the same time turn it on to the cotton goods so much required by the average person in Canada, so that she may see that the duty on that is almost double the duty on silk. You might go a little further and turn it on the boot and shoe business, also the hides which are the raw material which go into the manufacture of these boots and shoes. Let the facts appear in contrast with the statement made by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Peter McGibbon) who quoted from Hansard of the first session of 1919, stating that the duty paid on boots and shoes was just about equal to the duty paid on the raw material. If hides are not the raw material that goes into the manufacture of boots and shoes, I am under a great misapprehension as to what our boots and shoes are made of.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON (Muskoka): Might I correct the hon. member? What I referred to was the leather that was brought in, not the hide?

Mr. MAHARG: Raw material is what the hon. member referred to, and if the House wished, I could easily quote Hansard to show that the words used were "raw material". The raw material for boots and shoes, if I am any judge, is hides. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. McGibbon) might also have pointed out that there was about $45,000,000 or $50,000,000 worth of Canadian boots and shoes sold in this country in each year. He took very good care to point out that there was less than $1,000,000 worth of duty collected on boots and shoes entering Canada and that about $3,000 of duty was collected on the boots and shoes that the farmer and the labourer wore, meaning the cheaper class of boots and shoes. He described them as those with pegged soles, but I notice that the words "pegged soles" are not mentioned in Hansard, although the hon. gentleman used that expression. I should like the farmers and labourers in the electoral district of Muskoka to ask the hon. member when he next appears before them, if he ever should, if he does not think they might be permitted to wear a little better class of boot than those with pegged soles. I have worn this kind and I know what they are like; the pegs come through the soles continuously, and I did not wear them any longer than I had to, and I hope I shall never wear them again. The hon. member for Muskoka also took a fling at the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) and criticised him for making what he considered inaccurate statements to the House. He objected to what the hon. member for Marquette said with regard to the amount of duty collected on articles of consumption, and proceeded to enumerate certain articles other than articles of consumption and gave the duty collected on them. In his enumeration he included fruit, both green and dried, and nuts. I can only say that either his knowledge as to what articles of consumption consists of is very faulty, or else he is trying to place the hon. member for Marquette in a false position. He even went a little further in giving these figures and mentioned animal and vegetable products such as furs, feathers, etc. Now that word "et-cetera" may cover a great deal, and if it does in proportion to the number of articles which I regard as articles of consumption, but which evidently the member for Muskoka does not, then I think his criticism of the hon. member for Marquette was very much uncalled for.

The ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) evidently had some particular object in coming here. This is the second visit he has paid us at intervals since his retirement from the Cabinet. Since he resigned from the Government he appears to have gone into seclusion, at all events from political life. However, he breaks that seclusion to a certain extent and the Great War Veterans were the first, if I may use the expression, to smoke him out of his lair. Things were getting pretty warm here last session. A committee had been appointed to inquire into the possibility of giving further aid towards the re-establishment of the returned men. That committee had several different organizations before them, one of which was the Great War Veterans Association, who submitted a plan to the committee which evidently members of the Government thought it would be just a little difficult to get over, and called for playing their very best cards.

2 a.m. Consequently the ex-Minister of Finance was called before the committee and the remarquable thing about his visit was not his appearance, but what he told the committee, at that time and what he told the House yesterday. The inference to be drawn from his evidence before the committee was this: That the financial condition of the country was so critical that it would me impossible to raise further sums than those already provided for the re-establishment of the soldier. Now what did he say yesterday when addressing this House? Here are his exact words—unrevised Hansard, Page 201. He

is referring to a statement made by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark):

> My hon. friend says: Your currency is inflated. It is less inflated than the currency of any country in the world; less inflated than that of the United States now.

Again on page 202 he says:

> No country in the world—including Great Britain that my hon. friend so properly holds up as an example—where the Victory Loan securities stood at par, or above, at the end of the war except Canada—not one. In the United States, 90-92.

He might have gone a little further and told this House what interest the United States are paying on the bonds they sold. He might have told us that the rate of interest of a bond bears some relation to its selling price, and that the highest rate of interest the United States bonds bear, if I am properly informed, is 4¼ per cent, and the majority of their issues bore a less interest rate than that.

On page 202 of unrevised Hansard the ex-Minister of Finance has something further to say with regard to the remarks of the hon. member for Red Deer.

> Unless my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) had taken the steps which he recently took, Great Britain would sell back to us or would offer in our markets the securities of our municipalities,—of our provinces, the securities guaranteed by the Dominion and by the provinces that we sold to her years ago and which have been years overseas—she would have sold and continued to sell those here until our exchange dropped to the level of sterling exchange; that is what would have happened.

In one page our Dominion securities are such and such, and on the next page they are entirely different, and we are told that if a further flotation of bonds had been made they would at least have gone down to the level of sterling. A little further down we have the hon. gentleman's answer to the criticism of my hon. friend from Red Deer of the floating of loans to such a large extent in New York. The ex-Minister of Finance refers to Great Britain's action in regard to the floating of loans in New York as a reason why it was good business for Canada to seek the New York market. He does not say why Great Britain floated these loans. He did not tell this House that Great Britain had lent to her Allies an amount far in excess of the total amount of her borrowings on the New York market. He might have told us that there was something else that Great Britain did while she was borrowing on the New York market. He might have told the House that Great Britain was also raising a large percentage of the money required for her war expenditure by direct taxation. If he had compared what was being raised by direct taxation under his adminstration with what was being done by the British Government he would have found that the amount that we were raising was as nothing compared with what Great Britain was doing in this respect. If there is one thing that we do dislike in this House it is a failure to state the whole of the facts. At page 200 the hon. gentleman deals with the question of direct taxation in regard to excess profits and there he says:

> Supposing we had appealed to the farmers to produce all they could for the armies overseas and the civilian population behind them, supposing we had asked the manufacturers to produce all they could and had asked the munition manufacturers to turn out all the munitions they could and, at the same time, suppose we had told them that we were going to take away all their profits? They are a pretty patriotic lot of men. I ask this House—you are all sensible business men— would you have got the same production in the country and in the factory that you did get? You would not.

That would have been all right, but he goes a little further and says:

> Further than that if you took away all the money that the producing classes had made, or the greater part of it, what position would those classes be in should there come the depression which always follows war?

What does he mean by the greater part of their profits? It means that you would at least have to take 51 per cent of their profits, or over 50 per cent. What position would they have been in if a greater portion of their profits had been taken? I will answer that by saying that if he had taken all their profits their position would at least have been as good as was that of the great proportion of the returned men when they came back. If he had taken the greater portion of their profits their position would have been much better than that of the great majority of returned men. I do not think his argument is very sound. He said something about slander. He made the statement that the two parties had been slandered by the charge that they had betrayed the farmer. The word "slander" is not a very nice one to use, and I doubt whether I would have used it if the ex-Minister of Finance had not introduced it. But I say that the statement of the ex-Minister of Finance is a slander upon the patriotic people of Canada who remained behind while the boys went overseas to do the fighting. Was it the expected profits that caused the boys to go overseas and do their bit? I think not. They could not expect to realize very great profits out of

$1.10 a day. I do not think that was the incentive that took them overseas. But if we are to accept the words of the ex-Minister of Finance the incentive for those of us who remained at home was that we should be permitted to make nice, handsome profits, that we might produce. It seems to be an absurd argument to be used by a member of this House, and it is an insult to the people of Canada who remained at home and in a patriotic way did all they could to help to win the war. The inference can only be that our patriotism was largely of the lips and not of the heart; otherwise, we should have been prepared to carry on without the hope of making large profits. I would like to say a word or two about what the policy of the ex-Minister has done for Canada. One of the things was to build up tremendous fortunes to be loaned to the Government at nice, comfortable rates of interest. We have evidence of that everywhere throughout the country. We do not need to go far afield to find it.

The ex-Minister of Finance went further and possibly the most significant statement that he made was that the protective principle in our tariff must remain. His words were something to this effect: Do not think for a moment that the people of Ontario are going to be satisfied with a tariff for revenue only. The system of protection has to remain. That is a very brief statement, but there is very much implied when you read between the lines. His statement during the first session of 1919 was that we must have a tariff to raise revenue.

Now, Sir, something has intervened and it is said we must have the tariff for protection—in fact the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. McGibbon) made the statement last night that it was a tax for the protection of industry. It seems rather strange, Mr. Speaker, that we should be compelled to pay a tax in order that our industries may flourish.

In conclusion, there is just one more statement the hon. gentleman (Sir Thomas White) made which is of considerable significance at this particular time, viz., that a new Liberal-Conservative party should be formed. What does that name imply? Can you have such a thing as a Liberal-Conservative party? I doubt it very much. If my interpretation of what Liberals claim to be the meaning of Liberalism is correct, it seems to me that such a thing would be absolutely impossible and that the name would only be used for the purposes of deception. I cannot understand how you can have a Liberal-Conservative party, and I would like to ask the ex-Minister of Finance in what way the Liberal-Conservative party—if you can have such a thing—would differ from the party that we have been pleased to name the new and National Progressive party. The new Liberal-Conservative party can only be composed of former Liberals and Conservatives; it cannot be the old Conservative party and it cannot be the Liberal party, consequently it must be a third party. Yet the ex-Minister of Finance told us yesterday in the early part of his speech that third parties could not survive; although towards the conclusion of his remarks he proposed what in substance—if it could be brought into existence—means nothing more or less than an additional party.

I would repeat that I am delighted that the ex-Minister of Finance saw fit to come here and direct so much attention to those of us who occupy the cross-benches. It suits us very well, and the harder our opponents hit us the better pleased we shall be. Let me close with this statement: The harder you are thrown the higher you will bounce. Don't think of the blackened eye, nor yet of the fact that you got licked, but how did you fight, and why.

The House divided on the proposed amendment of Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King, which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS.

Messrs.

Archambault,	Knox,
Baldwin,	Lanctôt,
Béland,	Lapointe,
Boivin,	Lavigueur,
Bourassa,	Leduc,
Boyer,	Leger,
Brouillard,	Lesage,
Bureau,	McCoig,
Cahill,	McCrea,
Caldwell,	McGibbon (Argenteuil),
Cannon,	McKenzie,
Cardin,	McMaster,
Casgrain,	Maharg,
Chisholm,	Marcile (Bagot),
Clark (Red Deer),	Mayrand,
Copp,	Michaud,
Crerar,	Pacaud,
d'Anjou,	Papineau,
Déchêne,	Pardee,
Delisle,	Parent,
Demers.	Pedlow,
Desaulniers,	Pelletier,
Deslauriers,	Power,
Devlin,	Proulx,
Duff,	Reid (Mackenzie),
Ethier,	Robb,
Euler,	Ross,
Fafard,	Savard,
Fielding,	Séguin,
Fournier,	Sinclair (Antigonish
Gauthier,	& Guysborough),

Gauvreau,
Gladu,
Gould,
Halbert,
Hunt,
Johnston,
Kennedy (Essex N.),
Kennedy (Glengarry and Stormont),
King,
Sinclair (Queens, P.E.I.),
Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Tobin,
Trahan,
Truax,
Turgeon,
Verville,
White (Victoria).—78.

NAYS.

Messrs.

Anderson,
Argue,
Armstrong (Lambton),
Arthurs,
Ballantyne,
Ball,
Best,
Blake,
Bolton,
Bonnell,
Bowman,
Boyce,
Boys,
Brien,
Bristol,
Buchanan,
Burrell,
Butts,
Calder,
Casselman,
Chaplin,
Charters,
Clark (Bruce),
Clarke (Wellington),
Clements,
Cockshutt,
Cooper,
Cowan,
Cronyn,
Crothers,
Crowe,
Currie,
Davidson,
Davis,
Douglas (Strathcona),
Douglas (Cape Breton S. & Rich.),
Drayton (Sir Henry),
Edwards,
Finley,
Foster (Sir George),
Foster (York),
Fraser,
Fripp,
Fulton,
Glass,
Green,
Griesbach,
Guthrie,
Halladay,
Harold,
Harrison,
Hartt,
Hay,
Henders,
Hocken,
Lang,
Loggie,
Mackie (Edmonton),
Mackie (Renfrew),
Maclean (Halifax),
McCurdy,
McGibbon (Muskoka),
McGregor,
McIsaac,
McLeod,
McQuarrie,
Manion,
Martin,
Meighen,
Merner,
Mewburn,
Middlebro,
Morphy,
Mowat,
Munson,
Myers,
Nesbitt,
Nicholson (Queens, P.E.I.),
Nicholson (Algoma),
Paul,
Peck,
Porter,
Redman,
Reid (Grenville),
Richardson,
Rowell,
Scott,
Sexsmith,
Shaw,
Sheard,
Sifton,
Simpson,
Smith,
Spinney,
Stacey,
Steele,
Stevens,
Stewart (Hamilton),
Stewart (Lanark),
Sutherland,
Thompson (Weyburn),
Thompson (Hastings),
Thompson (Yukon),
Tolmie,
Tremain,
Tudhope,
Wallace,
White (Sir Thomas),
Wigmore,
Wilson (Wentworth),
Wilson (Saskatoon),
Wright.—112.

PAIRS.

(The list of pairs is furnished by the Chief Whips.

Messrs.

Keefer,
Whidden,
Blair,
Murphy,
Andrews,
MacNutt,
Burnham,
Borden, Sir Robert,
Kemp, Sir Edward,
Lalor,
Hepburn,
Charlton,
Chabot,
McIntosh,
Elkin,
Long,
Allan,
Doherty,
Hughes, Sir Sam,
Fontaine,
Lemieux,
Prevost,
Gervais,
Kay,
Fortier,
Denis,
Vien,
Jacobs,
Molloy,
Lafortune,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
DuTremblay.

Main motion (Mr. Hume Cronyn) for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General agreed to.

On the motion of the Right Hon. Sir George Foster, seconded by Sir Henry Drayton, it was ordered that the Address be engrossed and transmitted to His Excellency the Governor General by such members of the House as are of the honourable the Privy Council.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

On motion of Sir Henry Drayton (Minister of Finance) it was ordered that this House do to-morrow, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to His Majesty.

WAYS AND MEANS.

On motion of Sir Henry Drayton (Minister of Finance) it was ordered that this House do to-morrow, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the House I beg to move that when the House adjourns to-day it do adjourn until three o'clock this afternoon.

Mr. SPEAKER: This motion can only be entertained by unanimous consent.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Sir George Foster the House adjourned at 3 a.m., Wednesday.

Wednesday, March 10, 1920.

The House met at Three o'clock.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways and Canals) presented the report of the Select Committee appointed to prepare and report lists of members composing the Select Standing Committees of the House, as follows:

No. 1.

ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

Messieurs:

Armstrong (*York*),
Blake,
Boys,
Buchanan,
Bureau,
Cannon,
Copp,
Crothers,
Davidson,
Demers,
Devlin,
Doherty,
Douglas (*Strathcona*),
Fripp,
Guthrie,
Jacobs,
Keefer,
Lapointe,
Lemieux,
McCoig,
McIntosh,
McKenzie,
McMaster,
Meighen,
Mowat,
Porter,
Sifton,
Tweedie, and
Vien.—29.

No. 2.

ON RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES.

Messieurs:

Allan,
Anderson,
Andrews,
Archambault,
Argue,
Armstrong (*Lambton*),
Arthurs,
Ballantyne,
Béland,
Blair,
Bolton,
Bonnell,
Boyer,
Boys,
Bristol,
Buchanan,
Bureau,
Cahill,
Calder,
Campbell,
Cannon,
Casgrain,
Chabot,
Charlton,
Chisholm,
Clark (*Red Deer*),
Clements,
Cockshutt,
Cooper,
Copp,
Crerar,
Crowe,
Cruise,
Currie.
d'Anjou,
Davidson,
Davis,
Déchêne,
Delisle,
Devlin,
Doherty,
Douglas (*Cape Breton*),
Douglas (*Strathcona*),
Edwards,
Elkin,
Ethier,
Euler,
Fafard,
Fielding,
Fontaine,
Fournier,
Fraser,
Fripp,
Gauvreau,
Guthrie,
Harold,
Harrison,
Hay,
Henders,
Hepburn,
Hocken,
Hughes (Sir Sam),
Keefer,
Knox,
Lalor,
Lanctôt,
Lapointe,
Lavigueur,
Leduc,
Lemieux,
Lesage,
Long,
Mackie (*Edmonton*),
Mackie (*Renfrew*),
Maclean (*York*),
MacNutt,
McCoig,
McCrea,
McCurdy,
McGregor,
McLean (*Royal*),
McLeod,
McQuarrie,
Maharg,
Manion,
Marcile (*Bagot*),
Martin,
Merner,
Mewburn,
Middlebro,
Molloy,
Morphy,
Mowat,
Murphy,
Myers,
Nesbitt,
Nicholson (*Algoma*),
Nicholson (*Queens*),
Pardee,
Parent,
Pelletier,
Porter,
Power,
Reid (*Grenville*),
Reid (*Mackenzie*),
Richardson,
Savard,
Séguin,
Shaw,
Sheard,
Simpson,
Smith,
Stevens,
Stewart (*Hamilton*),
Stewart (*Lanark*),
Sutherland,
Thompson (*Weyburn*),
Thomson (*Qu'Appelle*),
Trahan,
Tudhope,
Vien,
Wallace,
Wigmore,
Wilson (*Saskatoon*),
Wilson (*Wentworth*), and
Wright.—126.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Twenty-five Members.

No. 3.

ON MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS.

Messieurs:

Ames (Sir Herbert),
Anderson,
Armstrong (*York*),
Ballantyne,
Ball,
Blair,
Blake,
Bourassa,
Boyer,
Boys,
Brien,
Bureau,
Butts,
Casselman,
Charters,
Cronyn,
Douglas (*Cape Breton*),
DuTremblay,
Ethier,
Fortier,
Foster (*York*),
Fraser,
Fripp,
Fulton,
Gauthier,
Glass,
Green,
Guthrie,
Harrison,
Hepburn,
Hocken,
Kennedy (*Essex*),
Lafortune,
Mackie (*Renfrew*),
McGibbon (*Muskoka*),
McLean (*Royal*),
McLeod,
Marcil (*Bonaventure*)
Martin,
Pacaud,
Papineau,
Pardee,
Parent,
Paul,
Peck,
Pedlow,
Power,
Prévost,
Proulx,
Reid (*Grenville*),
Richardson,
Robb,
Ross,
Rowell,
Scott,
Sifton,
Steele,
Stewart (*Lanark*),
Thompson (*Hastings*),
Tobin, and
Tolmie.—61.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Ten Members.

No. 4.

ON STANDING ORDERS.

Messieurs:

Armstrong (*Lambton*),
Brien,
Burrell,
Butts,
Chabot,
Clarke (*Wellington*),
Cruise,
Deslauriers,
Doherty,
Duff,
Euler,
Gervais,
Griesbach,
Halbert,
Hartt,
Hepburn,
Kemp (Sir Edward),
Maclean (*York*),
MacNutt,
McGibbon (*Argenteuil*),
McGibbon (*Muskoka*),
McIsaac,
Marcile (*Bagot*),
Mayrand,
Michaud,
Mowat,
Paul,
Séguin,
Stacey,
Turgeon,
Verville,
Wallace, and
White (Sir Thomas).
—33.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Seven Members.

No. 5.

ON PRINTING.

Messieurs:

Bowman,
Brouillard,
Buchanan,
Burnham,
Cardin,
Charters,
Clark (*Bruce*),
Clarke (*Wellington*),
Crowe,
Currie,
Fontaine,
Hocken,
Hughes (Sir Sam),
Keefer,
Maclean (*Halifax*),
Michaud,
Murphy,
Prévost,
Richardson,
Shaw,
Verville,
White (*Victoria*),
Wilson (*Wentworth*), and
Wright.—24.

No. 6.

ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Messieurs:

Andrews,
Archambault,
Ball,
Best,
Bonnell,
Boys,
Calder,
Cannon,
Chaplin,
Chisholm,
Copp,
Crothers,
Crowe,
Davidson,
Demers,
Devlin,
Drayton (Sir Henry),
Duff,
Edwards,
Fripp,
Fulton,
Gauvreau,
Green,
Griesbach,
Jacobs,
Kemp (Sir Edward),
Lapointe,
Mackie (*Renfrew*),
Maclean (*Halifax*),
McCoig,
McCrea,
McGregor,
McIsaac,
McMaster,
Maharg,
Meighen,
Merner,
Mewburn,
Michaud,
Middlebro,
Morphy,
Murphy,
Parent,
Proulx,
Redman,
Reid (*Grenville*),
Ross,
Scott,
Sheard,
Sifton,
Simpson,
Sinclair (*Antigonish*),
Spinney,
Thomson (*Qu'Appelle*),
Tobin,
Tremain,
Tudhope,
Tweedie,
Verville,
Vien,
White (Sir Thomas), and
Wigmore.—62.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Twenty-one Members.

No. 7.

ON BANKING AND COMMERCE.

Messieurs:

Allan,
Ames (Sir Herbert),
Argue,
Baldwin,
Best,
Bristol,
Burnham,
Calder,
Cardin,
Casgrain,
Chaplin,
Charlton,
Clements,
Cockshutt,
Cowan,
Crerar,
Cronyn,
Currie,
d'Anjou,
Davis,
Déchêne,
Demers,
Denis,
Desaulniers,
Deslauriers,
Douglas (*Strathcona*),
Drayton (Sir Henry),
DuTremblay,
Edwards,
Elkin,
Fielding,
Finley,
Fortier,
Foster (Sir George),
Foster (*York*),
Gauthier,
Gladu,
Glass,
Halladay,
Henders,
Hunt,
Jacobs,
Johnston,
Kay,
Kemp (Sir Edward),
Kennedy (*Essex*),
Lang,
Lavigueur,
Leduc,
Léger,
Lemieux,
Lesage,
Loggie,
Maclean (*Halifax*),
McCurdy,
McQuarrie,
Meighen,
Middlebro,
Molloy,
Nesbitt,
Pacaud,
Papineau,
Pardee,
Peck,
Pedlow,
Porter,
Redman,
Robb,
Ross,
Sexsmith,
Sinclair (*Antigonish*),
Steele,
Stevens,
Stewart (*Hamilton*),
Sutherland,
Thompson (*Yukon*),
Thomson (*Qu'Appelle*),
Tobin,
Trahan,
Tremain,
Tweedie,
Whidden,
White (Sir Thomas), and
Wilson (*Saskatoon*).—84.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Twenty-one Members.

No. 8.

ON AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION.

Messieurs

Allan,
Anderson,
Argue,
Armstrong (*York*),
Armstrong (*Lambton*),
Arthurs,
Baldwin,
Ball,
Best,
Blair,
Bolton,
Bourassa,
Bowman,
Boyce,
Brien,
Brouillard,
Burrell,
Cahill,
Caldwell,
Casgrain,
Casselman,
Charters,
Clark (*Red Deer*),
Clarke (*Wellington*),
Cowan,
Crerar,
Cruise,
Davis,
Delisle,
Denis,
Mackie (*Renfrew*),
Maclean (*York*),
MacNutt,
McCoig,
McCrea,
McCurdy,
McGibbon (*Argenteuil*),
McGibbon (*Muskoka*),
McGregor,
McIntosh,
McIsaac,
McLean (*Royal*),
McMaster,
Maharg,
Marcile (*Bagot*),
Mayrand,
Merner,
Molloy,
Morphy,
Myers,
Nicholson (*Algoma*),
Nicholson (*Queens*),
Paul,
Proulx,
Reid (*Mackenzie*),
Robb,
Savard,
Séguin,

Desaulniers,
Douglas (*Strathcona*),
Edwards,
Finley,
Fournier,
Fulton,
Gervais,
Glass,
Gould,
Herbert,
Halladay,
Harold,
Hay,
Henders,
Hughes (Sir Sam),
Hunt,
Johnston,
Kay,
Kennedy (*Glengarry*),
Knox,
Lafortune,
Lanctôt,
Lang,
Léger,
Long,
Mackie (*Edmonton*),
Sexsmith,
Shaw,
Sifton,
Simpson,
Sinclair (*Antigonish*),
Sinclair (*Queens, P.E.I.*),
Smith,
Spinney,
Stacey,
Steele,
Sutherland,
Thompson (*Hastings*),
Thompson (*Weyburn*),
Thompson (*Yukon*),
Tremain,
Truax,
Wallace,
Whidden,
White (*Victoria*),
Wilson (*Wentworth*), and
Wright.—105.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Twelve Members.

No. 9.

ON MARINE AND FISHERIES.

Messieurs:

Ballantyne,
Butts,
Caldwell,
Cardin,
Chisholm,
Clark (*Bruce*),
Clements,
Duff,
Fielding,
Gauvreau,
Gladu,
Hartt,
Hay,
Lang,
Léger,
Loggie,
Manion,
Martin,
Munson,
McIntosh,
McKenzie.
McQuarrie,
Nicholson (*Queens*),
Papineau,
Pelletier,
Rowell,
Sinclair (*Antigonish*),
Sinclair (*Queens, P.E.I.*),
Spinney,
Stevens,
Trahan,
Truax,
Tudhope,
Turgeon, and
Wigmore.—35.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Ten Members.

No. 10.

ON MINES AND MINERALS.

Messieurs:

Arthurs,
Blake,
Bolton,
Bonnell,
Burrell,
Cahill,
Campbell,
Cockshutt,
Déchène,
Denis,
Fortier,
Gould,
Green,
Kennedy (*Glengarry*),
Lalor,
Lemieux,
Loggie,
Long,
Marcil (*Bonaventure*),
Nesbitt,
Nicholson (*Algoma*),
Pacaud,
Peck,
Pelletier,
Prévost,
Reid (*Mackenzie*),
Griesbach,
Halbert,
Harrison,
Hartt,
Johnston,
Sexsmith,
Smith,
Thompson (*Yukon*), and
White (*Victoria*).—35.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Ten Members.

No. 11.

ON FORESTS, WATERWAYS AND WATER-POWERS.

Messieurs:

Baldwin,
Béland,
Bourassa,
Bowman,
Boyce,
Bureau,
Caldwell,
Campbell,
Casselman,
Charlton,
Cooper,
Cowan,
Ethier,
Fafard,
Finley,
Foster (*York*),
Fraser,
Gould,
Halladay,
Kennedy (*Glengarry*),
Mackie (*Edmonton*),
Manion,
Michaud,
Pacaud,
Power,
Redman,
Stewart (*Hamilton*),
Thompson (*Hastings*),
Thompson (*Weyburn*),
Tolmie,
White (*Victoria*), and
Wilson (*Saskatoon*).
—32.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Ten Members.

No. 12.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

Messieurs:

Ballantyne,
Burnham,
Chabot,
Devlin,
Elkin,
Foster (Sir George),
Hocken,
Kay,
Lemieux,
McKenzie,
McLeod,
Marcil (*Bonaventure*),
Munson, and
Richardson.—14.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Five Members.

No. 13.

ON THE LIBRARY.

Messieurs:

Andrews,
Béland,
Borden (Sir Robert),
Boyer,
Chaplin,
Clark (*Red Deer*),
Cooper,
Cronyn,
Crothers,
Drayton (Sir Henry),
Foster (Sir George),
Harold,
King,
Lapointe,
Lemieux,
Meighen,
Myers,
Pardee,
Rowell,
Sheard, and
Whidden.—21.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Reid the report was concurred in.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING.

On motion of Rt. Hon. Sir George Foster (Acting Prime Minister), Messieurs Andrews, Béland, Borden (Sir Robert), Boyer,

Chaplin, Clark (Red Deer), Cooper, Cronyn, Crothers, Drayton (Sir Henry), Foster (Sir George), Harold, King, Lapointe, Lemieux, Meighen, Myers, Pardee, Rowell, Sheard, and Whidden, were appointed a committee to assist his honour the Speaker in the direction of the Library of Parliament, so far as the interests of the House of Commons are concerned.

POWERS OF COMMITTEES.

On motion of Sir George Foster the Select Standing Committees of the House were severally empowered to examine and inquire into all such matters and things as may be referred to them by the House, and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon, with power to send for persons, papers and records, with the exception of the Committees on Debates and the Library of Parliament.

NAVAL DEFENCE OF CANADA.

ADMIRAL JELLICOE'S REPORT PRESENTED BY HON. MR. BALLANTYNE.

Hon. C. C. BALLANTYNE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) tabled Admiral Viscount Jellicoe's Report to the Government on the Naval Defence of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. JACQUES BUREAU: Are there any recommendations?

REPORTS AND PAPERS TABLED.

Rules and Orders of the Exchequer Court of Canada; Report of the Secretary of State; Rules of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia under the Controverted Elections Act.—Hon. Mr. Sifton.

Annual report of the Department of the Interior; Report showing the number of permits to take intoxicating liquor into the Northwest Territories for the year ended 31st December, 1919.—Hon. Mr. Meighen.

Report of the Department of Public Works.—Hon. Mr. Reid.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill No. 7, an Act to incorporate The T. Eaton General Insurance Company.—Mr. Mowat.

Bill No. 8, an Act to incorporate The T. Eaton Life Assurance Company. — Mr. Mowat.

Bill No. 9, an Act to incorporate Scottish Canadian Assurance Corporation. — Mr. Mowat.

Bill No. 10, an Act respecting The Trust and Loan Company of Canada.—Mr. Cronyn.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT (CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.)

Mr. JOHN W. EDWARDS (Frontenac) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 11 to amend the Criminal Code (Capital Punishment).

Mr. CASGRAIN: Explain.

Mr. EDWARDS: In one sentence, Mr. Speaker, the object and purpose of the Bill is that in all cases where persons convicted of murder have been sentenced by the Courts to be hanged, such persons, instead of being conveyed from the court room to the gaol of the county in which the crime was committed, shall be conveyed to the penitentiary of the district or province, to remain there in confinement until the date for their execution, which execution will take place within the walls of the penitentiary.

Mr. BUREAU: What improvement on the present system will my hon. friend accomplish by getting the execution carried out in the penitentiary?

Mr. EDWARDS: I think it will be a very great improvement on the present system.

Hon. Mr. FIELDING: Does the hon. gentleman propose to adopt electrocution, or is the present method of execution to be adhered to.

Mr. EDWARDS: The Bill itself does not propose to make any change in the method of carrying out the death sentence, but I may say very frankly that my purpose in introducing the Bill was to make possible a change along that line.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

COLONEL JOHN A. COOPER.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. Who is Colonel John A. Cooper, who according to an interview purporting to have been given by him to the Boston Globe, claims that he is the first representative the Canadian Government has ever sent to a foreign country?
2. Did he at any time represent the Canadian Government?
3. Does he now represent the Canadian Government?
4. If so, where, and what is his status?

Hon. N. W. ROWELL:

1. The Government have no knowledge of the newspaper interview referred to, nor what was said thereat.

2, 3, and 4. On the 17th July, 1919, an Order in Council was passed appointing Lt.-Colonel John A. Cooper, of Toronto, Director of the Canadian News Service at New York. It was provided that this office should be under the supervision of the Canadian War Mission at Washington. Colonel Cooper still fills this office, and his status is as described in the Order in Council.

PAPER CURRENCY.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. Is it the intention of the Government to restore the law making bank notes redeemable in gold?

2. What has been the total increase in paper currency, (a) since 1911, and (b) since 1914?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. At the first practical opportunity, due regard being had to the interests of the country.

2.

—	Dec. 31, 1911.	Dec. 31, 1914.	Dec. 31, 1919.
	$	$	$
Bank Notes in circulation	102,037,305	105,969,755	232,486,734
Dominion Notes in circulation	115,149,749	162,395,231	318,690,089
	217,187,054	268,364,986	551,176,823
Less			
Dominion notes deposited in Central Gold Reserve by chartered banks against which the Banks issued their own notes for a like amount		3,450,000	115,300,000
Total notes in circulation	217,187,054	264,914,986	435,876,823

NAVAL POLICY.

*Hon. Mr. MURPHY (Russell):

1. Has the attention of the Government been directed to a despatch from the special correspondent in Canada of the London Daily Telegraph, which was published by that paper on December 22, 1919, and reprinted by the Empire Parliamentary Association, and in which the following paragraph occurs:—

"So far as relations with the Empire are concerned, the most important matter that will be considered at the beginning of the next session will be the submission to Parliament of the Naval Policy of the Government, as a result of the advice which is being tendered by Lord Jellicoe. The Government have already determined that the ships they are to build shall be the last word in efficient naval construction."

2. Is it true, as stated in the despatch that "the Government have already determined" to build ships as part of their naval policy?

3. If so, when was such determination reached, and when will the details be given to Parliament?

Hon. C. C. BALLANTYNE:

1. The attention of the Government has not previously been called to this despatch.

2 and 3. Admiral Viscount Jellicoe's report on the Naval Defence of Canada is at present under consideration of the Government. The Government will give due notice of any policy decided upon.

THE NATIONAL DEBT.

*Hon. Mr. MURPHY (Russell)

1. Referring to the Government's announcement that Canada's net debt on January 31, 1920, was slightly over $1,900,000,000, and that the increase of $62,000,000 shown in the said debt for the month of January last was the result of "Closing up and adjusting Overseas Accounts."

Was such increase $62,000,000 due to the payment of claims made by the British Government for extra remuneration on account of maintenance of the Canadian Corps in the field during the later period of the war, and to the payment of certain other claims made by the said Government for the cost of the artillery ammunition used by the said Canadian Corps."

2. What are the particulars of the said increase of $62,000,000 in the said debt?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1 and 2. The total increase of debt for the month of January, 1920, was $62,015,109.67 made up, as follows,—

Ordinary Receipts for January		$34,295,988.64
Ordinary Payments for January		3,073,829.48
Surplus Consolidated Fund		164,624.51
Other Expenditure—		
Capital Expenditure for January		3,073,829.48
War Expenditure for January*		43,800,000.00
Demobilization Expenditure, ary		15,305,904.70
		$62,179,734.18
*Less Surplus Consolidated Fund		164,624.51
Increase of Debt during January		$62,015,109.67

£9,000,000 or $43,800,000, being adjustment of balance due the Imperial Government for the period March 2, 1917, to October, 1918, for Canada's share big gun ammunition. Amount arrived at by calculation of total number of rounds fired in each period and the proportion chargeable to Canada

is based on total number and calibre of Canadian guns in France during that period and this amount was then divided by the number of "Man Days" charged in the bill for maintenance. The account was audited on London personally by the Auditor General for Canada assisted by Col. L. A. Dowie and D. M. McClelland, C.A.

VATICAN MISSION.

*Hon. Mr. MURPHY (Russell):

1. Is the Government aware that in reply to a question in the British House of Commons, the following answer was given on February 16, 1920?
"No decision has yet been taken regarding a mission to the Vatican, as some of the Dominion's have not yet replied to the invitation to give their views on the matter."
2. Was the Government invited to give its views on the matter referred to?
3. If so, when was such invitation received?
4. Has the Government replied to such invitation? If so, on what date?
5. What was the Government's reply?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. No.
2. Yes.
3. 17th October, 1919.
4. Yes, on the 6th December, 1919.
5. That they had not sufficient information to justify them in offering advice as to the usefulness of continuing representation at the Vatican.

ELECTORAL LISTS.

Mr. PARENT (Quebec West):

1. What total sum was paid for the preparation of electoral lists in connection with the recent partial elections held in the Counties of Quebec East, Glengarry, Assiniboia and Carleton, stating separately the figures for each of these counties?
2. What amount was claimed from different sources in connection with the preparation of said lists?

Hon. A. L. SIFTON:

1. Payments—

Glengarry and Stormont	3,277.78
Quebec East	3,132.26
Victoria and Carleton	2,417.15
Assiniboia	3,716.46

2. Claims—

Glengarry and Stormont:

Enumerators	2,436.19
Registrars and Expenses	402.58
Revising Officers and Expenses.	278.18
Printing and Advertising	416.60
	3,533.55

Quebec East:

Registrars and Expenses	2,655.89
Revising Officer and Expenses.	616.83
Printing and Advertising	2,509.25
	5,781.97

Victoria and Carleton:

Enumerators	1,998.68
Registrars and Expenses	292.56
Revising Officer and Expenses.	211.05
Printing and Advertising	113.50
	2,615.79

Assiniboia:

Enumerators	3,828.49
Registrar and Expenses	64.00
Revising Officer and Expenses.	78.00
Printing and Advertising	72.00
	4,043.29

WAR EXPENDITURE.

* Mr. E. B. DEVLIN (Wright):

1. What amount, if any, is or was due by Germany by way of war expenditure?
2. How much, if any, has been refunded to Canada?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I take it that question No. 1 refers to what is due by Germany to Canada?

Mr. DEVLIN: Yes.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Then the answer to that question is, that no amount has been ascertained or determined.

The second question of course is answered by No. 1.

Mr. DEVLIN (Wright):

1. What amount, if any, is or was due by the British Government to the Government of Canada for advances of munitions and other war material?
2. How much, if any, of same has been paid?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1 and 2. Total advances to Imperial Government to March 1, 1920 for munitions and other war material only, $654,900,000. Total repayments to same date, $441,715,560.84. The balance as shown by the above is in excess of the actual amount due the Dominion Government by the Imperial Government on the same date. This is due to advances made by Great Britain to Canada in London for war purposes, which advances are not allocated to any particular credit in the books of the Finance Department.

ADMIRAL JELLICOE'S VISIT.

Mr. DEVLIN (Wright):

1. Did Admiral Jellicoe visit Canada recently?
2. If so, had he any communication of an official character with the Government of Canada?
3. Was his visit upon an official invitation of the Canadian Government?
4. If not upon such invitation, what was the purpose of his coming, by whom was he sent, and what was the result of his visit?

Hon. C. C. BALLANTYNE:

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. His visit was part of an official tour to the British Dominions as a result of a request from the combined Dominions Governments to have an experienced naval officer investigate questions of naval defence in the Dominions.
4. Answered by No. 3.

NEW PARLIAMENT BUILDING.

* Hon. Mr. MURPHY (Russell):

1. What has been the cost of the new Parliament Building to date?
2. If the expenditure on the said building exceeds the amount upon which the contractors are to be paid a percentage under their original contract, how, and at what rate, are they to be paid for work done in excess of such amount?
3. Are the architects for the said building to be paid any commission if the cost of the said building exceeds the sum of $5,000,000?
4. If not, how are the architects to be remunerated for work done in excess of the said sum of $5,000,000?

Hon. J. D. REID:

1. $6,954,116.15 to 28th February, 1920.
2. The contractor is to receive eight per cent on the total cost of the building, dating from February 3, 1916, up to the amount of four million dollars, and seven per cent on the cost in excess of that amount up to the further sum of one million dollars, it being understood and agreed that the contractor is not to receive any commission on the cost in excess of five million dollars, said cost to be exclusive of the architect's and contractor's commissions, and the cost of structural steel.

3 and 4. The architects receive a fee of five and one-half per cent on the total cost of the work of reconstructing the Parliament Buildings exclusive of the percentage paid Messrs. P. Lyall & Sons Construction Company, Limited; it being understood that the commission of five and one-half per cent is to apply to an amount not to exceed the sum of five million dollars.

* Hon. Mr. MURPHY (Russell):

1. What are the names of the present members of the Parliamentary Committee which is alleged to have charge of the construction of the new Parliament Building?
2. How many meetings of the said committee were held to discuss or decide details of construction during the last six months?
3. Are minutes kept of the meetings of the said committee? If so, by whom?

Hon. J. D. REID:

1. Hon. J. D. Reid, Acting Chairman; Hon. C. C. Ballantyne, Hon. J. A. Calder, Hon. Sir James Lougheed, Hon. Robert Watson, Hon. G. D. Robertson
2. Two, September 26 and December 4, 1919.
3. Yes; by the Deputy Minister of Public Works.

* Hon. Mr. MURPHY (Russell):

1. What are the names and addresses of the several Canadian companies that supplied various kinds of marble, stone and brick used in the construction of the new Parliament Building?
2. What are the names and addresses of the several companies in the United States that supplied similar material for the said building?

Hon. J. D. REID:

1. G. P. Sherwood & Co., Montreal; Howard Rock, Ottawa; Foran & Thibault, Ottawa; Campbell, McKee & Williams, Bells Corners; Nepean Sandstone Quarries, Ottawa; W. J. George, Ottawa; Wallace Sandstone Quarries, Montreal; Wright & Co., Incorporated, Hull; Megantic & Stanstead Quarry Co., Limited, Montreal; John R. Hoidge, Toronto; Mariotti Marble Co., Montreal; Anglin-Norcross, Limited, Montreal; Sun Brick Company, Toronto; National Brick Co., Limited, Montreal; Dartnell, Limited, Montreal; Don Valley Brick Company, Toronto; Webster & Sons, Limited, Montreal; Montreal Terra Cotta Co., Montreal; National Fireproofing Co., Toronto; Brick Tile Supply Co., Ottawa; Barrett Bros., Ottawa; T. Sidney Kirby Company, Ottawa; Can. Custodis Chimney Co., Montreal.
2. W. McMillan & Sons, Chicago, Ills.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

How many appointments have been made by the Board of Civil Service Commissioners since the date of the armistice?

Hon. Mr. SIFTON: Permanent appointments, 4,176; temporary assignments, 22,954. Of the latter many thousands are for short periods, often less than thirty days.

INTERNATIONAL FISHERIES COMMISSION.

Mr. DUFF:

1. When will the report and findings of the International Fisheries Commission be laid on the table of the House?
2. When was the last meeting of the commission held, and where?
3. Who are the Canadian members of said commission?
4. What has been the total cost of said commission to Canada, and the amount paid to each member for salary or remuneration and expenses respectively?

5. Did the said Canadian members agree to the placing of an embargo on live lobsters under 10½ inches, caught by Canadian fishermen in Canadian or international waters, whereby live lobsters under above mentioned size would not be allowed entrance into United States markets or ports?

6. Were the Canadian commissioners or any of them consulted with regard to the clauses of Bill No. 4871, which was later introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives?

7. Did they give their approval to clause 2 of said Bill, which was to prohibit live lobsters under 10½ inches from being exported from Canada to the United States, either at a meeting of the commission held in the rooms of the Chamber of Commerce, Boston, or at a meeting held in Ottawa, in 1918?

8. Has the said International Commission ceased to function? If not, why not?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. This matter is under consideration with the United States Government.

2. September 6, 1918, at Lake Champlain, N.Y.

3. Sir J. Douglas Hazen, K.C.M.G., G. J. Desbarats, Esq., C.M.G., Wm. A. Found, Esq.

4. $5,593.49. Sir J. Douglas Hazen, $1,436 expenses; G. J. Desbarats, $1,193.59 expenses; Wm. A. Found, $1,692.73 expenses. None of the members received any remuneration.

5. No.

6. No.

7. No.

8. Yes.

SS. "STANLEY."

Mr. DUFF:

1. Does the Government own a steamer named the "Stanley"?

2. If so, when did she last undergo overhauling and repairs?

3. Have said repairs been completed, and what were the nature of said repairs?

4. What did said repairs cost?

5. How long was the ship out of commission, giving dates?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. Yes.

2. At present under repair.

3. No; general overhaul of the hull, boilers and machinery, including removal and refitting of certain shell plating, renewal of defective double bottom tank tops under boilers. General overhaul of the main and auxiliary machinery and boilers, overhaul of underwater fittings, also overhaul of the electric light installation including the rewiring of the ship.

4. Amounts of contracts let, $23,907.85.

5. December 12; still under repair.

[Mr. Duff.]

SS. "CANADIAN RECRUIT."

Mr. DUFF:

1. Does the Government own a steamer named the "Canadian Recruit"?

2. If so, what is her gross, net and deadweight tonnage?

3. What did she cost ready for sea?

4. Where is the said steamer at the present time?

5. What amount of insurance is carried on the said steamer's hull?

6. What is the said steamer's valuation as appears in her hull policies?

7. What insurance is carried on said steamer's freight?

8. Whilst vessel is in her present position and condition are the Government's interests being properly protected? If so, how?

Hon. J. D. REID:

1. Yes.

2. Gross tonnage, 2,409; net tonnage, 1,451; deadweight, 3,964.

3. $813,252.

4. Stranded on Vache Reef in the St. Lawrence at the mouth of the Saguenay.

5. Insurance on hull, $578,571; other insurance, $231,429; total insurance on vessel, $810,000.

6. $578,571.

7. Freight charges are prepaid, and not insured. Cargo is at shipper's risk, and each cargo owner carries at discretion his own insurance.

8. Yes. Notice of abandonment has been tendered to the underwriters. Necessary steps to prevent further damage have been taken by underwriters' representatives.

SHIPMENTS OF GOODS TO ROUMANIA THROUGH AMERICAN PORTS.

Mr. DUFF:

1. Are Canadian goods, purchased by Roumanians on the credit of the twenty-five million dollars established by the Government, and destined for Roumania, still being shipped through an American port?

2. If so, why does not the Government insist that such goods, destined for Roumania, be forwarded through a Canadian port?

3. Will the Government give this important matter its most serious consideration?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1. Canadian goods destined to Roumania, having been purchased by that country on the credit of the $25,000,000 advanced by the Government, are not being shipped through an American port. Of a total of over 36,000 tons shipped, some two thousand odd have been shipped through an American port, owing to their being small lots which were wanted quickly and for the shipment of which no boat was at the time available at a Canadian port.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. It will not be necessary, therefore, that the Government give serious consideration to the matter.

CHARLOTTETOWN HATCHERY.

Mr. DUFF:

1. Has the hatchery at Charlottetown, P.E.I., been sold?
2. If so, were tenders asked for?
3. Who were the persons submitting tenders and what were the amounts of said tenders?
4. Was the Inspector of Fisheries at Charlottetown afterwards instructed by the Department of Naval Service to endeavour to procure other offers?
5. If so, from whom did he receive offers, and what were the amounts?
6. On what date did the competition close?
7. Whose offer or tender was accepted?
8. Did the person whose tender was accepted make his offer to the inspector at Charlottetown or direct to the department at Ottawa by telegraph?
9. On what date did the department receive the said tender, what was the amount of said tender, and on what date was the said tender accepted by the department?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. Yes.
2. Tenders were called for by advertisement published in the press and by poster.
3. Edmund T. Higgs, Charlottetown, P.E.I. $460 for land, buildings and plant; $320 for land and buildings; $200 for buildings only.
4. All tenders received were rejected as unsatisfactory, and the Inspector of Fisheries was instructed to endeavour to obtain further offers, for the buildings and plant only, as no land was involved.
5. W. E. Agnew, Charlottetown, $645 for the building and plant; E. T. Higgs, Charlottetown, $550 for the building, machinery and plant; J. J. Hughes, Charlottetown, $350 for the plant and equipment.
6. On February 2, when satisfactory offer was accepted.
7. W. J. McMillan, Charlottetown.
8. Mr. McMillan telegraphed the department confirming offer made to the Inspector of Fisheries.
9. January 28, 1920, $700; February 2, 1920.

INTEREST ON AMERICAN LOANS.

Mr. MICHAUD:

1. How much interest was paid on American loans during the year 1919?
2. How much was the exchange on said interest?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. The Dominion Government paid interest on loans floated in the United States for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1919, $7,543,550.
2. The various amounts making the above total were paid out of the account of the Dominion Government with the agency of the Bank of Montreal, New York, and the question of exchange did not arise.

EXPORTS OF WHEAT TO UNITED STATES.

Mr. MICHAUD:

1. How many bushels of wheat were exported from Canada into the United States during the year 1919?
2. How many bushels were exported to Europe during the same year?
3. How many bushels were exported during the year 1919 through the ports of St. John, N.B., Halifax, N.S., Quebec, Montreal, and Vancouver?
4. How many bushels were exported through the United States?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. 6,137,643 bushels.
2. 61,723,631 bushels.
3. St. John, N. B., 10,248,286 bushels; Halifax, N.S., 2,685,844 bushels; Quebec, P.Q., 2,312,910 bushels; Montreal, P.Q., 26,385,818 bushels; Vancouver, B.C., 50,012 bushels.
4. 20,040,960 bushels.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—PENSIONS.

Mr. FOURNIER:

1. Is the Honourable Minister of Railways and Canals aware that the present rates of pension respecting the minimum and maximum amounts granted to superannuated employees of the Intercolonial railway between Montreal and Halifax, are based upon salaries paid many years ago when cost of living was much lower than at present?
2. Is it the intention of the Honourable Minister to take favourable action upon the many requests, applications and petitions from the superannuated employees of said road for an increase of pension?
3. Has this question of an increase of pension been studied with the president of the Canadian National Railway system?
4. Is it the intention of the Honourable Minister to settle it during the present session?

Hon. J. D. REID:

1. Yes.
2. Matter is being given consideration.
3. Yes. The matter is under consideration by the Canadian National Railways' management.
4. In view of the Grand Trunk Railway being acquired by the Government, it is thought desirable that any pension scheme should not be concluded until all Government-owned and controlled railways are coordinated under one management.

EXPORT OF HIDES TO UNITED STATES

Mr. FOURNIER:

1. Has an Order in Council been passed by the Government preventing the exportation of hides to the United States?

2. If so, on what date was that Order in Council passed?
3. Since the passing of that order, how many manufacturers or exporters have obtained permits to ship hides to the United States?
4. What are the names of these favoured manufacturers and exporters of hides?
5. Under these special permits, how many carloads of hides have they exported up to date?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: An Order in Council was passed by the Government prohibiting the export of hides without a license. Licenses, however, have been granted in every case where application has been made. The bringing the matter under license enabled the department to obtain statistics relating to the general trend of the trade and provided it with information which would have been necessary had it been deemed advisable to restrict importation.

ALIENS IN DETENTION CAMPS.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. What has become of all the aliens or enemy subjects held in the various detention camps in Canada by the Federal Government since the outbreak of the war?
2. What measure has been adopted by the Government to deal with them since the war is over?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. All prisoners of war who have not been repatriated have been released in Canada.
2. Answered by No. 1.

BUSINESS PROFITS WAR TAX.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

Is it the intention of the Government to re-enact the Excess Business Profit War Tax for the ensuing year?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Information with regard to taxation policy will be announced in the Budget Speech of the Minister of Finance.

BILINGUAL STAMPS.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to issue bilingual stamps in the future?
2. If so, when?
3. If not, why?
4. Is it the intention of the Government to issue bilingual coins and paper money in the future?
5. If so, when?
6. If not, why?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No departure from the present practice is contemplated.

SS. "CHAMPLAIN."

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Has the Government disposed of the steamer "Champlain?"
2. If so, why?
3. What price was realized by said sale?

[Mr. Fournier.]

4. Is it the intention of the Government to buy or construct another steamer to replace the "Champlain?"
5. If so, when?
6. If not, why?
7. Is there any steamer at present replacing the "Champlain" along the route Murray Bay Tadousac?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. No, but intends doing so.
2. No further use for her.
3. $61,050.
4. No.
5. Answered by No. 4.
6. No necessity for replacing her.
7. The "Champlain" is still at Murray Bay.

LORD JELLICOE'S VISIT TO CANADA.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. By whom was Lord Jellicoe asked to come to Canada?
2. What was the result of his visit to Canada?
3. Has the Government any naval legislation to submit to this House this session?
4. If so, when is it to be submitted?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. The Admiralty were requested by the Dominions Governments to send an experienced naval officer to investigate questions of Naval Defence for British Dominions, and Lord Jellicoe was chosen by the Imperial authorities.
2. He submitted a report to the Dominion Government containing his recommendations.
3. The Government will give due advice of any legislation contemplated.
4. Answered by No. 3.

SHIPBUILDING CONTRACTS.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. How many contracts for shipbuilding were given by the Government since the 1st of January, 1918?
2. To what firms were said contracts given and what were the respective amounts?
3. Were all of said contracts given after proper tender?
4. If so, were they given to the lowest tenderer?
5. If not, why?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. Fifty-six contracts.
2. Canadian Vickers, Ltd., Montreal, P.Q., 12; Collingwood Shipbuilding Co. Ltd., Collingwood, Ont., 7; Wallace Shipyards Ltd., Vancouver, B.C., 4; Tidewater Shipbuilders, Ltd., Three Rivers, P.Q., 4; Davie Shipbuilding and Repairing Co., Ltd., Lauzon, Levis, P.Q., 3; Port Arthur Shipbuilding Co., Ltd., Port Arthur, Ont., 7; Halifax Shipyards, Ltd., Halifax, N.S., 4; Victoria

Machinery Depot Co., Ltd., Victoria, B.C., 2; J. Coughlan & Sons, Vancouver, B.C., 4; N. S. Steel & Coal Co., New Glasgow, N.S., 2; Prince Rupert Dry Dock & Engineering Co., Ltd., Prince Rupert, B.C., 2; Br. American Shipbuilding Co., Ltd., Welland, Ont., 2; Dom. Shipbuilding Co., Ltd., Toronto, Ont., 2; Midland Shipbuilding Co., Midland, Ont., 1.

3. Contracts were placed after offers had been received from the several yards and prices and other details agreed upon.

4. Answered by No. 3.

5. Answered by No. 3.

RIVIERE-DU-LOUP WORKSHOPS.

* Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. What quantity of machinery was taken away from the C.N.R. workshops at Rivière-du-Loup and transported to St. Malo, up to March 1, 1920?

2. How many employees were transferred from the said workshops at St. Malo?

3. How many machines and employees does the C.N.R. Commission propose to take away from Rivière-du-Loup to use at St. Malo?

4. Is it the intention of the Department of Railways to stop the alleged destruction of property of the Rivière-du-Loup workshops?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Nineteen machines.

2. Sixty employees.

3. Total of 90 employees and 19 machines. Transfer to the latter has been completed.

4. There has been no destruction of property at Rivière du Loup and it is not the intention to transfer any additional machinery.

CANADIAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCE—STATISTICS.

Mr. DEMERS:

Are the reports prepared by British statisticians, fixing Canada's contributions in the Great War to the number of 640,648 men, considered accurate by the Canadian Government?

Hon. Mr. GUTHRIE: Until all the documents from which complete and authentic statistics can be compiled have been returned from overseas and properly allocated, no figures can be verified or considered accurate, but have to be accepted as the nearest possible estimate obtainable from sources through the medium of cable or telegraph, and, as such, are liable to amendment.

So far as is ascertainable from such telegraphic reports, there were:

(a) Grand total recruited in Canada for Canadian Expeditionary Force during the war up to 31st December, 1918, (exclusive of those enlisted for Naval Service, Royal Air Force, Imperial Mechanical Transport, Inland Water Transport, and exclusive of British and Allied reservists) 591,472; (b) Enlisted in England up to 31st December, 1918, 1,733; (c) Enlisted in Canada for overseas service other than Canadian Expeditionary Force, 21,169; (d) British and Allied Reservists (exclusive of (c)), 14,590. Total, 628,964.

NEWSPRINT CONTROLLER.

Mr. DEMERS:

For what reason did Mr. R. A. Pringle, K.C., Controller of Newsprint Paper, resign?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Mr. Pringle in his letter of resignation made the following statement:

"I am afraid I will have to ask you to relieve me from the distribution of newsprint. I may say that for the last two or three months the matter has been most troublesome and has been taking my whole time. Some of the manufacturers, as you are aware, are refusing to comply with my orders, which will necessitate drastic action being taken. My staff is limited and the work is becoming very burdensome. You have other departments of the Government under which this distribution could probably be better carried on, and orders enforced."

FARMERS' ACCOUNT BOOK.

Mr. DEMERS:

1. When was the "Farmers' Accountant Book" printed by the Government?

2. Has the French edition of the said book been printed? If so, when?

Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

1. The Farmer's Account Book was printed in 1918.

2. A French edition of 2,000 copies has been printed, and delivered January 13, 1920.

Another 3,000 copies are now being printed at the Printing Bureau, and will be delivered in due course.

"TI-NOIR" DESJARDINS.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Is the Government aware that "Ti-noir" Desjardins was arrested in the city of Hull, Canada, for murder, a month ago, and that he has been temporarily given his freedom while awaiting his trial?

2. Has the Government furnished bail in this case as it did at Montreal when the said "Ti-noir" Desjardins was arrested for conspiracy?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

VANCOUVER DRYDOCK.

Mr. DEMERS:

1. Is it true that a subsidy contract for the construction of a drydock at Vancouver was awarded? If so, to whom?
2. What is the amount of that contract?
3. What is the percentage subsidy?
4. Were there any competitors for the subsidy?
5. If so, who were they and what were their tenders?

Hon. J. D. REID:

1. (a) Yes; (b) Coughlan & Sons, Limited.

2 and 3. The dock is to be of the second class and the maximum amount on which a subsidy of 4½ per cent is to be paid annually for thirty-five years is $2,500,000.

4 and 5. Under the Dry Dock Subsidies Act, applications were received from the following Companies who offered to build a dock at Vancouver:

Coughlan & Sons, Ltd., Second class dock; Davidson & Cameron, First class dock; Wallace Shipyards, Second class floating dock; Raymond Concrete Pile Co., Second class drydock. The maximum amount on which subsidy is payable at 4½ per cent for 35 years in the case of first class docks is $5,500,000.

QUEBEC MARINE STOREHOUSE.

Mr. POWER:

1. Were any repairs made to the Marine Storehouse, Quebec, during 1919?
2. If so, how much was expended for that purpose?
3. Were tenders called for?
4. If so, who was the successful tenderer?
5. Was his price the lowest offered?

Hon. J. D. REID:

1. Yes; roof and floors put on portion destroyed by fire.
2. $9,480.35.
3. Yes.
4. L. H. Peters, Limited.
5. Yes, by over $4,700.

BULGARIAN PEACE TREATY—CANADA'S REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. DEMERS:

Who were the Canadian representatives during the course of negotiations when the treaty of peace with Bulgaria was signed, and who signed the said treaty on the part of Canada?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL: The general provisions of the Bulgarian Treaty are similar to those embodied in the Treaty with Germany and were settled when the Prime Minister and his colleagues were in Paris last year. The territorial readjustments and the application of these general provisions to Bulgaria were also considered at that time, and the Prime Minister was Vice-Chairman of the Commission on the Greek claims, consideration of which involved the Balkan territorial settlement in some of its most important aspects. The Treaty was signed by Sir George Perley, as plenipotentiary on behalf of Canada appointed by His Majesty on the advice of His Majesty's Canadian advisers.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS—CANADA'S CONTRIBUTION.

Mr. DEMERS:

1. Has the question of Canada's contribution towards the maintenance of the League of Nations been considered by the Government?
2. Is it a fact that Canada's share of the necessary expenditure for the maintenance of the said League will be as considerable as that of England and more considerable than that of Belgium and several other independent countries which are members of the League?
3. Has Canada's contribution for the said expenditure been fixed? If so, what is the proportion?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. The basis of Canada's contribution is settled by Article 6 of the Treaty of Peace which is as follows:

"The expenses of the Secretariat shall be borne by the members of the League in accordance with the apportionment of the expenses of the International Bureau of the Universal Postal Union."

2. Canada is one of the countries in the "first class" under the International Bureau of the Universal Postal Union and therefore contributes the same amount as all other members in the "first class." The following are the members of the first class: Germany, Austria, United States of America, France, Great Britain, Hungary, British India, Commonwealth of Australia, Canada, the British Colonies and Protectorates of South Africa, the whole of the other British Colonies and Protectorates, Italy, Japan, Russia, Turkey.

3. In conformity with Article 6 of the treaty with Germany, Canada's contribution is fixed on the basis of the apportionment of the expenses of the International Bureau of the Universal Postal Union, but the actual amount which Canada may be called upon to contribute must necessarily depend upon the number and classification of the states which become members of the League of Nations. Canada's contribution for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1920, was fixed at £16,234 which at the current rate of exchange on February 13, the date on which the draft was sent to London, amounted to $64,043.15.

ICE-BREAKERS IN ST. LAWRENCE.

Mr. DELISLE:

1. Is the Government aware that there is an insufficient number of ice-breakers operating in the St. Lawrence?
2. If so, does the Government propose to order the construction of new ice-breakers, how many, and of what type?
3. If the Government has not been made aware of such a condition, is it the intention to order the construction of one or several of such ice-breakers?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. The only ice-breaker operating in the St. Lawrence river at present is the C.G.S. "Lady Grey."
2. Under consideration.
3. Under consideration.

DR. MICHEL FISET.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR:

1. In what capacity is Dr. Michel Fiset employed as a public officer?
2. When and by whom was he appointed in his present public charge?
3. Has he submitted a report to the Government? If so, when, and to whom?
4. Has he an office in Quebec City? If so, where is it located?
5. What pay or salary does the said Dr. Michel Fiset receive?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. Parcel post supervisor.
2. Appointed by Order in Council, dated April 18, 1914.
3. Not to the knowledge of the department.
4. No office supplied by this department.
5. $2,800 a year.

RIVER BATISCAN BRIDGE.

Mr. DESAULNIERS:

1. Referring to an Order of the House issued on the 12th of May, 1919, for a copy of all reports, letters, memoranda, telegrams, plans and estimates and relating to the construction of a bridge on the River Batiscan, in the parish of St. Francis Xavier de Batiscan, in the county of Champlain, has the request contained in said Order of the House been carried out? If not, why?
2. Is it the intention of the Government to lay the said papers on the table of the House in the early part of the present session?

Hon. J. D. REID:

1. When an Order of the House was issued on May 12, 1919, there were no reports, letters, etc., on file relating to the construction of a bridge on the River Batiscan, and notification was given the Secretary of State to that effect, but since that date, plans have been submitted and there has been some correspondence.

2. Yes, when application is made.

THE ELECTORAL ATLAS.

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. What was the cost of the mechanical work, including the paper used, in the publication of "The Electoral Atlas of the Dominion of Canada"?
2. What was the total cost of the work?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. Cost of 4,000 copies, part bound and part in sheets: Lithographic work, $11,026.43; press work, $2,000; binding, $2,127.92; paper stock, $3,744.

2. Grand total cost, $18,897.45.

CUSTOMS DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEES.

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. How many employees are there in the Inside Service of the Customs Department?
2. How many are males?
3. How many are females?
4. How many males are French?
5. How many females are French?
6. How many males are Protestants?
7. How many females are Protestants?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

	Customs Service	Inland Revenue Service	Total
1.	226	37	263
2.	213	28	241
3.	13	9	22
4.	29	15	44
5.	1	1	2
6.	142	9	151
7.	11	3	14

Mr. BUREAU: Will the minister permit me a further question? With regard to the answers to questions 4 and 5, have these people been naturalized?

Mr. BURRELL: I will have to find that out. Perhaps my hon. friend had better put that further question on the Order Paper.

STE-FAMILLE WHARF.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR:

1. Has the contract been awarded for the repairs of Ste-Famille wharf at the Island of Orleans, Quebec, in accordance with the tenders advertised for in the month of October, 1919, and is such contract based upon the estimates of cost which were voted by this House?
2. If so, to whom was the contract awarded, and for what amount?
3. Are the repairs under construction? If not, when will they be started, and for what reason have they been delayed?

Hon. J. D. REID:

1 and 2. No.

3. No; tenders were called for, prices submitted considered too high. Matter is now under consideration.

ST.-JEAN WHARF.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR:

1. Have contractors Methot and Thibault, of Montmagny, Quebec, started work upon the re-

pairs of the St.-Jean wharf at the Island of Orleans, in accordance with the contract which was awarded to them in 1919?

2. If so, on what date were the said repairs started, and when were they to be terminated, according to the terms of the contract?

3. Have every necessary precautions been taken by the Department of Public Works to have said repairs terminated as promptly as possible owing to the urgency of such repairs?

Hon. J. D. REID:

1. No.

2. (a) Repairs not yet started; (b) 7th August, 1920.

3. Yes.

LOANS TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

Mr. DESAULNIERS:

1. Has the Government advanced any loans to foreign countries during the Great War, or since the 11th of November, 1918?

2. If so, to which countries, for what amount, and upon what terms?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. Yes.

2. (a) Italy. Total advance, $6,003,301.20. Treasury bills of the Italian Government covering the whole advance have been deposited in London to the order of the Minister of Finance. These Bills mature December 31, 1920, on which date the Italian Government have the option to deposit new dollar treasury bills maturing December 31, 1923, at which latter date the principal must be paid. Interest is payable half-yearly at 5½ per cent in Canadian dollars; the first payment due December 31, 1919, has been received.

(b) France. Under agreement dated May 15, 1919, the Dominion Government agreed to make advances up to $25,000,000 for purchase in Canada of Canadian products during the period ended December 31, 1919. The total advances including contracts entered into and still unpaid amount to $5,519,047.60.

Sterling treasury bills have been deposited to the order of the Minister of Finance in London which are to be exchanged for dollar treasury bills as soon as the above mentioned amount has been paid in full. The bills will carry interest at 5½ per cent and are to be repayable December 31, 1924. The first payment of interest has been fixed for June 30, 1920.

(c) Greece. Under agreement dated March 31, 1919, the Dominion Government agreed to make advances up to $25,000,000 for purchase in Canada of Canadian products during the period ended December 31, 1919.

[Mr. Lavigueur.]

The total advances including contracts entered into and still unpaid amount to $8,119,347.86.

The Greek Government are to deposit debentures of the Kingdom of Greece payable in dollars and maturing five years from the respective dates.

These bills will carry interest at 5½ per cent payable June 30 and December 31 in each year. So far two debentures have been deposited, No. 1 for $565,157.92, dated September 30, 1919, and No. 2 for $763,948.81, dated October 31, 1919. The first interest under the agreement amounting to $7,834.79 was due December 31, 1919, and has been collected by the Canadian Mission in London. The next payment of interest covering interest on debenture No. 2 and subsequent debentures for the balance of the advances will be due June 30, 1920.

(d) Belgium. Under agreement dated March 31, 1919, the Dominion Government agreed to make advances up to $25,000,000 for purchase in Canada of Canadian products during the period ended December 31, 1919. The total advances including contracts entered into and still unpaid amount to $1,735,634.58. The Belgian Government are to deliver debentures payable five years after date in dollars for the total amount of the advances, which bills are to carry interest at 5½ per cent, to be paid when the bills mature. There is a further proviso that the Belgian Government has a right to pay these bills at any time after receipt by them of compensation from the enemy powers. The necessary debentures have been deposited in London to the order of the Minister of Finance.

(e) Roumania. Under agreement dated April 18, 1919, the Dominion Government agreed to make advances up to $25,000,000 for purchase in Canada of Canadian products during the period ended December 31, 1919. The total advances including contracts entered into and still unpaid amount to $22,542,223.76. The Roumanian minister in London deposited in the Bank of Montreal, London, to the order of the Minister of Finance, a bond for $25,000,000. A statement of the advances made including interest from the date of the advance to the end of the month is sent forward and the Bank of Montreal endorses on the bond the total amount of such account. As soon as all payments have been completed the Roumanian Ministry will furnish five year dollar debentures dated from the date of each statement referred to above, and carrying interest at 5½ per cent, payable June 30 and December 31. It is expected that pay-

ments will be completed and the bond exchanged for the necessary dollar debentures before June 30, and if so, the first interest period will be as of that date.

FREIGHT CAR SITUATION.

*Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. How many cars belonging to Canadian railways are now in the United States?
2. How many cars belonging to the United States railways are now in Canada?

Hon. J. D. REID:

1. Up to March 1, 1920, the following Canadian railway cars were on American railways: Box cars, 42,347; auto cars, 3,502; refrigerator cars, 883; open top cars, 5,781; stock cars, 1,751; flat cars, 4,428; other cars, 1,024. Total, 59,716.

2. Up to March 1, 1920, the followingUnited States railway cars were on Canadian lines: Box cars, 24,151; auto cars, 1,380; refrigerator cars, 1,388; open top cars, 11,934; stock cars, 187; flat cars, 1,454; other cars, 138. Totol, 40,632.

Mr. FIELDING: Does that mean the Canadian National Railways only, or all Canadian railways?

Mr. J. D. REID: All railways in Canada.

INVERNESS RAILWAY.

Mr. CHISHOLM:

1. Has the Inverness railway been purchased by the Government?
2. If so, what was the price paid for the property?
3. If not, did the Government make an effort to buy the road?
4. What was the amount of such offer and to whom was it made?
5. Did such party or parties to whom this offer was made express a willingness to accept such offer?
6. If so, why did not the Government complete the negotiations and take the propetry over?
7. Is it the intention of the Government to continue such negotiations or do they intend to expropriate the property?

Hon. J. D. REID:

1. No.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. Yes.
4. The committee representing the bondholders urged that the Government take over the railway as a feeder for the Canadian National Railway system, the transfer to be made on a basis similar to that on which certain branch lines in New Brunswick had been taken over. That on this basis, it was agreed that the price be $150,000 for 60.91 miles of railway, and 4.6 miles of siding, exclusive of the company's pier at Port Hastings; the rolling stock and equipment of the line to be paid for on a price to be agreed upon between the committee and the Board of Directors of the Canadian National Railways, but such price not to exceed $175,000. Supplies on hand were to be taken over at a valuation to be made by the president of the Canadian National Railways.
5. Yes.
6. Negotiations are still pending and the Government hope to complete on the basis agreed to.
7. Answered by No. 6.

CHARLEVOIX-MONTMORENCY LIGHTHOUSE KEEPERS.

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. How many lighthouse keepers are there in the county of Charlevoix-Montmorency?
2. What are their names?
3. Where do they reside?
4. When were they appointed?
5. What are their actual salaries?
6. Have salaries been increased since appointment?
7. If not, why?
8. If so, when, and to what extent?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. Ten.
2. Wilbrod Savard, Delphis Bouchard, Henri Audet, Hector Tremblay, Eucharest Pedneault, Polycarpe Cimon, Chas. Tremblay, Ferdinand Filion, Gaudiose Paré, Joseph Deblois.
3. St. Simeon; at lightstation, (Cape Salmon); at lightstation, (Cap aux Oies); Les Eboulements, Ile aux Coudres, Baie St. Paul, Baie St. Paul, at lightstation, (Cap Brulé); Ste. Anne de Beaupre, Ste. Anne de Beaupre.
4. Wilbrod Savard, June 1, 1919; D. Bouchard, May 1, 1916; H. Audet, Dec. 4, 1917; H. Tremblay, April 1, 1914; E. Pedneault, May 1, 1912; P. Cimon, July 13, 1912; C. Tremblay, April 1, 1916; F. Filion, March 15, 1912; G. Paré, July 8, 1912; J. Deblois, July 13, 1912.
5. W. Savard, $105 per annum; D. Bouchard, $1,335 per annum; H. Audet, $475 per annum; H. Tremblay, $100 per annum; E. Pedneault, $100 per annum; P. Cimon, $120 per annum; C. Tremblay, $645 per annum; F. Filion, $820 per annum; G. Paré, $120 per annum; J. Deblois, $120 per annum.
6. W. Savard, no; D. Bouchard, yes; H. Audet, yes; H. Tremblay, yes; E. Pedneault, yes; P. Cimon, yes; C. Tremblay, yes; F. Filion, yes; G. Paré, yes; J. Deblois, yes.
7. W. Savard: less than one year of service.

8. D. Bouchard: from $880, on appointment by annual increments to $955; by Order in Council 5th November, 1919, (P. C. 15/2229) to $1,335; H. Audet: from $345, on appointment by annual increments to $360, by Order in Council, 5th November, 1919, (P.C. 15/2229) to $475; H. Tremblay: from $80 an appointment by annual increments to $100; E. Pedneault: from $80 on appointment by annual increments to $100; P. Cimon: from $100 on appointment by annual increments to $120; C. Tremblay: from $320 on appointment by annual increments to $425, by Order in Council 5th November 1919, (P.C. 15/2229) to $645. (Station raised one class in the Classification of Lights by O.C. 7th October, 1919, (P.C. 63-2100); F. Filion: from $520 on appointment by annual increments to $600, by Order in Council 5th November, 1919, (P.C. 15/2229) to $820; G. Paré: from $100 on appointment by annual increments to $120; J. Deblois: from $100 on appointment by annual increments to $120. Lightkeepers D. Bouchard and F. Filion benefited during the fiscal year 1918-19 by the extra temporary allowances provided for full time keepers to the extent of $180 and $120 per annum respectively.

POSTMASTER AT ASBESTOS.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. Who is the present postmaster at Asbestos, county of Richmond and Wolfe, province of Quebec?
2. When was he appointed?
3. Upon whose recommendation?
4. If no postmaster has been appointed, has any one been recommended for the position?
5. If so, who was recommended, and who made the recommendation?
6. Did the former postmaster resign, or was he dismissed?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL: There is no permanent postmaster for Asbestos at the present time; the late postmaster having died on the 17th December, 1919. The question of the appointment of his successor is now before the Civil Service Commission.

PARLIAMENT BUILDING DOOR CONTRACT.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. From whom did the contractors of the new Parliament Building purchase the doors which are used in the said building?
2. Where and by whom were the said doors manufactured?
3. What is the cost of each of the said doors?

Hon. J. D. REID:

1 and 2. Henry Morgan & Co., who submitted the lowest tender. The doors were manufactured in Montreal.

[Mr. Ballantyne.]

3. There are 38 types of door, and the average cost of each door with frame, jamb, transom, trim, etc., complete, is $72.20.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. ETHIER:

1. How many conscripts have been sentenced by virtue of the Conscription Act?
2. How many of these have been fined?
3. How many have been sentenced to imprisonment?
4. How many have paid their fines?
5. How many have served their sentence?
6. In what district were said conscripts sentenced?
7. What are their names, addresses and occupations?
8. To whom were the fines paid?

Mr. FRIPP:

1. How many persons have been discharged from the Government Printing Bureau and Department of Public Printing and Stationery from 1st January, 1919, to 1st March, 1920?
2. Upon whose recommendation and report were dismissals made?
3. Did the King's Printer or Assistant King's Printer recommend the persons to be dismissed?
4. Was the report of dismissal in writing?
5. What qualifications had the person or persons who investigated the respective cases for dismissal, what investigation was made by them, and are their conclusions reduced to writing?

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. How many postmasters are there in the county of Charlevoix-Montmorency?
2. What are their names?
3. Where is their residence?
4. When were they appointed?
5. What is their actual salary?
6. Was it ever increased since they were appointed?
7. If not, why?
8. If so, when, and to what extent?

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. How many mail carriers are there in the county of Charlevoix-Montmorency?
2. What are their names?
3. Where is their residence?
4. When were they appointed?
5. What is their actual salary?
6. Was it ever increased since they were appointed?
7. If not, why?
8. If so, when, and to what extent?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. What was the total amount of commission charges paid to brokers and agents in connection with the last Victory Loan?
2. What amounts have been paid to each of the said brokers and agents?
3. Have any of the said commission charges not yet been paid?
4. If so, whose accounts are they, and for what reason have they not been paid?

Mr. MACKIE:

1. How many dismissals of civil servants have been made in the cities of the Dominion of Canada since the 1st of January, 1915?

2. How many appointments have taken place or have been made of civil servants in the cities of the Dominion of Canada since January, 1915?

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. What amount of money has been expended by the Government during the years 1918-19-20 in providing seed grain for settlers in the Lethbridge and Calgary land districts respectively?

2. What amount of money has been expended by the Government as its share of the freight charges in providing feed for live stock in Southern Alberta in the years 1918-19-20?

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. DEVLIN:

For a return showing the total amount of Canadian securities previously held in Great Britain, and sold to the United States, with the amount of interest now payable by this Dominion to the United States to replace amount formerly paid to Great Britain. Also a copy of all correspondence relating to this matter.

Mr. CASGRAIN:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, documents, petitions, reports, received by the Department of Railways and Canals and Canadian National Railways and the correspondence exchanged between this Department and different persons and public bodies in reference to the curtailing of the railway service along the new line of the Quebec and Saguenay Railway between Quebec and Murray Bay since the 1st of November, 1919.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

For a return giving a list of the lawyers from the province of Quebec who acted: (a) as public representatives; (b) military representatives; (c) in the office of the registrars; and (d) in the office of the Central Appeal Judge, during the administration of the Military Service Act, showing the amount paid to each of the said lawyers.

Mr. SAVARD:

For a copy of all correspondence relating to the appointment of the Postmaster at Metabetchouan, Quebec.

Mr. SAVARD:

For a copy of all correspondence relating to the public cross-road between Ste.-Catherine and Tadousac.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

For a copy of the contract between the Government of Canada or the Canadian Wheat Board and Greece, for 12,000,000 bushels of wheat.

Mr. CHISHOLM:

For a copy of all telegrams, petitions, letters and documents of all kinds sent to the Post Office Department referring in any way to the mail route and mail service between Mabou, N.S., and Whycocomagh, N.S.

DOMINION MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION.

Mr. EMMANUEL B. DEVLIN (Wright): moved:

For a copy of all correspondence between the Dominion Government or any member thereof and the Dominion Manufacturers Association or any manufacturer, relating to appeals from the Supreme or other courts in regard to validity of certain Dominion or Provincial Acts and Provincial Licenses whereby the Dominion Government undertook to give financial aid to said manufacturers for said appeals, as shown in the Financial Times, Montreal, of the 21st February, 1920.

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY: I have no objection to producing the papers if there are any, but I have a strong impression that there are none in reference to the subject matter of this motion.

Motion agreed to.

LORD JELLICOE'S VISIT.

Mr. PIERRE FRANCOIS CASGRAIN (Charlevoix-Montmorency) moved:

For a copy of all papers, documents, telegrams, correspondence, and report or reports, made, had or exchanged between the Government of Canada and Lord Jellicoe.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: The Government has no correspondence nor documents in regard to Lord Jellicoe's visit to Canada.

Motion dropped.

HIGH COST OF NECESSARIES—FUEL, ETC.

Mr. JOHN H. BURNHAM (Peterborough West) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, whereas the rise in the price of necessaries is leaving many of the people of Canada in a desperate condition, and whereas the fuel question has become an acute one in many parts of the country, it is desirable that the Government select a time for a full discussion of these matters to the end that the people may be protected and served and peace and order be continued.

He said: Mr. Speaker, those of the members who are accustomed to go to church—and I have no doubt that some of them—

Mr. BUREAU: Why doubt?

Mr. BURNHAM: —will realize that it is necessary on the part of the speaker to speak to his text, and on the part of the congregation to give him some attention.

Mr. BUREAU: That all depends on the speaker.

Mr. BURNHAM: While I am getting ready to descant on food and other necessaries which form the subject matter of this resolution, I will give hon. members something to think of on the fuel side of the question which was very well comprised in a letter which I received to-day from a large structural steel company in Toronto, namely Messrs. McGregor and McIntyre, Limited, Mr. McIntyre being the writer of the letter, in which he says:

Dear Sir,—I have read with much interest your notice of motion in connection with the rise in price of necessaries, particularly in connection with the fuel question. May I, therefore, bring to your attention the action of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association in authorizing the appointment of a special committee, of whch the writer is a member? This committee is to investigate the possibilty of using Canadian coal for the whole of Canada.

There are several phases of this fuel situation which I am sure need not be brought to your attention. However, you will recall the experience Canada had during the middle and latter period of the war, but more especially would I draw your attention to the serious coal miners' strike in the United States last year, which at one time promised to create a more serious situation for Canada than during any part of the war period. The conditions were so grave that even the United States Government did not appear to be fully in control of the situation. The special feature in this strike was that Canada had nothing whatever to say in adjusting the strike one way or the other, but particularly was Ontario solely dependent upon that part of the United States affected by the strike for our supply of coal.

You will also have noticed on several occasions in the newspapers that a suggested threat was made since that time to retaliate provided Canada would not supply the United States to their satisfaction with pulp and paper. I will not go further into the whole situation other than to quote an extract from the "Industrial News Survey," published by the National Industrial Conference Board, 15 Beacon street, Boston, Mass., for week ending March 1, 1920:

"Wages and Hourse of Labour.—Anthracite miners' convention has voted to demand 60 per cent wage increase for contract miners and $2 a day increase, six-hour day and five-day week, for day-workers; about 170,000 men are affected; present agreement dates from May, 1916, and expires March 31, 1920; supplemental agreements have adjusted wages to war conditions; operators are to meet March 9 to discuss a new agreement."

This will at once bring very forcibly before the Canadian people the further seriousness of depending upon the United States for supply of coal. I will now try to outline in short what our committee hopes to accomplish:

As you, no doubt, are well aware of the enormous coal resources in Western Canada, particularly in the province of Alberta, where it is stated that twelve per cent of the supply of the known coal of the world is in that province, and also that every kind of coal necessary for the fuel supply of our country is to be had, from any kind of domestic to any kind of steam coal, including the very finest coking coal in the world. Also Nova Scotia has a supply; of this area I am not at all familiar.

I suppose he means, "With this area I am not at all familiar."

The solution of our fuel situation would appear to the writer to be a matter of transportation, and the Government now owns two transcontinental railways.

I will enclose a copy of a resolution passed by the Edmonton Board of Trade at a special meeting held to deal with the coal situation. As a result of their co-operation with our committee in Toronto, this resolution will give you an outline of what I think is most practicable.

[Mr. Burnham.]

May I, in closing, offer you the co-operation of our committee in any scheme that will assist in this section of your motion, also may I ask in return your co-operation with us in our scheme. Thanking you in advance,

Yours very truly,

R. L. McIntyre.

The resolution referred to in the letter is as follows:

Report of Coal Section of Edmonton Board of Trade or Chamber of Commerce on the matter of Coal Production in Alberta for use in the Province of Ontario.

Inasmuch as the Canadian Manufacturers' Association from their head office in Toronto and Montreal are considering the advisability of seeking coal supply from Western Canada, and have appointed a committee to investigate the resources, development and qualities of coal in Western Canada; and the cost of transporting coal to the Province of Ontario giving as some of their reasons and objects, the following:—

1. Whereas Ontario is not possessed of any coal deposits, and is therefore dependent upon a supply of its fuel coming from a foreign country over which the Ontario consumers and the Government of Canada have no control; and,

Whereas the industrial life of Ontario is largely dependent upon the good will of the American people for its supply of coal; and,

Whereas there is always the possibility of the United States being so situated that its whole supply of coal might be required to insure its own protection; and

2. Whereas the Government railways in Canada, particularly the Canadian National, and the Grand Trunk Pacific which apparently the Government contemplates operating, are nearly faced with heavy deficits which arise through lack of sufficient traffic to assure a profitable conduct of their business; and

3. Whereas the Province of Alberta is possessed of unlimited quantities of all varieties of coal suitable for Ontario's needs; and,

4. Whereas Alberta is a large market for Ontario manufacturers, and that this market will best be maintained and consolidated through the correct methods of commerce being applied, namely, by selling to Ontario as well as buying from them; and

5. Whereas Canada is largely indebted to the United States through the development of our own resources and industries, with the result that the time seems to be approaching when we will only be able to purchase from the United States for cash.

Therefore, it is in the best interest of Canada that the Dominion Government, and the Government of the Province of Alberta should co-operate to help bring about the desired condition of making Canada independent of any foreign country in its fuel supply, and thus retain for the development of Canada the means of exchange which comes about through using our own coal, and thus stimulating every branch of industry through the good results which would follow, which may be summed up in a variety of ways:

First: Relieving Canada of a large portion of the annual deficit of the railways.

Second: The building up of an industry in the province of Alberta which would be a large consumer of Canadian made goods, and

Lastly: By having the foresight to assure a supply of fuel for all of Canada, so that in-

dustries of Ontario would not at any time be in danger of competition, or otherwise, of having their factories closed through inability to obtain coal.

They suggest that the freight rates from any mine in Alberta to any point in Ontario should be equalized with the freight rate prevailing from the mines in the States to the point of consumption in Ontario. For example, if the freight rate from any mine in Pennsylvania to any point in Ontario is $5.40 per ton, then the same freight rate should apply from any point in Alberta; in addition that the freight rate from Alberta might also bear the duties and exchange charge, which would go to help out the railways. In other words, the freight rate from Alberta to Ontario to be on an equality with all charges assessed against the American coal, and

Inasmuch as according to estimates carefully made and generally accepted, Alberta contains approximately one twelfth of the world's known supply; and that according to figures submitted by the Mines Branch of the Alberta Provincial Government, the mines of this province are now developed to produce approximately ten million tons of coal per year in the following tonnages: Anthracite, one hundred and fifty thousand tons; bituminous, four million tons; domestic coal, five million tons, and

Inasmuch as the development could and would be rapidly increased to meet enormous additional needs to almost any extent whatever in any or all of the three grades of coal available, and

Inasmuch as the operating of coal mines in Alberta up to and including the present time is hazardous and usually unprofitable as evidenced by the fact that approximately sixty coal mining companies cease to operate during each year on account of insufficient market, and, because the increase in market would enable the coal mine operators in Western Canada to make enormous increase in their development, insuring labour a more nearly constant employment, and at the same time reducing the cost of mining in this province, as well as stabilizing the industry generally. All of which would bring an enormous amount of money into Western Canada.

And for many other good and sufficient reasons too numerous to enumerate at this time be it therefore resolved that this Edmonton Board of Trade or Chamber of Commerce goes on record favouring a most thorough inquiry into the cost of transportation of coal in railway cars to Ontario, as well as by lake and rail; and pledging ourselves to assist the Canadian Manufacturers' Association in every way possible to secure necessary information to lay before our Federal Government on this matter with a view to enlarging the markets for Canadian coal in Canada, as well as benefiting Canada as a whole; and also be it resolved that this board through its organization pledges itself to endeavour to secure the co-operation of the Provincial Government in this endeavour, and that the president appoint a strong committee to present a copy of this resolution to the Premier of the province, and ask his assistance along all necessary lines in order that a definite conclusion may be arrived at; and every effort be put forth to secure the Ontario market for Alberta coal.

Respectfully submitted,
(Signed) C. G. SHELDON,
Chairman Coal Section.

Edmonton, Alta., Feb. 14, 1920.

21½

I think, Mr. Speaker, I am safe in saying that the foregoing is an excellent presentation of the whole situation in Canada, and of the possibilities in the future provided the railway situation can be accommodated to the requirements outlined in that report. It has been a source of grave anxiety to the Canadian people, but especially to the people of Ontario, that at any time they may find themselves in the appalling position of having no coal. They have very little wood (their alcoholic energy is as yet quite limited)—altogether insufficient for the supply of heat, and as a consequence, unless the coal situation is solved, we may encounter the severest difficulties at any moment. This would not only be a serious matter for the people from the domestic standpoint, but might result in the demoralization of our railway transportation, and Ontario might probably cease to be a fit place to live in, to say nothing of its continuing to be a manufacturing centre. This condition of affairs, Mr. Speaker, is by no means exaggerated. All those public bodies that have taken the matter into consideration—and I assure you Sir, that they are numerous—have come to the same conclusion; and private individuals who are interested in the questions of this kind are aware that what is here set out is perfectly correct. They realize that Ontario is in danger of a coal famine, and all the horrors incident to a fuel famine, and this is a disaster that may be imminent. It is therefore of prime necessity that we should consider this question in all its bearings now. Heretofore people simply threw up their hands, and impotently asked: "What are we going to do?"

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is offered by the Alberta people a very fair solution of the question with regard to coal, and I purpose also to introduce the matter of industrial alcohol, which, as I ventured to intimate the other day, has undoubtedly appealed to the eastern world, at any rate, as a source of all forms of energy including heat of course. Lest the people generally, who are so concerned in Ontario about alcohol, should step in the way and oppose any legislation having to do with that product, I wrote to the Prime Minister of the province at Toronto and asked him if we might consider the question of alcohol for Ontario. I live in Ontario and represent a constituency there; and whilst, of course, I am deeply concerned in the welfare of Canada and, for that matter, the world at large, still I am more particularly interested about the welfare of Ontario. The Prime Minister,

Hon. Mr. Drury, in a letter dated February 24, wrote:

> I am in receipt of your letter of the 21st instant, in which you ask whether the manufacture of alcohol for mechanical purposes is to be permitted in Ontario in the future. I am not aware that this is a matter on which the provincial legislature has any control or jurisdiction. So far as my advice goes, the matter is entirely within the purview of the Parliament of Canada.

A very large source of alcohol lies in grain —corn, potatoes, etc.—and the alcohol thus produced is the drinkable liquor, which constitutes by far the greater portion of all alcohol used for industrial purposes. At the present time it is shipped to Ottawa to be denatured: That is to say, it is so poisoned as to be unfit for drinking purposes. In other words, it is methylated. Having been rendered unfit as potable liquor it is despatched to the various users who employ it as they see fit. Heretofore industrial alcohol has been so expensive in the production as to have been practically out of the question. Its universality, of course, at once appeals to the whole industrial world, and industrial chemists everywhere have been bending their energies to find some solution of the difficulty with regard to price. This difficulty decreased with the rise in the price of the rival of alcohol, namely gasoline. It was found possible in the course of time to manufacture industrial alcohol at a price that put it on a par with gasolene; and now, owing to the scarcity of gasolene and its consequent high price, alcohol has come into the market. The price of alcohol has been going down, while the cost of gasolene has been going up. Alcohol will really be the source of energy of the future, and the National Council of Industrial Research has consequently appealed to the Government to effect, if possible, an increase in the natural sources of alcohol, such as corn, potatoes, etc. It is not necessary that these products should be all of the highest quality, but they must be that from which can be secured all the alcohol, and therefore all the energy, we need, without fear of exhaustion. So long as there is seed-time and harvest, so long will there be a source of alcohol and a source of energy which we can utilize. While this may have seemed for a time largely fanciful, it is now well within the realm of practicability. We know this on the authority of our scientific men, who are the only persons that are really capable of expressing an opinion on the subject. And in Canada, which at last has reached that stage of civilization in which the people are able to appreciate that form of organized or systematized knowledge, known as science, we are prepared at least to investigate, and probably to adopt, in very many particulars, the recommendations of scientific men.

They have control of heating; they have control of industry, they have suggested means to us now for increasing our power over nature and our resistance to climatic change as well as our ability to generate domestic heat. These things being so it is only for us to open our mind and receive the information which is now of a certain and undebatable character so that we may make use of it. And let me say, Mr. Speaker, that it does not do for the members of Parliament of Canada at any time to shrug their shoulders and wait for somebody else, or some other body, to take up these questions, because it is from the Parliament of Canada that the people expect all advances in this particular. The people of Canada expect that Parliament will look after their public affairs and rescue them from anarchy, scarcity, deficiency and weakness of every kind. It is therefore our duty to take advantage of the advice of experts and to see to it that we place in an organized way before the people all means of energy for their use, especially such forms of energy as are practically within our reach at the present time.

The struggle for existence is such that it never really changes. It is always a struggle for enough to eat, for sufficient clothing, for a place to live, and for those general requirements with which we are familiar. What is the function of Government? All the authorities, and there are many, clearly indicate that the function of government is to protect the individual—to protect the liberties of the individual from the encroachments of one another, and of the State, and to so guide and order the affairs of the people that they will all co-ordinate and reciprocate to the end that there will not be confusion, strife, discontent or suffering.

The idea that a government should keep the balance between the taxes collected from the people and the amount paid in, and that was all they had to do, is, in a country as large as Canada, entirely erroneous. It might do in some small country, or in some country where they have not reached that stage of ambition which would prompt them to greater effort, intellectually and otherwise. What is it that has made France great? Her chemistry. What is it that made Germany once great? Her chemistry and chemistry only. What is that is making England great? Her chemistry. We see

from day to day how she is advancing in that particular; and some of the most interesting articles in English books and English magazines are upon the fact that whilst their chemists and people discovered ways and means greatly to the profit of humanity, they had neither the brains nor the energy to develop them. They were picked up by Germany, and other countries, and made use of; and England, instead of benefiting, suffered in the long run. Great Britain has given that up. She has turned her attention to the use of those things that have been invented and discovered for her advantage. It is unnecessary to point to the United States in that particular. From one end of that country to the other they are throbbing with intelligence; they are throbbing with energy; they are seeking for every known means of bettering what we may call at large the physical condition of the world and their own people.

It behooves us to advance in that way; and I say that you will look in vain on the Order Paper for many years to find much which bears on questions which we are now about to consider. There are people who will say that the high cost of living should be left to take care of itself. Well, we find that such a state of affairs is absolutely impossible, unless we say at the same time that anarchy may run riot in the country, There must be a balance, an equilibrium in the country or you cannot have contentment, you cannot have satisfaction, you cannot have reasonable comfort, you cannot have progress. You will have what you are on the verge of having in this country, an upheaval; and I say that if we have discord, that if we have discontent, if we have disturbances in the country, it is largely the fault of this Parliament in that it has given no great intelligent consideration to the questions which stare it directly in the face.

We are supposed to control transportation; we are supposed to control all the adjuncts of transportation; we suppose ourselves to have reached that advanced stage in which we enable one part of the country to trade with another, working men to reach their work, and labour to secure work. They say there is plenty of labour in the country, plenty of work. Well then surely it must be the fault of the people who are administering the affairs of the country if labour cannot get to work and work is out of reach of labour. This happens in a great many cases because, of course, as we are all aware, it is a matter of serious expense on the part of labour to get to its work. Therefore it is for us to take an intelligent consideration of these matters and to remember above all not to bring forward weekly budgets from a Ministry of Labour that absolutely fail to tally with the week's earnings of the wage earner. It is a matter of the simplest possible logic that when the weekly budget amounts to a sum—mind you of necessaries, and really not all the necessaries but as a matter of fact less than two-thirds of the necessaries —in excess, and considerably in excess, of the weekly earnings of the average wage earner there can be no escape from discontent, anger and disturbance. People are very much inclined, especially those who have reached a certain stage of comfort and luxury, to wave off all these troubles as if they were necessary troubles arising from the struggle for existence, and to take the view, as the free-trader says, that they will settle themselves. Of course they will settle themselves. If a man is in trouble and if he becomes desperate he will settle the question by going out and snatching what he wants from somebody else. The questions will settle themselves, the problems will find solution, but such a solution as no civilized society could endorse or endure. Now when we have reached the very apex of the situation, when the high cost of living is so high that it is beyond all bounds, when it has nothing whatever to do, as at present, with the old time-worn doctrine of supply and demand,—when there may be a great supply and corresponding great demand, or a greater supply and a less demand, or vice versa,—it makes no difference, the cost of living mounts, the struggle for existence becomes more frightful, until at last every man who considers the question at all must ask himself: What will be the result?

The labouring men of this country will in the end solve the question for themselves if we do not solve it. There is a certain class of people not up to what we call the standard mechanic or the regular wage-earner, people who depend upon the precarious supply of unskilled labour—for example, the ordinary digger. If the winter is hard he has little to do, and the harder the winter the less he has to do, but the more it costs him to live. In a country sensibly managed such people should have every means afforded them of earning their livelihood and enjoying reasonable comfort, and not be condemned to a miserable existence because we are too lazy or too selfish or unchristianized and have not brains enough for the proper conduct of the ordinary affairs of life.

Christianity, the great ideal of the people as it was originally preached, is applicable first and foremost to the poor. But who in the wide world has tried to monopolize it, to dictate about it and to patronize it? The rich. God forbid that the rich should try to get into Heaven, for they will find it more difficult of entry than even the Scriptures have said! Their selfishness, their active hostility to the great body of the people, their hostility to any consideration of reason in the treatment of affairs will bring its revenge upon them; Nemesis awaits them, and it will be some satisfaction to see what it does with them ultimately.

In a word, we have a country with boundless resources, we have a people energetic, ambitious, well-intentioned, and desirous of getting on, but with no great power of settling their own affairs. That power rests largely with Capital and with those men who undertake to represent the people in houses of parliament. And if those people to whom I have last referred do not show consideration for the mass of the people, what can there be but discontent and dissatisfaction and an uprising of the people to seize the reins of power, to seize those resources which lie near at hand and which would satisfy all their wants and give them that labour which they are willing to expend in the satisfaction of such wants, but which they cannot afford under present conditions.

We talk of protection, which is a most admirable form when we speak of it as self-control. My hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) shakes his head, but if he is to be a consistent Free Trader his motto must be: Let the Devil take the hindmost. There is absolutely no qualification of Free Trade, no qualification of free competition, no opposition whatever to the importation of Chinese labour, no possibility of regulation. Oh, I have read Adam Smith, Ricardo, John Stuart Mill, and his father James Mill; I know them all word for word. You cannot fool me. Their idea was to take the bonds off industry, to let industry go free. And what happened? Of course, Capital in a short time had complete mastery of the situation, and the people became as nothing. Our friend John Bright was perfectly willing to see men, women and children working fifteen hours a day.

Mr. McMASTER: Mr Speaker, I want to correct my hon. and learned friend, because that is the second time he has repeated that slander against John Bright. John Bright did not object to factory laws protecting children. My hon. friend should not make such a statement; it is not true.

Mr. BURNHAM: In the English House of Commons he voted against the laws for shortening the hours of labour.

Mr. McMASTER: Not the hours of labour for children.

Mr. BURNHAM: I say he did, and it was the greatest possible surprise to the people of England. When the member for Rochdale, as John Bright was, addressed the people of Birmingham, they were very much taken with his plea for lower prices of food. They said they could not understand, however, why he was so opposed to shorter hours of labour and opposed to the relief of children, at least, if not of women, from long working hours. But he himself had shares in the Rochdale factories, and he began to shiver and tremble lest this freedom of trade, carried too far, might interfere with his pocket. His humanity was academic; it was not real.

Protectionists above all things seek to control the affairs of the country, to put them on a reasonable basis, to make them like a reciprocating engine so that they will work harmoniously. Protectionists do not want any one class to control the country. They do not want the farmer to say: "I do not care a brass farthing for the manufacturer or the wage earner, I want to get my goods from the Chinese workmen if they are cheap enough." Much as I esteem the farmer, if he only knows it, that doctrine will mean finally the sale of his own soul.

I am a Protectionist because I have some consideration for the people. It is not the protection of the capitalist or even of the wage-earner that I care about. I am anxious to see our industries so controlled that all men can be made to fit in reasonably together and all people given a fair chance. Let us have fair play. It is idle to pick out instances in which protection has not been up to the mark. We all know that. We all know there are people in churches who pretend to be good, but who ought to be in gaol. We know there are people sheltering themselves under protection and advocating further measures for their own selfish interests.

The whole trouble arises because some of these gentlemen have not at all considered the case broadly and exhaustively. They are so anxious to have all difficulties cast aside, being perfectly willing to sacrifice the people if it will result in success to themselves. That is what Free Trade means, and that is what the people know it will result in if we do not put the brakes on

Humanity is of that kind; we are all the same. But public opinion as one great speaker remarked, is a universal brake.

While we individually in our own affairs are only too anxious to do what we can for ourselves, and would even stretch the matter too far, there are others who will not suffer that condition of things. It is, therefore, when the whole mass of the people come together and work together that the desired and proper level is attained. That is what public opinion, which is public thought, means; that is what public effort really means. These two things together are the greatest safeguard that we have so far as human endeavour is concerned.

I think that I have said enough to indicate the great necessity that there is for the consideration of this question at the present time and to indicate that in my humble opinion it is essential to the continuation of order and good government that we reconcile the earning power of the people with the amounts that they have to pay for the necessaries of life. There can be nothing but danger ahead if we do not. I know the people well enough to be able to say that if the logical and reasonable request which they make can from time to time be satisfied in a sensible and absolutely fair way, the people will rest content; they will go about their business; they will be a happy and industrious people. But if we fail to measure up to the standards which we set for ourselves,—that self-contained ways of doing things; in the last analysis, that selfish way of doing things—we can only expect that the people at large will learn their lesson from us, and just as the prohibitionist who uses force may expect in the end to have force used against him, so we may expect that the mass of the people will take these matters in their own hands, and that those who fail to read the signs of the times will wake up some fine morning to find that the times have got ahead of them.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, the question which the hon. member (Mr. Burnham) has dealt with so ably is one to which more importance, perhaps, should be attached than we have been in the habit of giving it. The hon. member has dealt with the question of fuel as bearing upon the cost of supplying the needs of the ordinary household. In the country from which I come we have an abundance of splendid fuel. In Ontario and perhaps further West there are thousands of people who have not readily available a plentiful supply of good fuel. The coal which we have in Nova Scotia is soft or bituminous coal. A great many of the people of this country do not want to use this coal; they desire the more luxurious article,—anthracite or hard coal. I suppose that hard coal may be used more conveniently than soft coal, and perhaps it is cleaner and less productive of dust and smoke. Well, I like a comfortable home as well as anybody, and I have been burning bituminous Nova Scotia coal in my house for the last thirty years, with the exception of one or two years when I used a few tons of hard coal. What I regard as good enough for my home would be fairly good, I think, for the average home in this country. Of course, in many cities and larger centres of Canada the houses are not equipped for the burning of soft coal, the furnaces being constructed to burn hard coal. It is worth while considering the advisability of having these furnaces changed and of installing furnaces which will burn soft coal. Thousands of people who have no furnaces depend upon the ordinary stove and the ordinary grate. For people of that class no fuel is more satisfactory than the good coal which we in Nova Scotia are able to produce.

Of course, it is all very well for me to talk about the people of Port Arthur and other places that are far from Nova Scotia using our bituminous coal; the question for the consumer is: Can I, at reasonable cost, get that coal delivered at my residence? The question, therefore, is largely one of transportation. How are we to get the coal from Nova Scotia to these different parts of the country where it is most needed? I have several times spoken in the House upon this question. The member for East Lambton (Mr. J. E. Armstrong) brought the matter up in an indirect way last year or the year before and thus gave us an opportunity of discussing it. Now, the only way of getting the coal of Nova Scotia as far west as Port Arthur, the extreme western limit of our inland navigable waters, is by developing the St. Lawrence route. I suggest to the Government, and particularly to the Minister of Railways and Acting Minister of Public Works (Hon. J. D. Reid) and the Minister of Trade and Commerce that in my judgment nothing calls more urgently for the expenditure of public money than the opening of the St. Lawrence trade route between Port Arthur and the Atlantic seaboard, so that coal may be loaded on a vessel at Sydney, North Sidney, Pictou or Parrsboro and conveyed to Port Arthur, and, of course, intermediate points,

by water. The return cargo can be made up of manufactured goods, fruit, meat, or whatever else the people along that route have to supply. The miners and steel workers of Nova Scotia would be delighted to obtain some of that excellent fruit which is produced in Ontario and for which, I understand, the market is not what it ought to be. It may be surprising to some to hear people from Nova Scotia speaking of getting food from anywhere else, as we have beautiful orchards and we raise large quantities of fruit in that province. That is quite so; but instead of the fruit that is raised in the Annapolis valley going to the eastern part of the province, it finds its way to the United States, only very little of it going to the eastern part of Nova Scotia. Therefore, a magnificent market is left open for fruit which could be cheaply carried from parts of Ontario to Cape Breton if we had navigation from the seacoast as I have stated. This is the point which I wish particularly to bring to the attention of the Government, namely, that we have coal in abundance, in almost inexhaustible supply, and of its kind as good as any coal that there is in the world, and the question is one of opening up a way by which we in the East can send our products to the far West as far as navigation is possible, and bring back to our province wheat, flour, meats, fruits and other products which a vessel could bring back after having carried a cargo of coal and steel to points in the West. We produce abundance of steel, and we are only, so to speak, picking up pebbles on the seacoast of what is forthcoming in Nova Scotia as regards the production of iron and steel. Millions of English capital are, I understand, about to be invested in those great industries, and it would be well that we be able to supply the raw material for the manufacture of farm implements and such other articles as require the use of iron and steel in their manufacture. We shall be able to furnish, of our own production within Canada and for our own people, those goods, if we have the proper facility for transportation as I have stated. The difficulty now is that by rail the distances are great, and the freight rates, although possibly reasonable, will, on account of the long distances, make the transportation of those goods prohibitive. My reason, therefore, for taking part in this discussion was to impress on the Government, and particularly on the Minister of Mines (Mr. Meighen), that the subject touched upon by the hon. member (Mr. Burnham) is far-reaching in its effect, and that the motion should not be passed as a perfunctory matter that has no bearing upon the development of this country and of our resources. I am very glad that the hon. member has brought this matter, even in this somewhat indefinite way, before the House. I do not quite agree with him that it is necessary to set any time apart for the discussion of the subject, because that would be almost like asking us to set a time apart to prove that two and two make four. The question is what will the Government do? How can public money be utilized in bringing about the condition which I have outlined and which everybody knows? The Department of Mines should and, I suppose, have information in regard to the available coal in the different provinces. I suppose it will be found in the report of that department how coal may be utilized, whether it is fit for domestic purposes, and the prices at which coal, providing there are proper facilities for bringing it to the points which I have mentioned, may be laid down at those points. Finally, I have in mind the necessity of this country being indepedent of any other country in the world in regard to fuel. We get a large quantity of fuel from across the line now, and we are neighbourly and good friends. But should anything happen by which troubles might arise and an embargo be placed upon fuel coming into Canada, we could be starved out or frozen out in less than ten days if we were entirely dependent upon that country and not equipped for the use of our own coal and not able to bring our own coal to the points where it is required. This is an important question, and this is the place and the time that hon. gentlemen should give such an important question due consideration.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Minister of the Interior): Mr. Speaker, the opening sentence of the resolution calls attention to the high cost of living and to the consequences thereof; but I observed, I am sorry to say only after the hon. member for Peterborough West (Mr. Burnham) had commenced his address, that the latter half emphasizes in particular the fuel situation in Canada and the need for a time being selected for its discussion in this House. The sources of fuel supply of this Dominion are indeed ample; they are prolific. Fuel, as at present consumed, consists mainly of coal; but coal is only one source of supply; oil is another; wood is another; peat is a fourth, and oil from our oil shale deposits may be said to be a fifth. I have

a little knowledge of one subject of fuel supply mentioned by the hon. member for Peterborough West, namely, alcohol. I would not be in a position to discuss how far we might rely upon that for the development of energy, other than human energy.

Mr. McMASTER: Only briefly.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The coal of the Dominion lies mainly in the extreme provinces. In the province represented in part by the hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie), there are, of course, huge deposits of the character of coal he describes. There are also deposits in the other Maritime Provinces; but the great central provinces of Ontario and Quebec are in the main bereft of that supply. In Western Canada, coal is found in Manitoba in considerable abundance, in Saskatchewan in greater abundance, and in Alberta in abundance so very great as to make that province one of the main sources of supply of the world. The province of British Columbia also contributes its quota, and no meagre quota either. It is fortunate that in those provinces and areas of Canada where coal and, in the main, wood are not to be found, and where oil appears only in very limited quantities, we have another source of supply as yet only partially developed, though developed in greater degree than does any other country in the world develop it, namely, water-power. When one says that all those coal deposits lie in the provinces that I have named, that does not get us much further in the way of reaching a solution of what is called the fuel problem of Canada. There are many who loosely think or say that, inasmuch as there lies in Alberta 12 per cent, it is said—I think the percentage is larger—of the reserve coal of the world, we there may immediately rely upon a great bank against which we can issue cheques for the discharge of the national debt of Canada, or even a bank against which we can call for the supply of the fuel needed to heat our homes. There are a lot of graver problems associated with this question than the mere existence of what is described as an inexhaustible source of supply in the bosom of mother earth. If one talks in those terms it would be correct, I suppose, to say that in most sections of farm land in Western Canada there lies the potentiality of a million dollars' worth of value for the good of the people of Canada. The value is there all right. The content of the soil is there, the sunlight and the rains fall upon the lands, and if human brain and human muscle are brought to bear and time does its work, then doubtless the wealth will come. The very same argument applies to our coal. There is in the province of Alberta alone, speaking from memory, 400,000 million tons of coal deposits, chiefly lignite, very largely bituminous, but with some anthracite, which, though not as hard as Pennsylvania anthracite, is claimed to have an oil content and other contents which make it a better fuel. But the fact is undisputed that the invested capital heretofore applied to the coal of that province has returned to the investor something like only one-eighth of one per cent of annual revenue. It has been charged against the policy of Canada dating back for decades that we have given these deposits away to speculators and others, but the fact of the matter is that up to the present hour the Dominion, as a Dominion, has not at all lost its fair share of the wealth of those deposits. It is true some of them have been fee alienated, but even in those cases a return has been secured, and I think a comparison between the position of the country on the one hand and the alienee or purchaser on the other would show that the country came off rather the better. The purchaser for the most part, though there may be exceptions, has secured very little at all on his capital invested, whereas the country has secured at all events the purchase price and the advantage of some development. Dating back I think to 1914, the alienation of natural resources ceased, except by means of leasing. A fee has not been given since that time, and the coal deposits, the same as other resources, have been let on rental terms and subject to royalty, both bringing in revenue to the Dominion, and subject to carefully devised regulations to protect the public interest so far as the best experts at our command could advise us how those interests could be protected. The difficulty is mainly that the market within transportation range of the coal pit is so limited that to turn out the coal on such a scale as would admit of cheap production is very difficult indeed. When we reach the day when that country will have developed and industries have become established there and population increased, the market will grow with the growth of the nation, and the output of coal will reach a scale where it will more easily compete in point of cost of production with coal fields in other lands.

Another factor in the situation is this: Western coal, and particularly Saskatchewan coal, is mainly a lignite deposit, and not of a nature that admits of much ex-

posure and transportation. Consequently, efforts have been made by this Government and by the previous Government to devise some scientific means whereby that lignite coal could be put in a form not only to be of use in competition with anthracite coal, but to admit of transportation the same as anthracite, and be made available for the consumers of Western Canada, who are now compelled to use mostly anthracite from Pennsylvania. A board was formed in co-operation with the provinces of Saskatchewan and Manitoba, and appropriations were made to that board, whose duty it was to engage in scientific research in order to devise carbonizing methods, and study the briquetting that follows the carbonizing, in order, if possible, to put the briquetting of lignite coal on a commercial basis where it might succeed. My information is that the results so far obtained by that joint board are very encouraging indeed. It is even intimated that private capital would be disposed now to attack the problem and possibly to relieve the Dominion of further financial obligations, but I have nothing definite to say in that regard. It is, however, a pleasure to me to intimate to Parliament that the members of that board are encouraged by the results so far attained, and hope to be able to reach results more complete which will make certain the commercial success of the briquetting process.

Mr. NESBITT: Has the minister any idea of the actual cost of transport of a ton of coal from Edmonton to Toronto?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have not definite information, but I rather think the actual cost of transport is now not less than the amount charged. I am inclined to think that the coal rates, generally speaking, are placed as low as they can be placed, unless it is to be assumed that coal must be carried at a loss.

Mr. NESBITT: Is it not a fact that the cost of freight and handling alone would be greater than what we have to pay now for bituminous coal on the other side?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think it is.

Mr. BURNHAM: Does that take into consideration water transport?

Mr. NESBITT: You have to have water transport for a certain distance.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I could not give the details, but I can assure the hon. member that all these subjects have been most carefully inquired into by those who would like to develop these mines and to reach the very market the hon. member has in mind. They are the most anxious people of all. There is no doubt in the world that the Edmonton Board of Trade would be delighted beyond measure if some means could be found that would reduce the cost of transportation, possibly at the expense of the Canadian National railways, to such a figure as would bring about a larger area of consumption for the coal of Alberta. We all would like the same thing, but these things must be put on a common sense business basis, and the efforts of the Mines Department are devoted to the finding of ways and means for putting the business on that basis in order that it may be made a success, on its own merits, and not at the expense of failure of some other national enterprise.

It is a fact that at the present time we import into this Dominion huge quantities of anthracite coal and, indeed, of bituminous coal as well. Our importations altogether from the United States last year amounted to $740,000,000. Of that sum, about $200,000,000 worth consisted of one article which I do not think it is necessary that I should mention at this moment; but $61,000,000 represented importations of coal.

Mr. BELAND: Seventy millions.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Sixty-one million dollars. Those are the figures given me by the Department of Trade and Commerce.

Mr. BELAND: I saw it given as $70,000,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is possible that the hon. gentleman saw the figures for another year terminating in another month. The figures given to me for the year 1919 by the department aggregate $61,000,000. However, if it were $70,000,000 my argument would be all the stronger. That is a stupendous sum, to save which it is worth making considerable sacrifice. It is noteworthy as well that while our consumption of coal has kept on increasing during the last few years, our consumption of imported coal has advanced far more rapidly than the consumption of domestic coal. I speak now from memory and am therefore subject to correction, but I think that in five years we have advanced in production of domestic coal from thirteen to fourteen million odd tons, while in the very same time there has been an advance in the use of imported coal from twenty-six to thirty-four million tons—a far greater advance in the consumption of imported coal than of domestic coal.

Mr. PARENT: In view of the figures cited by the minister, I should like to know if Canada would be in a position to supply its own market in the event of the United States Government prohibiting the exportation of coal from that country into Cnaada.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would be the last to admit that any action on the part of the United States would put us entirely off the map of the North American continent. We would have to meet the emergency, which I think is unlikely though not impossible; and in this connection I commend the prudence of the hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) in his assertion that we should guard against all such emergencies to the utmost of our power. The doctrine is a sound one and every Canadian should subscribe to it. But if the emergency suggested by the hon. member (Mr. Parent) did occur, while there would be hardship and suffering which would undoubtedly put us to our wits end and tax all our resources, we have the coal. Indeed, we have more than the coal; we have wood; and though it would cost a great deal, I do not think the time would be long before we should be able to meet even a disaster so great as the one in consideration. The question of transportation is of course relevant, and it is just because the coal of this country must be transported over distances so vast, our country being so extensive in proportion to the population, that this nation has gone to such colossal expenditures in the matter of transportation. We are now engaged in the enterprise of deepening the Welland canal to a twenty-five foot capacity. It is hoped that the St. Lawrence route will ultimately be made of the same capacity, and I should not like the word "ultimately" to be interpreted as being synonymous with "eternity." I trust it may be given a reasonable interpretation. It is not a matter of merely finding a method of using Dominion moneys to achieve this result; it is a matter of finding Dominion moneys to use for the purpose. The deepening of the Welland canal had to be deferred during the progress of the war, and just how far we shall be able to go in resuming operations is purely a matter of finance. It is not a question of desire nor one of the wisdom of the undertaking, because so long as the coal and grain and other huge resources of the Dominion must be transported east and west, so long is it clear that water transportation must be provided therefor.

Coming to other sources of fuel, I have briefly stated what is being done in the way of endeavouring to make available our softer coal deposits. I might go further and say that the transportation problem is being thoroughly studied in the department, whose officers are only too anxious that larger appropriations shall be made to enable them to go forward with this work, which is a question of money, too. I gave the figures of the coal deposits of Canada, and I think I referred to Alberta at the time. If so, my figures were wrong. The coal deposits of Canada are estimated at four hundred thousand million tons, and the peat deposits of Canada at nine thousand million tons, or two and a quarter per cent of the coal deposits. The coal deposits of this country would last for centuries for all the people whom the most optimistic of us could contemplate as likely to inhabit this land. The peat deposits would afford very considerable relief, though their development should also be put upon a commercial basis provided some process could be found to make them available. Some progress has been made along that line, but I fear it is not the most encouraging.

As to oil as a source of fuel—and this is a matter which is becoming of more and more importance as the years advance—we are still in a rather unfortunate position. I am not sure that I can give the figures correctly as to this, but I think we imported last year something like four hundred and fifty-one million gallons of oil, as against two hundred and thirty-odd million gallons five years ago—a tremendous advance in the oil importations of the country. Our own oil production during the same period increased from nine to ten million gallons; so that just two per cent of the oil consumed in Canada is produced at home. It is hoped by all that this condition of affairs will not last long. Oil is much more easily transported than coal, and there is every reason to hope, if not to believe, that we may see a very considerable oil discovery in this country. This Government, the previous government, and the government that preceded it —and particularly the last—offered considerable inducements to enable private enterprise to discover oil; and those of us who have given any thought to this question will not hesitate long to decide that private enterprise is the most likely agency to lead to mineral discovery; yea, to mineral development. Bounties have been, and are being paid, in oil production. Some ten years ago the minister of that day, under his powers granted him by Parliament, put

through an order whereby it was provided that in all oil leases issued thereafter a clause might be inserted protecting the lessee against royalty on his oil or gas up to 1930. That was done in order to induce to the utmost extent oil and gas prospecting in this country. All these efforts have resulted in, at least, a very great deal of prospecting and, as a consequence, the Dominion Treasury has benefited to a very considerable extent. I think if a comparison was made between the results to the Treasury on the one hand, and the results to the prospector on the other, the Dominion Treasury would be found to be the furthest ahead a long way. We have had a lot of money from oil leases, a great deal of money has come to the Treasury; but taking it all in all, and in the aggregate, not very much has come to the prospector. Believing that there was reason to expect better results in the near future, steps have recently been taken whereby that clause is no longer inserted in oil leases, and the Government will be empowered, as respects all leases issued after the change was made some months ago, to collect such royalty as may be deemed to be fair and reasonable in respect of oil and gas production. Also leases now held are being cancelled much more quickly than in past years, the object being to reduce as far as possible those within the exempted class and to bring them as far as possible within the non-exempted class, to the end that the State may conserve what may be deemed the rights of the whole people of Canada in respect of oil and gas deposits. But let it not be thought that this is a field where the State is likely to intervene as a commercial exploiter, and to succeed better than private enterprise. It seems to me that this field of activity is one where private enterprise will succeed most, and where the results will consequently be best for the State as well as best for the citizens of the State. So much for that.

As regards the source of oil from oil shales, not very great progress has yet been made. We have a number of officers who have given considerable attention to that work, and some investigation has taken place. It is our great desire that investigation be made more thorough and more expeditious. We have great oil shale deposits in New Brunswick, in Nova Scotia and in Alberta; I think, as well, there are some in Prince Edward Island. Of course the extracting of oil from oil shale is a much less agreeable way of getting it than merely watching it come through a pipe out of the earth. It will not likely be found that oil can be produced from oil shales in immediate competition with oil deposits in the bosom of the earth. Nevertheless it is of great value to the Dominion that those oil shales exist; and I think the time has come when we ought to try to spare the money, if we can, to investigate their possibilities. I take second place to none in the desire that the utmost progress be made as to coal, as to gas, as to oil, as to peat, as to every other source of fuel supply, to the end that this Dominion in that regard, as in all others, be to the utmost extent economically independent, and that we be to the least possible degree dependent upon the legislation, or the whim, of any other country. We cannot move too fast to that end, consistent with our financial capacity; and so far as my influence goes I intend to urge that these investigations proceed. I believe, however, that more has been done than is generally known to the people of Canada. Indeed one of the things that come under the notice of public men, and I am sure hon. gentlemen opposite have had the same experience, is this: It is very general to find an eager and honest desire for investigation and an impatience that all these things are not known; but those very men who express such impatience usually know themselves very little as to what actual investigation has gone and is going on. To my own knowledge services are being rendered by public officials, officers of departments and their branches—services rendered assiduously and efficiently and that possibly have been rendered for years. Nevertheless resolutions are received from public bodies, boards of trade and the like, demanding that something be done immediately to institute investigation into the very thing which has long been investigated, and thoroughly investigated, and in respect of which reports have been issued and findings made that the parties complaining have never even taken the trouble to refer to or read. I would commend to hon. gentlemen the desirability of communicating with the department in such matters. We will be only too ready to give the results of the inquiries that have been made by its scientific officers; and invite them further to stand behind any estimate that may be presented—estimates which are necessary and which will permit the officers of the department to achieve greater results more expeditiously, and more thoroughly.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: What objection is there to amend the regulations so as to permit the extraction of the oil from tar sand?

Mr. MEIGHEN: You cannot extract oil by regulation.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: You can get oil from tar sand but there is a restriction in the lease which prevents its extraction.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is a point which I would like the hon. gentleman to write me about. I do not know the exact point to which he refers but if his statement is correct there must be some good reason for the regulation.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: I endeavoured to get the department to permit the extraction of oil from tar sand but they refused.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I must remind hon. gentleman that the House is not in Committee and therefore questions cannot be promiscuously put at this stage.

Mr. A. R. McMASTER (Brome): I did not intend to take part in this debate and I propose that my entry into it shall be of very short duration. A remark dropped by the minister at the conclusion of his interesting remarks, however, gives me encouragement to bring up a matter which I think is of the utmost importance in connection with this and other allied possibilities. I would imagine that the work of the Dominion Government in connection with matters such as the one before the House this afternoon largely depends upon the success of the operations of the Geological Survey. That is, if the Geological Survey is in good working condition we may expect success, and if it is not in as good operation as it should be that success cannot be looked for. It has come to my attention that six months ago there were—and I speak subject to correction—about twenty-four qualified members of the Geological Survey, men whose reputation in Canada and on the Continent is of the highest, and my information is that a very substantial number—I think some six or eight— have in the last six months resigned from this very valuable service. No doubt the competition of mining and industrial companies to avail themselves of the expert knowledge of these men is responsible in no small degree for their leaving the public service to enter private employment. Nevertheless, according to the information which I have received, there is another reason for their resignation and it is that they have not been given the opportunity to carry out, as they would have desired, scientific investigations and to make known to the public the result of those investigations. These men, many of whom are scientists of the highest repute, have been for years induced to remain in the public service—not for the salary which they can obtain, because that was not commensurate with what they could gain elsewhere, but from the fact that they were doing valuable scientific work which would redound to the material interests of their country and to their own professional reputation.

Now, it has come to my knowledge that these men have not been given an opportunity of completing and making known to the world the results of the investigation which some of them have been conducting for many years. I place the matter before the minister, assuring him that I believe my information to be correct, and I would invite his careful attention to the matter at the earliest possible moment in order that an opportunity may be presented of dealing with the subject.

Mr. BURNHAM: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Before the hon. member addresses the House it is my duty to remind hon. members that he is exercising his right to close the debate. Therefore if any other hon. member wishes to speak he must do so now.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The motion calls for a time to be selected for the discussion, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact we have already fulfilled the purpose of the motion and discussed it.

Mr. BURNHAM: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the hon. minister to note that the day remains open. It would, in my opinion, give a very bad impression throughout the country to negative this resolution, because it can be passed, and to show the good-will of the House, without being brought to that severe concrete stage which might in view of the admirable statement given by the hon. minister embarrass him unnecessarily.

The object in discussing this question was, of course, to discover what condition Canada is in at the present moment with regard to fuel and the other necessaries of life. I touched generally upon those necessaries, because I did not think it incumbent upon me to carry about a pound of butter or a basket of eggs in order to impress hon. members with the details of what I meant. However, the subject dealt with by the minister has been exhaustively and satisfactorily handled by him, and therefore we may repose a measure of confidence upon the fact that the Government is doing all that it possibly can, even to

spending money in the interests of the people, in that respect.

Time and again people have asked me: What is the Government doing? The people did not know, and hon. members did not know; and, replying to the hon. minister, I may say that the ministry did not take the trouble to inform the House. The books and pamphlets which are issued from time to time in this respect convey a certain amount of information of a geological or mineralogical character, but without discussing economic questions in any satisfactory way. I wish to give to the National Council of Industrial Research the highest possible praise, their intentions are of the best, and they earn far more than the miserable pittance we give them.

I would therefore ask the minister to let this resolution go through in order that the people at large may be impressed with the idea that our minds are not closed to suggestions of progress.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have no objection to the motion going through, but I would suggest to the hon. member that the first portion of the resolution might be amended. Having secured discussion of the motion I thought it was the intention of the hon. member to withdraw it, as I see no purpose to be served by not taking that course. It does appear to me that it would not be good judgment on the part of this House to announce to the world that a large portion of the people of this country are in a "desperate condition." While of course we have our poor the same as other countries, I think we have a smaller proportion now, and undoubtedly fewer people are at present depending on charity, than ever before in the history of Canada, and certainly no more than in any other part of the world. Therefore, whatever opinions hon. members may entertain, I do not think it would be wise on the part of this House to propound to the world that our people are in a "desperate condition."

Mr. BURNHAM: I am perfectly willing to accept the hon. minister's suggestion and to let the resolution go through as he amends it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I move that the resolution be amended by striking out the first recital:

—whereas the rise in the price of necessaries is leaving many of the people of Canada in a desperate condition.

Amendment agreed to.

Resolution as amended agreed to.

[Mr. Burnham.]

A NATIONAL EIGHT-HOUR WORKING DAY.

Mr. J. H. BURNHAM (Peterborough) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that to the extent of the jurisdiction of this Parliament a national eight hour working day should be established immediately, subject only to the right of express private contract.

He said: Mr. Speaker, we might as well have a field day on labour questions while we are at it; they do not often adorn the journals of the House. This is a question of establishing what might be called in legal parlance a technical working day. I might illustrate what I mean by saying that if a suit were brought in court to recover wages for so many days, it would be understood that according to law those days would be composed of eight hours each, if not otherwise provided for in writing.

But it is, of course, always necessary that an individual should have the right of compromising, of altering the length of the day, or in some other way qualifying his control of the circumstances under which these contracts are usually given if he wishes. Therefore if a man should say: "I will work to-day fourteen hours or sixteen hours;" that would mean he would get two days' pay, or a proportionate amount of two days' pay. It throws the onus on the employer, instead of leaving it, as at the present time, upon the employee.

This change of onus is a very great advance, Mr. Speaker, and from what I hear I do not think that the employer would object to it at all, and I know that the employee is very desirous of having it brought about.

One of the contentions of the whole labour world is that it is best for labour, best for the human being, for the comfort and happiness of the people, best for industry, best for the quality of the work, that people should, as a rule, work eight hours a day—if necessary they may work longer on occasions, but eight hours should be the length of the working day. Industrial employers, I think, without exception, philanthropists and social reformers, labour itself—all agree that eight hours is the proper length of time for the standard working day.

We have lately assumed control of great railways. We are taking control of vast public works. We have territories in Canada outside the provinces over which the Dominion has exclusive jurisdiction. We

have, therefore, all the elements that will enable us to pass a statute reciting that after a certain date the working day shall be understood to be eight hours. That being the case, since the resolution calls for the exercise of our jurisdiction only—and that jurisdiction we have—steps should be taken to enact this legislation. It is advisable from all points of view that the working day should be stabilized and that there should not be what we might call the pulling and hauling that is going on now in different countries and in different parts of the same countries regarding the length of the working day. We may hope that when the western powers have established a reasonable working day, all the eastern powers will have regard to international interests by doing the same thing.

The greatest argument in favour of the adoption of the eight-hour day is the finding of the Peace Conference, if such we may call it, at Paris. At the Conference held in Switzerland and at the Conference lately held in Washington, which the President of the Council (Hon. Mr. Rowell) attended, it was agreed that eight hours was the proper working day. I do not understand, nor have I been able to gather, that we have made it a law in Canada that eight hours shall be considered, except by special provision or express private contract, to be the working day. There was a time, of course, when employers of various kinds took advantage of competition to require their employees to work unconscionable hours. That day has gone by. No employer wants such a thing now; no employer attempts to exact such a length of toil. Labour has become classified, as it were, and is not going about seeking what it may do to be saved and what might be for its benefit without having anybody to legislate for it or look after it. Having ceased, as I say, to be in that position, it now presents a united front, and its attitude is a reasonable one. It asks the employer to agree to a universal eight-hour day, and it asks the lawmakers of this country to crystallize that understanding into a statute. I fancy that it will be done, and we shall then have obtained the support, for the peace and good government of this country, of the great body of organized labour—a most reasonable body; a body which is seeking for the settlement of its affairs on a reasonable and logical basis. When these have been settled we may look for some degree of industrial peace and progress.

In connection with this whole industrial question, no charge of profiteering has been made against labour. Labour, except in a few individual instances, has made no attempt to indulge in profiteering; but the many cases of companies and individual employers who have been profiteers has excited the dismay of labour and the anger of all the consumers that I know. Therefore, when you come to examine the stand taken by labour in this particular and the aspirations of labour, surely you will realize that labour is entitled to every consideration. As I say, all these conferences have agreed that the demand is reasonable and that compliance with it would make for the prosperity, health and good government of the whole world. Surely, therefore, it is time for us in Canada, if we have not already done so, to say: Let eight hours be the understood legal national working day.

Mr. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wish to state very briefly the reasons why I consented to second the motion submitted by my hon. friend (Mr. Burnham). I hold in my hand a copy of Hansard of the second session of last year, which contains the statement of the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) and his report to the House of his activities as our chief representative at the Peace Conference. In that statement I find an account of the tentative agreement entered into with regard to improving the conditions for labour, and also a very clear statement that world-wide peace was largely dependent upon industrial and social peace within the bounds of each country, and that this industrial and social peace could best be brought about by instituting certain reforms which apparently were deemed by all to be necessary.

I shall not weary the House by making any lengthy remarks on the subject; I shall simply read one or two brief paragraphs from the statement officially presented to the House last September. The Prime Minister said:

> Side by side with the Covenant—

That is, the League of Nations.

> —stand the provisions of the Labour Convention. It was my privilege to attend the earlier meetings of the Commission which framed the articles on that subject now embodied in Part XIII of the Treaty. At one of these meetings the preamble of the Labour Convention was framed. It is as follows.

That preamble contains the following paragraph:

> And whereas conditions of labour exist involving such injustice, hardship and privation

to large numbers of people as to produce unrest so great that the peace and harmony of the world are imperilled;

That is a statement in which this House concurred, and in which I believe all the nations represented at the Peace Conference also concurred. It goes on:

An improvement of those conditions is urgently required; as, for example, by the regulation of the hours of work.

Surely we were serious a year ago when we, as a nation, proudly, I think, entered into this great League of Nations, became a party to it, took our place at the forefront of it. Indeed, Sir, our Prime Minister, if I remember rightly, presented to that Conference these very articles arrived at by the Labour Commission or committee. A little further on, it says:

Whereas also the failure of any nation to adopt humane conditions of labour is an obstacle in the way of other nations which desire to improve the conditions in their own countries.

And a little further on, it says also:

Holding as they do,—

That is, this particular portion of the Peace Conference, the Labour group.

—that labour should not be regarded merely as an article of commerce, they think that there are methods and principles for regulating labour conditions which all industrial communities should endeavour to apply, so far as their special circumstances will permit.

Then follow a series of nine specific articles citing what in their opinion should be the process of working out these improved conditions, and this series contains one article, No. 4, reading as follows:

The adoption of an eight-hours day of a forty-eight-hours week as the standard to be aimed at where it has not already been attained.

Upon this very important statement, presented to this House by the Prime Minister of Canada (Sir Robert Borden), the leader of the Government that I am now supporting, and arrived at at a conference which studied these problems from a world-wide as well as a national standpoint and at great length and in great detail, I propose to this House in support of the motion moved by the hon. member for Peterborough West (Mr. Burnham) that Canada should, by action of its Parliament, take the first national step, as I believe it would be, to bring into actual existence by law the intimation or suggestion made in this proposal at the Peace Conference.

I take another reason, and it is this, that it is common, ordinary justice. I believe that industrial peace, or the settlement of industrial disputes, will be arrived at more speedily and will be made more permanent by the introduction of the elements of justice into the consideration of these disputes than in any other way. Compromise is good; but a frank recognition by a nation of the elements of justice, so far as it is possible to ascertain them, will, I say, bring about permanent industrial and social peace within our boundaries more quickly, directly and effectively than in any other way, and I hold that the demand for an eight-hour day is a just and fair demand on the part of labour. I do not wish this House to infer that I stand behind the extreme demands of labour as they are made in some of their presentations; but there are some of their demands which have the elements of justice pre-eminently present, and I think we should hasten to accede to these.

Another point is this, that already a very large proportion of the great industries of Canada recognize and practise the eight-hour day as a standard day. Therefore, it would be infinitely better, in the interest of a stable industrial condition in Canada, that there should be a national standardized eight-hour day, so that in different parts of the country, manufacturing interests, for instance, would know that in estimating the cost of their products they would have to take into account a standard eight-hour day. Why, for instance, should a factory in British Columbia recognize an eight-hour day, having been forced to that perhaps by the organized strength of labour, and a factory in Quebec, or in the Maritime provinces, or in Ontario manufacturing the same article, recognize a nine or a ten-hour day? The immediate consequence of such a condition is that one manufacturer is undoubtedly handicapped to a greater or lesser degree. In any case it does not provide for those who are considering investment in industrial concerns any idea of the stability of the hours of labour and of what is commonly called the conditions of the labour market. Therefore, I say it would be fairer to all if we had a standardized day of labour for the whole of Canada rather than to have in one province an eight-hour day and in another a ten-hour day, and in another a nine-hour day, and so on.

In conclusion, let me say this, that the industrial condition of Canada is not by any means in a hopeless state. I look over the world to-day and I read with the utmost attention and interest the reports we are re-

ceiving from all quarters, and weighing these with the greatest care and discrimination, I feel that I am not boasting when I say that Canada is in a better condition than any other country as regards industrial and social conditions within its own boundaries. That being the case, I contend that it is strong evidence that we have made no mistake in treating labour with a generous hand, as we undoubtedly have done in Canada in comparison with other countries, and it warrants us in taking this forward step and establishing a standard eight-hour day in Canada. I shall, therefore, support the motion moved by the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham).

Mr. EDMOND PROULX (Prescott): Mr. Speaker, I am not in sympathy with my hon. friend (Mr. Stevens), because there is a danger of having too much governmental regulation. This question, I believe, can be left to employees and employers to settle. Labour unions are now very powerful; they can dictate their terms to their employers, and in certain industries if an eight-hour day is sufficiently long, I think they can manage to get their requests acceded to by their employers. In certain industries ten hours would not be harder than eight hours a day in others. Most of the industries which run night and day and which require three shifts, have adopted the eight-hour day; but where industries work only in the day time, eight hours would be a short day, and those industries could not produce the same quantities of goods in eight hours as they could in ten hours. Countries like Germany have maintained the ten-hour day, and Germany is producing more to-day than probably any of the allied countries. This question will also affect agricultural industry. Labour unions are satisfied that it should not be applied to agricultural industry or lumbering operations, but it cannot otherwise than affect agricultural industries. Farmers who live near a town or village will not be able to get their men to work ten hours a day when those men see others in the town or village working only eight hours, and we shall have diminished production. What we need is greater production, particularly in agriculture, and greater export if we are to stabilize the trade of this country. Decreasing the hours of labour will mean diminished production. Agriculture, like lumbering, is a seasonal occupation.

I think this is a question that can wait, and that can very well be dealt with by the employers and employees. It came before them at the Industrial Conference last September. The labour unions represented there were strong for the eight-hour day, but I think the majority of the employers were against it. I am sorry that all the labour unions in this country were not represented at that conference. There are some labour unions in the province of Quebec which are doing good work and have a large membership that were not represented at that Conference, and these unions are not in favour of the eight-hour day for all industries, although they favour it for certain industries. We have a great war debt, which has to be paid, and how are we going to pay it if we decrease production in this country and lessen the means of earning?

Mr. BURNHAM: There is nothing in this resolution which would prevent a man from working twenty-four hours a day if he wanted to. The eight-hour day simply means payment on that basis. If anybody wished to make an agreement to work longer than that, it would be quite open for him to do so.

Mr. PROULX: But if you make the eight-hour day the standard, you would not be able to get men in many industries to work longer than that, or you would have to pay them perhaps fifty or one hundred per cent more than the regular rate for overtime. I am not in favour of this resolution, and I hope the Government will not be in a hurry to present to this House any measure for standardizing the hours of labour in this country or adopting the eight-hour day.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE (East Edmonton): I desire to speak to this resolution more particularly on account of what took place in the dying hours of last session, when there was a great disturbance throughout the Dominion, and more particularly in the Western provinces. Having been solicitor for the United Mine Workers of Alberta for ten years, I was deluged at that time with letters and telegrams in connection with the trouble. I brought the matter before the ministers and asked what steps would be taken to meet the situation. The agitation at that time was for collective bargaining, but it also involved the question of wages and hours. I was advised by those in authority that collective bargaining was a provincial matter as it related to the question of wages and hours, and this Government would take no steps to meet the demands of the people who were agitating at that time. On

the contrary, federal assistance was given to the provincial police authorities in quelling some disturbances which had arisen through the demands which are now embodied, in principle, in this resolution. Subsequently, and during the recess, I was advised through the medium of the press that as the Covenant of the League of Nations and the Treaty of Peace contained references to working hours that might be adopted all over the world, the Federal Government was ascertaining from the Supreme Court of Canada whether it was competent to legislate along the lines which had been demanded at the last session. I am also advised through the press that this Government has jurisdiction in these matters, and I was therefore surprised that in the speech from the Throne a matter of such great importance to the welfare and stability of society in Canada was not referred to. One need give only a cursory study to the progress of labour matters in the Old Country as well as here to learn that labour has been exploited to the extent that in some cases it has sought a remedy by revolutionary methods. Fortunately those methods have not been adopted in Canada, for there has been a disposition on the part of the provincial and Federal governments to assist in every possible way. That very excellent piece of legislation, the Lemieux Act, passed by the late Liberal Government, has given great satisfaction all over this Dominion and has saved the people of this country from many difficulties. Now that we are engaged on reconstruction, which is the word that is used to describe what is going on all over this world, it is only right that this Government should take steps of its own initiative to see that labour is given that measure of consideration which it has been demanding. Rather than adopt this resolution I should like to have the Ministers of the Crown announce that they intend to introduce a Bill this session along the lines suggested in the resolution.

The hon. member for Prescott (Mr. Proulx) has expressed the fear that a reduction in the hours of the working day will mean diminished production. That is an argument that has been advanced in all countries by those who oppose legislation such as is being sought by the labour people in Canada to-day. I have here a book published by Mr. John R. Common, Professor of Political Economy at the University of Wisconsin, in collaboration with Mr. John B. Andrews, Secretary of the American Association for Labour Legislation, after a very careful study of labour conditions in America and elsewhere, and I find—page 202—the following statement:

> Aside from their weaker physique, the "long day" is especially onerous for women workers because of the double burden of domestic duties and wage work which many of them carry. Ordinarily, men can rest when their day's toil is over, but there are few working girls who do not have at least mending and laundering to do in the evenings, and many married women must take the entire care of their homes and children before and after work.
>
> Moreover,—

And this is in answer to the remark of my hon. friend opposite—

> Moreover, long hours do not necessarily make for the greatest economy and efficiency in production. It is sometimes argued that if hours are reduced output will decline proportionately. This might be true if human beings were mere machines and not living creatures who grow tired. But as a matter of fact the law of diminishing returns operates nowhere more strikingly than in regard to hours of labour. Studies of output before and after a shortening of hours show that where the human element enters into production, hour reductions by no means necessarily imply a decrease in output.

On motion of Mr. H. A. Mackie, the debate was adjourned.

At six o'clock the House adjourned, without question being put, pursuant to rule.

Thursday, March 11, 1920.

The House met at Three o'clock.

FRANCHISE ACT.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS AND THE ELECTORAL FRANCHISE BILL INTRODUCED BY HON. HUGH GUTHRIE.

Hon. HUGH GUTHRIE (Minister of Militia and Acting Solicitor General) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 12, respecting the Election of Members of the House of Commons and the Electoral Franchise.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might be permitted to explain briefly the Bill which I have just asked the leave of the House to introduce. The purpose of the Bill is threefold: In the first place, to fix a uniform franchise throughout the Dominion; in the second place, to provide a uniform method for the preparation of voters' lists; and, in the third place, to provide a simple and satisfactory method for the conduct of elections.

The franchise is to be established upon very broad principles. The only require-

ments will be those of British citizenship, residence in Canada for one year and in the particular constituency for two months, and the attainment of the age of twenty-one years; these requirements will apply in the case of male and female voters alike.

In regard to the preparation of voters' lists, the principle adopted is that the existing lists in any province which are authorized by law for use in provincial elections shall be utilized in Dominion elections, provided that they are not more than one year old, or that not longer than twelve months has elapsed between the completion of such lists and the issue of a writ for the Dominion election. Where such lists are not more than one year old they are to form the basis for the Dominion lists. In provinces where such lists exist they are adopted under the Bill; but power is given to add to such provincial lists names which should be added, and power also is given to take from such provincial lists the names of those persons which should be taken therefrom. That will provide an up-to-date list in all the provinces for use at a general election.

Where no such provincial lists exist the principle adopted by the Bill is, in urban municipalities, that of registration and, in rural municipalities, that of registration by way of enumeration. Urban municipalities are described in the Bill as cities, towns, and incorporated villages with populations of not less than 1,000. In such municipalities the principle of registration is very simple: All persons, male and female, will be required to register within the time prescribed by the Bill. When the registration period has expired appeals are permitted either by those whose names are not upon the lists, or against those whose names have been placed thereon. Those appeals in all provinces where there are what we know as County Judges are to those judges, who are appointed revising officers. In provinces where there are District Judges, as opposed to County Judges, the appeals are to the District Judges.

In rural municipalities the procedure is a little different. Where there are no provincial lists which can be utilized under the terms of the Bill a registrar is appointed to prepare the list. He makes an enumeration of the voters in the rural polling sub-divisions, notifying the community of the days during which he will act. When his list has been completed it must be returned to the proper officer. But in this case there is no revision or appeal, because there is a clause in the Bill which provides that any person who claims to be entitled to a vote, in a rural sub-division, and whose name has been omitted by the registrar, shall be entitled on polling day, on taking the prescribed election oath, to receive a ballot and cast his vote as any other elector is entitled to vote. It is therefore not necessary under this system to provide for any appeal or revision.

The machinery provided by the Bill for the conduct of elections does not differ very greatly from the machinery which has been utilized in this country during the past twenty-five or thirty years. A great many clauses of the old election law have been retained, some new ones have been added, and some have been incorporated from the English election law. I would call the attention of the House to the references which appear at the end of the various sections in the Bill. The Bill will be printed in a day or two and then distributed. These references relate to the Dominion Election Act of 1896, to the subsequent election Acts passed in this country, and also to the British Election Act. But when you see a reference to any of these Acts at the end of a section, it does not mean that that section has been copied verbatim into the new Act, because in a great many cases the old sections have had to be modified.

There are one or two innovations—I think they are innovations in this country. The Bill proposes to abolish the office of Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and to substitute an official to be known as the General Electoral Officer. The duties of the General Electoral Officer will be, generally speaking, to take charge of the election machinery and the conduct of elections in general throughout the Dominion. These duties will correspond to a large extent with those performed by the Dominion Returning Officer in the election of 1917.

Hon. Mr. BELAND: Will he be a permanent official?

Mr. GUTHRIE: The Bill provides that the General Electoral Officer of Canada shall be a parliamentary counsel of the House of Commons. He is to be a permanent officer. His tenure of office will be the same as that of a Superior Court Judge, and he can only be removed from office upon grounds similar to those upon which a Superior Court Judge can be removed. He will be in every way a permanent and independent officer.

There are other innovations, such as the provision for advance polls to enable railway employees, sailors, commercial travellers, and other persons whose usual business

takes them away from home from time to time to record their votes, the object of the provision being to give these classes of persons the right to vote notwithstanding their absence from the particular locality on polling day. That provision, I think, was in force during the election of 1917, but its terms have been somewhat elaborated in the new Bill. The period fixed between nomination day and polling day is fourteen days under the new law. I think I am correct in saying that as the Act is now drawn it will take about one month to carry out all preliminaries between the time when the registrars start to prepare their voters' lists and polling day.

When the Bill comes before the House on the second reading I hope to have an opportunity of making a more elaborate statement in regard to its provisions. Some of the methods proposed are quite new so far as Dominion elections are concerned, although all the systems, I think, which the Bill proposes have heretofore been adopted in some parts of Canada, and from the reports that have come to the Government's knowledge these provisions have worked exceedingly well. The Bill has been prepared with the idea of bringing about uniformity in all parts of Canada; of providing a simple, safe and expeditious method of compiling voters' lists; of providing generally as simple and expeditious election machinery as it is possible to provide. When hon. members have had an opportunity of reading, analysing and discussing the measures, I think they will come to the conclusion that the Bill has been prepared and is now offered to the House upon the foundation of equality and justice in every part of the Dominion.

Mr. W. D. EULER (North Waterloo): May I put a question to the hon. minister just to make one point perfectly clear? I understood him to state that the only requirement for the franchise under the proposed Bill is British citizenship. Will that restore the franchise to all citizens who were naturalized under the old naturalization law—which, I think, gave not British citizenship, but only Canadian citizenship? In other words, will the disabilities be removed that were imposed on citizens of foreign birth under the War-time Elections Act?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Any disability which takes place under the Naturalization Act will still continue. Any person who under the Naturalization Act is precluded from naturalization cannot vote under this Act, because he is not a British subject.

[Mr. Guthrie.]

Mr. EULER: Will people who were naturalized under the Act of 1914 and the Act prior to that be disfranchised under the proposed Act?

Mr. GUTHRIE: The only disfranchising clause in regard to naturalization is the provision which was in our former law: That no person should claim to be a British subject by reason of marriage or relationship with any other person. That provision is continued in the present Bill.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Leader of the Opposition): My hon. friend has said that the basis of the franchise under the proposed Act is citizenship. Is there any exception to that rule?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes, there is an exception which was provided under the Act of last session. It provides that where any person is disqualified by reason of race under the laws of any province from voting at any election in the province, the disqualification is continued for the purpose of Dominion elections.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I inquire when copies of the Bill will be available?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I expect that it will be printed in two or three days.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

REPORTS TABLED.

Annual report of Superintendent General of Indian Affairs; copies of Report of the Royal Commission on Indian Affairs for the Province of British Columbia.—Sir George Foster.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

EMBARGO ON CANADIAN CATTLE.

Mr. FOURNIER:

1. Is there an embargo on Canadian cattle exported to Great Britain?
2. If so, have any representations been made since January, 1918, to the Imperial Government asking for the repeal of such embargo?
3. If so, when were these representations made?
4. What is the nature of these representations, and what was the reply of the Imperial Government?

Hon. Mr. TOLMIE:

1. Yes. The legislation (United Kingdom) of 1896 prohibits the landing of cattle from all countries in the United Kingdom, except for purposes of immediate slaughter.

2. Yes. The representations, however, were of an informal nature and were not made through the usual official channels.

3. During the year 1919.

4. The representations for the removal of the embargo were made by Dr. Robertson and Mr. Arkell, the Live Stock Commissioner, through Colonel Amery, Parliamentary Secretary of the Colonial Office, and Lord Ernle, President of the Board of Agriculture. Both these gentlemen were seen on several occasions and the matter of the embargo discussed in detail. With Lord Ernle's approval, Dr. Robertson and Mr. Arkell conveyed similar representations to the Scottish Board of Agriculture; The Scottish and English Farmers Unions; the Scottish Chamber of Agriculture, The Agricultural Committee of the House of Commons, Special Committee of the London County Council and to several other important bodies in Scotland and in England, with the view of furnishing information which would enlist their support in Canada's position. The arguments used made reference to the health of Canadian cattle; to the fact that Canada regularly grows more cattle than she can finish; to the advantage which British feeders had previously obtained in feeding Canadian cattle; to the interests of British consumers in increasing the supply of fresh killed meat and to the very great importance of building up an Empire source of supply in competition with the control of the British meat trade which had already been secured by American packers.

The campaign which was carried on by Dr. Robertson and Mr. Arkell led to the matter being taken up in the Imperial Parliament. A question on several occasions was asked respecting the position of the Government. In substance the reply of the Government fully recognized that the embargo could no longer be continued against Canadian cattle on the grounds of disease but that, in consideration of the unsettled condition of British agriculture and the lack of confidence amongst feeders and breeders which would be created by removing the embargo, the Government regarded it as inadvisable to take any action in the matter. It may be added that, in personal conversation with Dr. Robertson and Mr. Arkell, Lord Ernle gave it as his considered opinion that, in view of the unsettled state of British agriculture following war conditions, it would be quite inopportune to take any action toward the removal of the embargo at the present time.

DOMINION NOTES IN UNITED STATES.

Mr. POWER:

1. Are the notes of the Dominion of Canada taken at their face value on Canadian-owned railroads over the portions situate in the United States?

2. What value is placed on the above notes when presented on American branch lines of the Grand Trunk Railway system?

Hon. J. D. REID:

1. Canadian National Railways accept Canadian funds at face value for transportation to or from points in Canada to points on system in United States.

2. Canadian currency is accepted at face value for tickets sold from points in United States to Canada on lines of Grand Trunk Railway system.

MR. G. M. PONTON.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. Is Mr. G. M. Ponton of the Canadian Trade Commission conducting an industrial survey of the Dominion?

2. Has he made a report?

3. If so, what is the nature of the report?

4. Is it the intention to continue this useful work?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1. Mr. G. M. Ponton left Ottawa January 17, to conduct a preliminary survey concerning matters affecting production and commerce in Western Canada. It was the intention of the Commission to continue the work throughout the Dominion. The original time allotted for this preliminary work in Western Canada extended to the middle of April but under instructions Mr. Ponton returned to Ottawa on March 2.

2. Mr. Ponton's report is in the course of preparation, and will be ready within the next fortnight.

3. The report will deal principally with recommendations for continuation of the work, as owing to time allotted being cut short the work planned could not be fully carried out.

4. Answer to this question must be delayed until Mr. Ponton's report is prepared.

MEDICAL OFFICERS AND NURSES.

*Mr. TOBIN:

1. How many medical officers and nurses were sent over to Europe after the 1st December, 1918?

2. What was their destination?

3. What work were they supposed to do?

Hon. Mr. GUTHRIE:

1. 20 Medical officers; 61 nursing sisters.

2. To report to the Director General of Medical Services, London, England.

3. They were asked for by the Overseas Minister as reinforcements to the Overseas Military Forces of Canada, and were employed in the hospitals during a severe epidemic of influenza; also on demobilization work.

PETERBOROUGH POSTMASTER.

Mr. BURNHAM:

Who has been appointed postmaster of Peterborough in succession to the late Mr. Edgar?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL: John E. Corkery, the Assistant Postmaster.

CAMPBELLTON-GASPE STEAMSHIP SERVICE.

Hon. Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure):

1. Does the Government intend to offer a subsidy this year for a steamship service between Campbelton, N.S., and Gaspé, Que.?

2. Since when has this service been discontinued?

3. Have any requests been received for the revival of the service this year?

4. Does the Government contemplate the subsidizing of a steamer service this year between Montreal and Quebec and Gaspé or Paspebiac, Que.?

5. Was there any steamer service at all last year between Montreal and Quebec and Gaspé and Campbellton and Gaspé?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1. No.

2. Since the close of navigation in 1917.

3. No.

4. Yes, the Gulf of St. Lawrence Shipping & Trading Co. of Quebec hold a contract for this service.

5. The Gulf of St. Lawrence Shipping & Trading Co. ran fortnightly trips last year between Montreal, Quebec, Gaspe and Paspebiac. There was no service to Campbellton.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAY—VESSELS.

*Mr. PARENT:

1. Has the Canadian National Railway at the present time twenty-four or any number of vessels plying in various routes?

2. If so, how and on what terms or conditions have said vessels been acquired by said Canadian National Railway and what is the name of each steamer?

3. Who is the present owner of each of said steamers or vessels?

4. What is the tonnage of each?

5. What port or ports is each one of them plying between?

Hon. J. D. REID:

1. Yes,—25.

2. Vessels are being operated as provided for by Order in Council passed June 2, 1919.

Name of Vessel.	Approx. D.W. Tonnage.	Trade Route.	Owner.
Canadian Voyageur	4,575	St. John-London.	
" Pioneer	8,408	Halifax-S. America.	
" Warrior	3,995	St. John-West Indies.	
" Ranger	8,382	St. John-Liverpool.	
" Recruit	3,964	Stranded account ice St. Lawrence.	
" Volunteer	4,485	Laid up at Quebec.	
" Trader	3,341	Halifax-West Indies.	
" Sailor	3,357	Halifax-West Indies.	
" Trooper	4,540	Halifax-London.	H.M. the King represented by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.
" Seigneur	8,391	Halifax-Liverpool.	
" Signaller	3,990	Halifax-West Indies.	
" Miller	8,390	Halifax-Liverpool.	
" Adventurer	3,408	Halifax-West Indies.	
" Gunner	3,990	Halifax-West Indies.	
" Aviator	5,100	Halifax-West Indies.	
" Sower	3,400	St. John-West Indies.	
" Navigator	4,575	St. John-London.	
" Settler	5,100	Halifax-Glasgow.	
" Spinner	8,393	Halifax-S. America.	
" Raider	5,100	Vancouver-Australia, N.Z.	
" Importer	8,390	Vancouver-Australia, N.Z.	
" Exporter	8,390	Vancouver-Australia, N.Z.	
Drummond	3,000	St. John-West Indies.	H.M. the King represented by the Minister of Railways and Canals.
Sheba	3,500	Halifax-West Indies.	
Makee	3,000	St. John-West Indies.	

3, 4, and 5. Answered by No. 2.

[Mr. Guthrie.]

SUPERINTENDENT OF SOREL SHIPYARD.

Mr. GERVAIS:

1. By whom has Mr. Jackson been replaced as superintendent of the Government shipyard at Sorel, and at what salary?

2. Has he a practical knowledge of the English and French languages?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. No permanent appointment has been made. Louis Lacouture is Acting Officer in Charge. Salary, $2,100 plus bonus $228 per annum.

2. Yes.

SHIPMENTS OF GOODS TO ROUMANIA THROUGH AMERICAN PORTS.

Mr. DUFF:

1. Are Canadian goods, purchased by Roumanians on the credit of the twenty-five million dollars, established by the Government, and destined for Roumania, still being shipped through an American port?

2. If so, why does not the Government insist that such goods, destined for Roumania, be forwarded through a Canadian port?

3. Will the Government give this important matter its most serious consideration?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Shipments to Roumania are being forwarded from Canadian ports. The total quantity shipped via Canadian ports has been 32,881 cubic tons, and via New York 2,850 tons. The traffic from Canadian ports has been handled in full ship loads. At the close of navigation last fall it was necessary to relieve the various manufacturers of their accumulation of goods packed ready for shipment, although this quantity was not nearly sufficient to make up a cargo. About 75 per cent of the material consisted of roofing, a comparatively low-priced commodity, which made the cost of storage, insurance and other charges prohibitive. There is no regular steamship service from Canadian ports to the Black sea, but the Furness-Withy company have a regular sailing from New York. In order to relieve the accumulation of goods in the manufacturers' stores, it was necessary to forward these goods through New York where they could be shipped without storage or insurance charges being incurred.

Meanwhile, the remainder of the goods to be shipped are being accumulated at Sydney and St. John, and as soon as there is a sufficient quantity to warrant chartering a vessel the remainder of the shipments will be made from these ports.

EXPORT OF HIDES TO UNITED STATES.

Mr. FOURNIER:

1. Has an Order in Council been passed by the Government preventing the exportation of hides to the United States?

2. If so, on what date was that Order in Council passed?

3. Since the passing of that order, how many manufacturers or exporters have obtained permits to ship hides to the United States?

4. What are the names of these favoured manufacturers and exporters of hides?

5. Under these special permits, how many carloads of hides have they exported up to date?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1. Yes.

2. On the recommendation of the War Trade Board June 13, 1918, and on the recommendation of the Cost of Living Commissioner August 2, 1919.

3. Under the War Trade Board order hides were first offered to the Canadian trade and after ten days if they were not absorbed in the domestic market licenses to export were granted. On January 1, 1919, the War Trade Board issued a general license covering the export of hides, but an embargo was reimposed on August 2, 1919, at the instance of the Cost of Living Commissioner. After a consultation with the Canadian tanners, hide dealers, and boot manufacturers, it was decided to grant permits on all applications.

4. There were no favoured exporters; all applications were treated alike and no one was discriminated against.

5. Since August 2 permits were issued covering the exportation of 631 cars of hides.

MAIL CARRIERS.

Mr. DESAULNIERS:

1. How many mail carriers were appointed in 1919, and what was the name of each person appointed, place of residence, date of appointment and salary?

2. What distance are they required to cover each day when delivering mail?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL: I should like to inquire of the hon. member whether, in using the words "mail carrier" he means letter carriers or mail contractors?

Question stands.

GROSSE ISLE PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. DECHENE:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to construct wharves at Grosse Isle this coming season, and extend same to deep water so that delay to ships may be prevented whilst inspection and disembarkation of passengers is being effected?

2. If so, what amount will be expended therefor, and when will construction be started?

Hon. J. D. REID: This information will be given when the Estimates are laid before Parliament.

Mr. DECHENE:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to make improvements to those buildings at the Quarantine Station in Grosse Isle which are intended for immigration purposes?
2. Will the hospital, the construction of which has been started, be completed in the coming summer?
3. Will the sheds, which at present serve to shelter immigrants, be replaced by more suitable buildings? If so, when will such improvements be started?

Hon. J. D. REID: This information will be given when the Estimates are laid before Parliament.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN.

Mr. McKENZIE:

1. How many officers are being retained in the service of the Militia Department at Headquarters at Ottawa who have not seen service overseas?
2. Give the names and positions and salaries, and length of time in the service, respectively.
3. Are returned men available for those positions?

SAAR VALLEY COMMISSION.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. C. W. PECK (Skeena): In view of the fact that a statement was made in the House by, I think, the Minister of Customs, that Mr. Waugh had been appointed to the Saar Valley Commission, I should like to know whether or not a returned soldier was available for that position, as a returned soldier would be particularly and peculiarly qualified to fill the position.

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Acting Prime Minister): The Saar Valley Commission is a body which is under the direction of the League of Nations, and the appointees are the appointees of the League of Nations. Certain countries have representation on that commission, the British Empire being one of those countries, and Mr. Waugh has been appointed as the representative of the British Empire on that commission. The Government of Canada was asked to name a fit and proper person as a member of the commission, and the Government gave the very best attention that it possibly could to the selection of the proper man in the time which it had at its disposal, for it was very pressing that this appointment should be made early. The names of a number of gentlemen were canvassed, and what we particularly wanted was to get a man of practical experience in municipal utilities and their working, and after the best consideration that could be given to the selection of a man of that kind who was available, Mr. Waugh was recommended to the position. Since that recommendation, I understand, though no official communication has been received—and it was not necessary that there should be—that he has been appointed as the chairman of the commission; that is, the chairmanship of the commission fell to the British Empire, and Mr. Waugh will take that position. Mr. Waugh was not in service himself across the seas, but he had two sons in service, one of whom, if I am correctly informed, met his death in battle; and whilst Mr. Waugh was not himself an actual soldier, he has thus a claim of high character in connection with war service.

OLIVER—ST. PAUL DE METIS RAILWAY.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. HENRY ARTHUR MACKIE (Edmonton East): I should like to ask the Minister of Railways when we may expect to have completed the Oliver-St. Paul de Metis railway, a portion of which is in my riding. A number of the farmers there drove their cattle to fields where there was feed, and now they want to utilize the road to get their cattle back. The road has been under construction since 1909.

Hon. J. D. REID: I could hardly catch what the hon. gentleman said. Does he ask when construction will be commenced on a road in his locality.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: When will the Oliver-St. Paul de Metis branch of the Canadian Northern, which has been under construction since 1909, be completed?

Mr. J. D. REID: I could not answer offhand, but I will make a note of the hon. gentleman's question and be able to answer him probably to-morrow or Monday.

Mr. SPEAKER: The fact that the answer to that question cannot be given offhand is evidence that it is one that ought to have been put on the Order Paper.

ADMIRAL JELLICOE'S REPORT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING: The Minister of Marine and Fisheries laid on the table of the House yesterday a copy of Admiral Jellicoe's report. Will copies be available for all the members?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: Ony a limited number of copies are now printed, and in the English language only; but to-morrow I will place before the House a motion,

which I hope will receive approval that a sufficient number be printed in both languages for every member of the House.

NOISE IN THE CHAMBER.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): I should like to call your attention, Sir, to the circumstances under which we are met at the present moment, and which are very disconcerting. I have been endeavouring for a number of years to practice the apostolic maxim or to follow the apostolic example and say to myself: "In whatsoever state I am, therewith I shall be content." But there has been, during the half hour we have been in session to-day a periodic knocking which has made it absolutely impossible for us at this end of the Chamber to follow the proceedings in the House. The Minister of Militia (Mr. Guthrie) is a very fine speaker, and when the knocking was not going on I could hear everything he said; but the knocking immediately took away my ability to hear him, and what was much worse than that, Sir, I could not follow you in prayer. May I suggest that in the few hours that we meet in the afternoon, the knocking so near the Chamber should not proceed?

Mr. SPEAKER: I might inform the hon. member as well as the House that the Speaker has not been spared more or less knocking whether the House was in session or not, in consequence of the inconvenience to hon. members of occupancy of the new building. I appreciate, however, the difficulty at the moment, and I will endeavour, if possible to have the workmen cease working so near the Chamber during sitting hours as to inconvenience hon. members.

LETTER CARRIERS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JOHN A. CURRIE (Simcoe North): I should like to ask a question of the representative of the Postmaster General in the House. There is a good deal of unrest amongst the letter carriers, and there are threats of a strike in the city of Toronto. I understand that some arrangement has been reached between the letter carriers and the Government, and that some delay has occurred in putting that arrangement into effect. Is there any possibility of anything being done to avert that strike and trouble such as we had a few year ago.

Hon. Mr. ROWELL: I assume that what my hon. friend refers to is the question of the classification going into effect with reference to the letter carriers. The Bill passed last session re reclassification of the Civil Service was to go into effect on the 1st of April, 1920. It was contended that it should have gone into effect a year earlier, and when the Bill was before the House, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean), who was in charge of it, stated that the question would receive further consideration at the hands of the Government and, if necessary, an amendment would be brought down this session making the change. It is the intention of the Government to submit an amendment at this session providing that reclassification shall go into effect from the 1st of April, 1919. I think that is the point upon which there is some complaint; but until the amendment is passed, I presume no compensation can be paid on the basis of it.

Mr. CURRIE: When will this legislation be introduced?

Mr. ROWELL: There are under consideration, I believe, certain other amendments to the Civil Service Act, and the view was that it was much better to have one Bill covering all the points than to introduce separate Bills dealing with separate matters, but the Bill will be brought down at the earliest possible moment.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAY COMPANY.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North and Victoria): I should like to ask the Minister of Railways (Mr. J. D. Reid) whether the National Railway Company, the organization of which was provided for by the National Railway Corporation Act, if I remember the title correctly, passed in 1918, has been formed, and if so, who are the officers. If nothing has been done in the matter as yet, when may we expect action to be taken under that legislation?

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways): No action has been taken in that direction as yet. We have been waiting until it was decided what action was to be taken in connection with the Grand Trunk Railway system, so that in forming the organization we could take into consideration all the railways that go to make up the National system.

UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PAPERS.

Mr. McMASTER:

For a copy of all correspondence, agreements and contracts, between the Government and any banks touching the payment of officers

and men in the Canadian Expeditionary Forces, especially as regards the rates of exchange prevailing between Canadian and British currency and the manner in which the same affected the pay of said officers and men, together with copies of all departmental or other Government orders or regulatioons dealing with the subject of soldiers' pay and the effect of fluctations of exchange thereon.

TREATY OF PEACE WITH BULGARIA.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTION AND SPEECH OF HON. N. W. ROWELL.

Hon. NEWTON W. ROWELL (President of the Privy Council) moved the following resolution:

Resolved by the House of Commons

That it is expedient that Parliament do approve of the Treaty of Peace between the Allied and Associated Powers and Bulgaria, signed at Neuilly-sur-Seine on the 27th day of November, one thousand nine hundred and nineteen, a copy of which has been laid before Parliament, and which was signed on behalf of His Majesty, acting for Canada, by the plenipotentiaries therein named, and that this House do approve of the same.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE: Are copies of the Treaty available?

Mr. ROWELL: Copies of the Treaty have been distributed. An order was given for the printing of it the second day the House was in session.

Mr. FIELDING: How have they been distributed?

Mr. ROWELL: Through the post office.

Mr. BUREAU: I never received a copy.

Mr. BELAND: Nor have I received mine.

Mr. ROWELL: A special order of the House was given for distribution of copies.

Mr. BUREAU: I have gone to the post office regularly but have not so far found a copy in the box.

Mr. DENIS: I for one have not received it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do I understand that hon. members desire to have the resolution stand?

Mr. BELAND: We do not object to a statement by the Minister.

Mr. ROWELL: Under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I will make a statement with reference to the Treaty, and if my hon. friends desire that discussion on it shall stand there will be no objection to this course. I assumed however, that hon. members had received copies of the Treaty.

[Mr. McMaster.]

The adoption of this Resolution involves:—

(1) The recognition of democratic control of foreign policy and that Canada should not be finally committed to important international engagements such as are embodied in this Treaty without the consent of Parliament.

(2) A recognition that in any war in which the British Empire is engaged and in which Canada has taken part is a matter of concern to the people of Canada; that the terms of the Treaty of Peace bringing such a war to an end are also a matter of concern to the people of Canada and that such a treaty should be ratified by His Majesty until it has been approved by Canada as of the five nations of the British Commonwealth.

(3) A reaffirmation by Parliament of its approval of the creation and maintenance of a League of Nations for the promotion of international co-operation and the achievement of international peace and security by the methods set forth in the Covenant of the League.

(4) A reaffirmation by Parliament of its approval of the Labour Clauses and of the creation and maintenance of the International Labour organization under its provisions.

(5) A reaffirmation by Parliament of its approval of the position and status accorded to Canada in the League of Nations and in the International Labour Organization and of its determination to maintain that status.

Dealing first with the terms of the Treaty, may I briefly point out to the House its main provisions, and say in passing that the general lines of the Treaty are similar to those contained in the Treaty of Peace with Germany which has already been approved by the House, and similar also to those embodied in the Treaty of Peace with Austria which was likewise approved by Parliament. These general lines were discussed and agreed upon when the Prime Minister and his colleagues were in Paris. The necessary adaptation of those general provisions to the situation in Bulgaria also came under consideration and review, and the Prime Minister was himself the Vice Chairman of the Commission of the Peace Conference on Greek claims, which gave special consideration to certain aspects of the territorial situation in the Balkans.

Part One, as in the German and Austrian treaties, incorporates the Covenant of the League of Nations. As in those cases, Bulgaria is not an original member, but may

be admitted when two-thirds of the assembly have consented. Hon. members will recall that under the covenant of the League of Nations none of the enemy countries are made members of the League, but they have the right to become members, under Article One of the covenant, upon a vote of the assembly and after compliance with certain conditions such as other nations, not members, are required to comply with.

Part Two defines the frontiers of Bulgaria, under which Bulgaria parts with most of the territory which, with the assistance of her then allies, Serbia and Greece, she won from Turkey in the war of 1912. Western Thrace, including the rich tobacco district of Xanthi and the Port of Dede-Agatch, is ceded to the Principal Allied and Associated Powers for future disposition; but in return these Powers undertake to ensure to Bulgaria commercial access to the Aegean Sea.

To the Serb-Croat-Slovene State she cedes the district of Stroumitsa, which experience has proved was too great a menace to the Serbian main railway to Salonika, while in the hands of a presumably hostile state. A further small rectification of the frontier is made in favour of Serbia on the west of Bulgaria in order that the Serbian town of Nish shall not be so exposed to the menace of the Dragoman Pass through the mountains. Roumania keeps the Southern Dodrudja which she seized when Bulgaria was at war with Serbia and Greece in 1913.

The territorial result is that both the Serb-Croat-Slovene State (Yugo-Slavia) and Roumania are more than treble the size of Bulgaria and have become Danubian or European States, while Greece, if she retains the territory now occupied by her in the smyrna region, will be more than twice as large as Bulgaria, and will have ceased to be a purely Balkan State. Henceforth that term would apply strictly only to Bulgaria and Albania.

The overlapping and confusion of races in the Balkan Peninsula is such that no line can conceivably be drawn by which each State would include all its nationals within its boundaries, while entirely excluding men of other races; nor is it practicable to pay much attention to Greek, Bulgarian and Serbian historical frontiers in a region where the tide of conquest ebbed and flowed during centuries prior to the absorption of the whole by the Turks. Consequently there are few districts which cannot be claimed on some grounds by at least two States and to satisfy them all would be a superhuman task even were the settlement not complicated by the fact that in the world war Bulgaria was on the losing, and Serbia, Roumania and Greece were on the winning side.

Mr. CANNON: Is there any provision about Macedonia?

Mr. ROWELL: There is no specific provision dealing with Macedonia.

Part III relates to various political adjustments. Bulgaria recognizes the Serb-Croat-Slovene State. She recognizes the other peace settlements concluded by the Allies and Associated Powers with the other enemy Powers. She undertakes to ensure full protection of life and liberty to all inhabitants of Bulgaria irrespective of birth, nationality, language, race or religion, and these guarantees are placed under the guarantee of the League of Nations. There is a provision also by which Greece agrees to afford protection to racial, religious or linguistic minorities.

Although at first recalcitrant Roumania, Serbia and Greece have now signed the Treaty with Bulgaria, (December 9th), thus concluding the Balkan settlement. Roumania and Serbia have also signed Treaties with the Allied and Associated Powers providing for the protection of minorities.

Part IV is a limitation of Bulgarian armaments. Universal compulsory military service is abolished and the voluntary system, with a twelve year period of service, is substituted. Bulgaria's total military forces are not to exceed 20,000 men. There are stringent provisions for the reduction of munition stores, guns, air craft and other armament, while the production of poison gases and liquids is forbidden. The manufacture of arms and munitions of war shall be carried on in a single factory under the ownership and control of the State. Bulgarian war ships are to be surrendered and Bulgaria may only maintain a few small boats for police and fishery duties on the Danube and the coast. Air craft and equipment are to be surrendered and no air forces are to be maintained in the future.

These disarmament provisions are to be carried out under the supervision of an Inter-Allied Commission of Control.

These provisions, providing for disarmament and limiting the strength of military forces are incorporated in the Treaty in pursuance of the policy set forth in the Covenant of the League of Nations for the reduction of armies and armaments. These reductions are imposed under the treaties on enemy countries but provision is made by

the Covenant of the League of Nations for the appointment of a commission to investigate the strength of the armies and armaments of countries which are members of the League and to make recommendations to those countries in reference to a reduction in the size of their armies.

Part V provides for the repatriation of prisoners of war and interned civilians who are Bulgarian nationals. An Inter-Allied Commission for inquiry and control is set up to search for non-repatriated Allied nationals, and for establishing the criminal acts punishable under the penalty provisions. Each side agrees to respect and maintain the graves of the soldiers and sailors buried in their respective territories.

Part VI binds Bulgaria to hand over persons accused of crimes in violation of the laws and customs of war, and to recognize the right of the Allies to bring such persons before military tribunals for trial and punishment.

Part VII provides for reparation by Bulgaria. She recognizes that by joining in the war of aggression waged by Germany and Austria she has caused the Allied Powers great losses and sacrifices for which she ought to make complete reparation. On the other hand the Allies recognize that her resources are not sufficient for this. Bulgaria agrees, therefore, to pay, and the Allies agree to accept, as being such reparation as Bulgaria is able to make, the sum of 2,250,000,000 francs in gold to be discharged by a series of half yearly payments with provision for the payment of interest and for a sinking fund. She also agrees to return to Greece, Roumania or Serbia the securities, records and other objects seized from the territories of those countries, and to these States she also undertakes to hand over large numbers of cattle, horses, mules and sheep in reparation for seizures made. In compensation for the destruction of Serbian coal mines by Bulgarian armies Bulgaria is to deliver to Serbia fifty thousand tons of coal a year for five years. To oversee the execution of these reparation provisions an Inter-Allied Commission, composed of three members appointed by the British Empire, France and Italy, is to be set up at Sophia. It is in the nature of a Sub-Commission to the Reparation Commission established under the German Treaty. It will have power to recommend to the Reparation Commission either a reduction or a postponement of the sums to be paid by Bulgaria if it finds that her resources and capacity to pay are inadequate.

Part VIII is concerned with the financial aspects of the settlement. It determines the priority of the charges for the cost of military occupation, for the service of the external pre-war Ottoman public debt, and for the costs of reparation. Provisions are made for the protection of allied nationals in respect of their pre-war financial dealings with Bulgaria or Bulgarian nationals with regard to state securities, private mortgages, etc.

These provisions relating to debts and financial matters are of special interest to Canada in view of the fact that there are a number of Bulgarian nationals living in Canada and there is a certain amount of enemy property in this country. The provisions of this clause are similar in their general terms to those contained in the treaties with Germany and Austria. The same may be said in regard to the clauses dealing with aerial navigation, wharves, docks and railways. Provision is made that the Danube shall be declared to be an international waterway and also for an international commission to govern it. The labour clauses of the Treaty are identical in their terms with those embodied in the Treaty with Germany and Austria.

The foregoing is a brief outline of the terms of this Treaty. To go back to the two groups of clauses in the Treaty which are of most immediate concern to Canada, I should like for a few minutes to speak in reference to the League of Nations and to the labour clauses of the Treaty.

First in reference to the League of Nations —and I mention this because of its relation to the question which is now before us of Canada's position and status under the treaty. Hon. members will recall that the League has two definite objectives: One is the promotion of international co-operation; the other is the establishment and maintenance of international peace and security. Four methods are proposed by which those two great objectives are to be secured. The first is an agreement by the nations not to resort to war—I shall not now go into the details of the provisions for attaining that object—but the agreement of the nations not to resort to war is, I venture to think, having regard to all the conditions, the most important feature of the Treaty. If any nation does resort to war in violation of its obligations, it immediately becomes at war with all other nations members to the League.

The second is what we might describe as the abolition of secret diplomacy. In the Treaty it is defined as "the prescription of open, just and honourable relations between nations." To secure that result it is pro-

vided that all treaties which are inconsistent with the terms of the Covenant must be modified or terminated without delay, and the nations parties to the Covenant agree that they will take such action in order to bring their international obligations into harmony with the terms of the Covenant. It is also provided that all treaties concluded in future must be filed or registered with the Secretary of the League, and such treaties are open to all the members of the League so that their contents may be known.

Mr. CANNON: Will the hon. minister permit me a question? Has this been done as far as the Anglo-Persian Treaty is concerned?

Mr. ROWELL: The Anglo-Persian Treaty was concluded before the League went into effect. But that Treaty must be brought into conformity with the terms of the Covenant, if it does not now actually conform to it. The Covenant provides for all cases of treaties concluded prior to its going into effect.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE: Do I understand the minister to say that the treaty-making power of Great Britain is now made subject to the approval of the League of Nations and, to that extent, the independence of Great Britain taken away?

Mr. ROWELL: I would not put it in that way, but rather that Great Britain binds herself, as do all the other nations parties to the League, not to enter into international obligations inconsistent with the provisions of the Covenant. All treaties when entered into must, as I said, be filed or registered with the Secretary-General of the League, and they do not become valid until they are so registered.

Mr. BUREAU: I understand that past treaties also must be registered with the Secretary of the League?

Mr. ROWELL: Yes, past treaties must be either rescinded or amended so as to bring them into conformity with the Covenant.

Then the third method for attaining the objects of the League is the establishment of the firm understandings of international law, as the rule of conduct among governments. In other words, just as in all civilized communities where law is administered individuals are governed by the rule of law in their relations one with another, the Covenant of the League provides that the firm understandings of international law shall be recognized by the nations parties to the League as binding upon them and as governing their conduct in relation to one another.

Then the fourth is the maintenance of respect for all treaty obligations. Mr. Speaker, hon. members will recall that at the outbreak of the war Germany laid down the principle that an international obligation should not be considered binding upon a nation longer than that nation considered it to be in its own selfish interest to so recognize it; when in the view of the nation it no longer served its purpose, it might repudiate, just as Germany repudiated her obligations under the treaty with Belgium. The principle that nations must respect their international obligations is embodied in this Covenant. The only way they can escape these obligations is by terminating the treaty in the manner provided in the treaty itself, or by a reconsideration of its terms under the provisions of the Covenant of the League.

Mr. BURNHAM: If it is regular, I wish to ask the hon. minister—at a somewhat inopportune juncture I admit—if the vote of Canada in the League of Nations is as part of the British Empire?

Mr. ROWELL: If my hon. friend has no objection I will come to that in due course and discuss it. I wish to deal with this in logical order.

Mr. CANNON: I would like to ask the minister if the reservations adopted by Switzerland when she decided to enter the League of Nations are not conflicting with the general principles just laid down and explained by him?

Mr. ROWELL: We have not yet received any official information as to the reservations adopted by Switzerland. I am therefore not in a position to give my hon. friend an answer to that question.

The organization of the League—and now I come to the question of the Council and the Assembly—consists of a Council, an Assembly, and a Secretariat. The Council, as hon. members will recall, is a body of nine, composed of the representatives of the five Great Powers, and four others representing the smaller powers, to be chosen by the Assembly when it meets. Pending the meeting of the Assembly the names are specified in the Treaty. As I now recall them they are Belgium, Brazil, Greece and Spain. When the Assembly meets it will be in a position to choose the four members who are to represent the members other than the five Great Powers.

The Assembly is composed of representatives of the members of the League. Each member of the League is entitled to send three delegates to the Assembly, but each member has only one vote. The Council will under normal conditions be the working body of the League. Its powers are set forth in the Covenant. It has all the powers of Assembly, with but few exceptions. It has the power to do the important work of the League.

The Assembly has all the powers of the Council, and it has also certain specified prerogatives. One of the most important is that of choosing the representatives on the Council of the powers other than the Great Powers. It must decide on the admission of new members to the League. Under certain conditions it has power upon reference from the Council, to investigate and pass upon matters originally referred to the Council

The actual working operations of the League are carried on by the Secretariat. That is, an international organization acting under the instructions of the Council carries on the work between the meetings of the Council and is the real working instrument of the League.

It is important to bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that except as otherwise expressly provided in the Treaty, all decisions of both the Council and the Assembly must be unanimous. The cases where unanimity is not required are relatively few. In other words, the great bulk of the work of the League can only be done if the members of the Council or the Assembly are unanimous. Some objection has been urged from some quarters to unanimity being required. The answer—which, I submit, is a good one—is that it is essential that public opinion should support this great international experiment, the greatest which the statesmen of the world have ever tried. After all, the success or failure of the League will depend upon the public opinion and the moral sentiment of the world. If public opinion and the moral sentiment of the world—the sentiment for justice, for peace and good international relations—are not sufficiently strong to back up the decisions of the Council and the Assembly, the League must fail, as other international experiments have failed. Therefore in the great majority of cases the decision must be unanimous.

I now come to the question of the status of Canada and the other self-governing dominions. I pointed out a moment ago that the Council was composed of representatives of the five great powers and of four others to be chosen by the Assembly. The question was raised overseas whether Canada and the other Dominions were entitled to be chosen as members of the Council, or whether by reason of their relation to Great Britain as part of the British Empire they were disqualified from being so chosen. A reading of the terms of the Covenant makes it perfectly clear, I should say, that they have exactly the same rights as all other members and are entitled to be chosen members of the Council.

Mr. FIELDING: Who raised the question? Who raised any doubt whatever about the matter, when a reading of the terms of the Covenant clearly shows that there is no question about it?

Mr. ROWELL: I understand that the question was raised in some quarters at Paris; I am not in a position at the moment to say who were the parties who raised it. But in order to prevent any misunderstanding so far as the great powers were concerned, the Prime Ministers of Great Britain and France and the President of the United States signed a statement, which was submitted to the House last session, in which they affirmed that that was their interpretation of the provisions of the Treaty and that it was clear that Canada and the other Dominions were entitled to be chosen among the nations to nominate members to the Council.

Mr. FIELDING: Eligible.

Mr. ROWELL: Yes, they are eligible.

Mr. BURNHAM: Shall we have that statement laid before the House?

Mr. ROWELL: It was laid before the House at the last session. My hon. friend will find it in the address made by the Secretary of State (Hon. Mr. Sifton) with regard to the Treaty.

Mr. CANNON: Is that document an official interpretation or simply a personal opinion?

Mr. ROWELL: It is the opinion—it could not be anything more—of the Prime Ministers of Great Britain and France and of the President of the United States. I assume that should any question arise in the Council with regard to the matter, the representatives of these nations would not depart from that interpretation. But my own view is the same as that of the member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), that on the reading of the Covenant itself it is clear that Canada and the other Dominions are eligible for election to the Council. The

statement to which I have referred is more for the purposes of confirmation than anything else.

Mr. W. D. EULER: If there were a difference of opinion, upon what authority would the interpretation finally depend? Could the matter be referred to any authority that had jurisdiction?

Mr. ROWELL: I assume that if a dispute arose the matter would finally be decided by the Council, unless it was referred to the Court of International Justice when constituted under the Treaty. But in this statement the Prime Ministers of Great Britain and France and the President of the United States say that the terms of the Covenant should receive a broad and generous interpretation in order that it may accomplish its obvious purpose, and that in their opinion no question could be raised on that point.

In reference to the Assembly, it is expressly provided that it shall be composed of representatives of the members of the League and as Canada and the other Dominions are members, there is no question about their right to vote in the Assembly, the question of our voting rights under Article 15 has been raised. Article 15 of the Covenant of the League provides as follows:

> If there should arise between members of the League any dispute likely to lead to a rupture, which is not submitted to arbitration in accordance with Article 13, the members of the League agree that they will submit the matter to the Council.

That is, for investigation and conciliation. Another clause of that same Article provides:

> The Council may in any case under this Article refer the dispute to the Assembly. The dispute shall be so referred at the request of either party to the dispute, provided that such request be made within fourteen days after the submission of the dispute to the Council.
>
> In any case referred to the Assembly, all the provisions of this Article and of Article 12 relating to the action and powers of the Council shall apply to the action and powers of the Assembly, provided that a report made by the Assembly, if concurred in by the representatives of those members of the League represented on the Council and of a majority of the other members of the League, exclusive in each case of the representatives of the parties to the dispute, shall have the same force as a report by the Council concurred in by all the members thereof other than the representatives of one or more of the parties to the dispute.

To illustrate, suppose a dispute should arise between any two nations. Simply in order to bring the point home, we will assume that the dispute is between the British Empire and the United States. If that dispute is of such a character that it is likely to lead to a rupture in international relations and is referred not to arbitration but to the Council for investigation and conciliation, then either party may ask that it be referred to the Assembly. If it is referred to the Assembly and the Assembly investigates the matter and reports upon it, that report, if concurred in by the members of the Council who are members of the Assembly and by a majority of the other members of the League has the same force and effect as if decided by the Council and concurred in by all the members of the Council, exclusive in each case of the parties to the dispute.

Two questions have been raised under this article. In case there is a dispute, to which any portion of the British Empire is a part, with any foreign country, could the other portions of the British Empire vote in the Assembly in such a case? The view of the Government, and it is the view of the Government of Great Britain also, is that no other portions of the British Empire could vote under those conditions, and the reason is simple. If it be a dispute likely to lead to a rupture, so long as we acknowledge allegiance to the same Sovereign as does Great Britain, as do the other portions of the Empire, then such a dispute is a matter of interest to all portions of the Empire.

Mr. BELAND: Then Canada has no discretion in such a case?

Mr. ROWELL: In a case like that, Canada would be a party interested and would not claim a right to vote.

Mr. BELAND: In the Assembly?

Mr. ROWELL: In the Assembly.

Mr. KING: And would not have the right?

Mr. ROWELL: And under the Treaty would not have the right to vote.

Mr. BELAND: That is what is contended in the United States.

Mr. ROWELL: That is contended, but there is no objection, and there never has been any objection on the part of the Government of Canada, nor on the part of the Government of Great Britain, to that contention. Lord Grey, in his letter, made that point perfectly clear, and I hope I have made it perfectly clear, so that there will be no misunderstanding about it.

Mr. BURNHAM: Does not that mean that the status of Canada is not the same

as that of any or every other member of the League?

Mr. ROWELL: No, I do not think that is the meaning at all. It simply means that Canada and the other dominions bear such a relation to Great Britain and to each other as nations of equal status in the British Empire under a common Sovereign, that a dispute likely to lead to a rupture which may result in war, is a matter in which all are interested. Therefore, by reason of being interested, they are not entitled to vote.

Mr. BURNHAM: Do I understand that that is not a matter of right, but a matter of good taste?

Mr. ROWELL: No, it is a matter of right, because, according to the Treaty, parties interested are not entitled to vote.

Mr. FIELDING: Canada being in the Assembly as a nation, independent of and separate from Great Britain, is not Canada an independent party?

Mr. ROWELL: Canada's position is as independent as Great Britain's but she is not independent of the British Empire, she is a part of the British Empire.

Mr. BELAND: In a case where Canada would be immediately interested, as, for instance, in the Alaskan boundary question, would Canada then be precluded from registering a vote through her representative in the Assembly of the League?

Mr. ROWELL: If a dispute of that particular character arose, and it were dealt with in that way, yes. The provisions of the treaty provide for arbitration, judicial determination and conciliation. If a matter is referred to arbitration, this provision does not apply at all, and all nations agree that matters suitable for arbitration must be referred to arbitration, and all agree to accept the award of the arbitrators. Therefore, if it be a proper subject for arbitration, this provision does not apply. It may be a matter for judicial determination when the International Court of Justice is established. If it be a matter for judicial determination, then this question does not arise. It arises only in the case of a question not suitable for either arbitration or judicial determination, where it is a question for conciliation which has been referred by the council to the Assembly for report.

Mr. CANNON: Do I understand the minister aright when I interpret his opinion as having the following effect, that Canada will have a vote or have something to say on all questions in which she is not directly interested as Canada nor a part of the British Empire, but that otherwise she will have nothing to say?

Mr. ROWELL: That is not the understanding.

Mr. BELAND: That is what it is.

Mr. ROWELL: Let us take one step at a time. If the matter be one for arbitration, then if Canada be concerned, she has full say in reference to the submission, the same as any other member. If the matter be one for judicial determination, she has exactly the same right of reference as any other country. If the matter be one for conciliation and if it be referred to the Assembly in the way I have mentioned, a report made by the Assembly with the majority I have indicated will have the same force and effect as a decision by the council concurred in by all the members except the parties to the dispute. What is the effect of a report of the Assembly under those conditions? Simply this, the report is published to the world, and the other nations bind themselves not to go to war with any nation which carries out the recommendations contained in that report. Dealing first with the Council. The dispute is investigated. If all parties, other than parties interested, reach a unanimous conclusion; they make a report and recommendation. All the nations bind themselves not to go to war with the nation that lives up to that report. That is the whole obligation. If that report is referred to the Assembly and the decision is concurred in by the members of the Assembly, who are members of the Council, and by a majority of the other members of the Assembly, then the report has the same effect and no more. In the great majority of cases, as I intimated in opening, the decision of both the Council and the Assembly must be unanimous; and Canada, as a member, if she dissents from the conclusion, by forcing her dissent, prevents the unanimity necessary to the Assembly reaching a decision on the point. In the same way in the Council, dissent by any one of the members prevents the unanimity necessary to the decision. Let me take a case which was raised last session as an illustration. If a dispute should arise and war should break out, and the Council, under the terms of the Covenant, meets to recommend what military forces should be used with a view to putting an end to that war and bringing about peace, the Council cannot make any recommendation except a unanimous one,

and any nation which might be called upon to make a contribution is made a member of the Council for the purpose of considering that matter. Therefore, if the question of military contribution should come up in reference to any country concerned, that country thereby becomes a member of the Council for considering that very matter. The Council could not reach a decision that the contribution should be made without the consent of that member. Therefore, the matter goes back to the principle I mentioned before, namely, that the League can only be effective if it carries the goodwill and hearty co-operation of its members.

Mr. BELAND: There is no provision in the Covenant that a member of the Assembly who is called into the Council for the purpose of discussing a certain matter shall have a vote.

Mr. ROWELL: They are made members of the Council for that purpose.

Mr. FIELDING: With the right to vote.

Mr. ROWELL: They have the right to vote. That has never been questioned.

Mr. BELAND: My hon. friend knows very well that that is not stipulated in the Covenant.

Mr. ROWELL: They are made members of the Council, and every member has the right to vote.

Mr. BELAND: The nine members have the right to vote.

Mr. ROWELL: The others too. That has never been questioned by any of the members of the League.

Mr. BELAND: But—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. I must remind hon. members that we are not now in Committee and arguments between hon. members cannot be permitted.

Mr. ROWELL: I would also draw my hon. friend's attention to this consideration. The British Government issued an official commentary on the terms of the Covenant. That commentary was prepared by General Smuts and Lord Robert Cecil. No two men would know better what was intended, for no two had a larger share in framing the Covenant, and they make the point I have mentioned perfectly clear in their commentary on the Covenant. So far as I am aware it has never been questioned by any of the nations parties to the League. Now if the dispute referred to the Assembly is one in which the British Empire is not a party, the various nations of the British Empire, as members of the League, have certainly the same voting rights as all other members.

Mr. CANNON: Is it not a fact that at Paris it was decided that the five great powers were always interested in questions of an international character? That is why the Council was formed, which decides practically everything. If that interpretation is to remain, would the minister mention a case of an international character in which the British Empire would not be interested?

Mr. ROWELL: The answer is that that is not the correct interpretation of the Covenant. In discussing the conditions of peace, the five great powers assumed the leadership and control. They considered themselves interested in everything, and therefore retained in their hands the final decision as to everything, but under the terms of the Covenant the great powers have no more interest in an international dispute in which they are not individually as nations involved, than have the smaller powers. They are members and no more.

Mr. CANNON: Would my hon. friend give me an example?

Mr. ROWELL: Take, for instance, a dispute between China and Japan. Japan is one of the great powers. She is interested; the others are not. In that case the others would not be precluded from voting. China and Japan would be the only nations precluded from voting.

Mr. BURNHAM: As regards the members of the British Empire I suppose their status is something like that contained in the Athanasian Creed—not three in one, but one in three.

Mr. ROWELL: That is not wholly the situation, but it may convey an idea of it to some hon. members.

Mr. FIELDING: Might not the British Empire be interested, in a given case, by reason of its alliance with Japan?

Mr. ROWELL: These questions as to who are and who are not interested must, I presume, be finally determined in some authoritative way, either by the Council itself or by the Court of International Justice when constituted, but the general understanding, as I have gathered from those who took part in the Conference and in framing the Covenant, as well as from all the literature on the question so far as I

have been able to peruse it is that "a party to the dispute" means that the nation itself must be involved. Let me illustrate it in another way. My hon. friend will recall that there is a proposed treaty between Great Britain, France and the United States for the defence of France against an aggressive attack by Germany. There are treaties between the United States and a number of Central and South American States. If a treaty between two nations such as those I have referred to is held to disqualify the parties to the treaty from any participation, it would greatly limit the number of those who could vote.

Mr. FIELDING: It would depend upon the nature of the treaty.

Mr. ROWELL: Quite so. One would be very foolish to express a dogmatic opinion offhand as to what the situation would be under any particular clause of the treaty. All that one can say is that all nations would be treated alike in that respect.

May I refer for a few minutes to the International Labour Organization, because what I have to say with respect to voting rights and status will apply to both organizations. The organization provided under the Treaty is (1) an International Labour Conference, (2) the Governing Body, and (3) the International Labour Office.

All the members of the League, by virtue of that membership, are members of the international labour organization. Each member is entitled to representation at the International Labour Conference by two Government delegates, and by one delegate representing the employers of the country, and one representing the employees. In this case the voting differs from the voting in the Assembly of the League. In voting in the Assembly there is only one vote per member. In the International Labour Conference all the delegates from each nation are entitled to vote. They may vote together or against each other, just as they see fit. At the International Labour Conference at Washington it was a very frequent occurrence for delegates representing the same nation to vote against each other. Particularly was that the case as between the employers' delegate and the workers' delegate on a number of questions that came up.

The question of representation in the governing body came up for consideration at the Peace Conference, and there was a direct conflict of opinion as to what should be done. In the original clause relating to the composition of the governing body, a provision was inserted that no high contracting party together with its self-governing dominions should be entitled to more than one representative on the governing body. If that clause had remained in the Treaty it would have cut down the rights of Canada and the other self-governing dominions as full members of the organization. It would have denied them eligibility to election to the governing body, which other members of the League enjoy. That governing body was composed of twelve representatives of governments, six representatives of employers and six of employees. Eight of the government representatives were to be named by the eight nations of chief industrial importance throughout the world. The other four were to be elected by the other members of the International Labour Conference, at the meeting of that conference. As Great Britain is undoubtedly one of the eight nations of chief industrial importance, she was bound to have a representative on the governing body; and if no nation, plus its self-governing dominions, could have more than one representative on the governing body, it meant that the representative of the Empire must always be a representative of Great Britain. The Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) and his colleagues took the ground that that restrictive clause should be eliminated from the covenant because it did impair the position and status of Canada and the other Dominions, and the Prime Ministers of the other Dominions shared this view. The result was that that clause was eliminated, only, however, after the greatest pressure on the part of the representatives of Canada and the other Dominions; and the treaty as finally submitted to Germany and accepted and signed by her, contained no such provision. Canada's eligibility for election to the governing body of the International Labour Organization therefore stands in exactly the same position as her eligibility for election to the Council of the League. It is not my intention this afternoon to refer to the proceedings of the International Labour Conference at Washington, because another opportunity will arise when these matters can be more properly discussed. But I would point out, in regard to the question of status, that at the International Labour Conference at Washington, when the four other nations were selected—that is to say, the four which should be entitled to name the four additional members, Canada was chosen one of the four. Spain had been in the original

eight of chief industrial importance and had been crowded out by the agreement to admit Germany. Every one agreed that Spain should be elected. It was also agreed that South America, with between fifteen and twenty members in the League and in the International Labour Organization, should be entitled to at least one member on the governing body, and Argentina was therefore selected. That left two places for the other countries of Europe, Asia, and America; and the House, I think, will be gratified to know that, by a vote of the representatives of nations of the world assembled in Washington, Canada was one of the two so chosen.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend will no doubt remember that prior to the creation of the League of Nations there existed in Switzerland what was known as the International Labour Office. Different countries were entitled to send representatives to that conference each year. Is there any privilege or right which the Dominions may have to-day under the League of Nations which they had not, prior to the establishment of the League, in connection with the International Labour Office?

Mr. ROWELL: The two organizations are entirely different.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What is the difference?

Mr. ROWELL: The International Labour Office in Switzerland was a purely voluntary organization, the sole purpose of which was to promote international co-operation in matters of labour legislation and questions of interest to labour. The International Labour Organization under the provisions of the Peace Treaty, has a very important jurisdiction in dealing with labour problems and in imposing certain obligations upon the Governments concerned.

Mr. FIELDING: Has it power to enforce them?

Mr. ROWELL: Perhaps it would be desirable to discuss the whole question of the work of the International Labour Conference at Washington, on some other occasion when we have time to go into the entire labour situation. I shall be very glad to do so on the estimates of the Department of Labour, or when some other suitable occasion offers.

Mr. McKENZIE: Was the United States of America represented at the Labour Conference at Washington? If it was, was it represented by virtue of the Treaty of Peace which it has so far refused to ratify?

Mr. ROWELL: The United States was not officially represented at that conference. Under the terms of the Treaty, the conference was to be called by President Wilson, and he did call it, with the approval of Congress. The United States was not represented under the terms of the Treaty, but on the invitation of the Organization Committee of the Conference, and with the approval of President Wilson, Mr. Wilson, Secretary of Labour in the government of President Wilson, accepted the position of Presiding Officer of the Conference. The Conference passed a resolution inviting representatives of the employers and employees of the United States to be present at the conference and to take part in its discussions, and pursuant to that resolution organized labour in the United States nominated Mr. Gompers as their representative to be present at the conference. Mr. Gompers was present and did take part in the discussions, although he was present only on a limited number of occasions. Apart from that the United States was not represented at the conference.

Mr. EULER: Was it eligible for representation on the governing body?

Mr. ROWELL: No, the United States was not eligible for representation, and I should perhaps add, in that connection, that when it came to a question of electing the six representatives of labour on the governing body—Mr. Draper of Canada was elected as one of the number. So that at the present time Canada is represented by two members on the governing body. It is only right to say, in this connection, that Mr. Draper recognizes that if the United States comes into the International Labour Organization organized labour in the United States should be represented and Mr. Draper will make way for Mr. Gompers as head of the American Federation of Labour. That was understood among the labour delegates at the conference.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Has Mr. Draper any authority to bind this country in any way in regard to any action which he may take?

Mr. ROWELL: None whatever.

Mr. FIELDING: Then, what good comes of it?

Mr. ROWELL: With all deference to my hon. friend, I may say that great good comes

of it. Both the governing body and the conference deal with questions of labour affecting Canada as well as all other countries. Now, while one may have the greatest respect for the representatives of Great Britain who attend this conference, I venture to say that neither employers nor employees of Great Britain are in a position to present the viewpoint of Canadian industry or Canadian labour, and that is of great importance, when questions come up for consideration, that the Canadian viewpoint should be presented in regard to both employers and employees.

Mr. FIELDING: With what result?

Mr. ROWELL: With the same result as would attend the representations of any other member, so far as discussion is concerned, and with the same right to vote as any other member.

Mr. FIELDING: Without power to bind the Dominion? They have merely the right to express their private opinions.

Mr. ROWELL: Not only that but they have power to take part in the proceedings.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: As my hon. friend appears to be desirous that the Canadian point of view shall be presented to the Conference, I wish he would make clear to the House wherein Canada's status is changed from what it was under the old system whereby different countries sent representatives to an International Labour Conference. I remember having the privilege of representing the Government of Canada at one of the International Labour Conferences. I think that the powers given me then were quite as considerable as the powers given to any representative under the League of Nations. If there is any difference I wish my hon. friend would explain it so that the House may understand wherein Canada's status is altered one way or the other.

Mr. ROWELL: Although I will answer my hon. friend's question, I am not concerned in discussing how Canada's status is altered. What I am concerned with is to make clear Canada's status in the League of Nations and in the International Labour organization. I thought I had answered my hon. friend before by saying that the two organizations were entirely different, that one was a voluntary organization without any powers whatever except to confer and to agree if possible on certain matters submitted by their consideration. Under the labour convention the powers go beyond that. Perhaps, in view of the question raised I had better explain what these powers are although I had not intended doing so at this time. My hon. friend will recall that under the provisions of the labour clauses of the Peace Treaty these conferences are to be held once a year and an agenda is to be prepared of the subjects which are to come up for consideration at the conference. To illustrate, I will give you some of the questions that

5 p.m.

came up at the Washington Conference. The Peace Conference in Paris settled the agenda for the Washington Conference. That agenda was as follows:

1. Application of principle of the 8-hours day or of the 48-hours week.
2. Question of preventing or providing against unemployment.
3. Women's employment:
   (a) Before and after child-birth, including the question of maternity benefit;
   (b) During the night;
   (c) In unhealthy processes.
4. Employment of children:
   (a) Minimum age of employment;
   (b) During the night;
   (c) In unhealthy processes.
5. Extension and application of the International Conventions adopted at Berne in 1906 on the prohibition of night work for women employed in industry and the prohibition of the use of white phosphorous in the manufacture of matches.

These were the matters with which the Washington Conference had to deal.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Is that agenda different in any particular from the agenda of the International Labour office? It seems to be exactly the same.

Mr. ROWELL: The International Labour office might adopt any agenda it chose.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is the agenda that the International Labour office had been adopting for years.

Mr. ROWELL: Well, they did not achieve results.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I beg my hon. friend's pardon. That very matter of phosphorus, which is dealt with, was taken up at the conference held at Basle, Switzerland, and as a result of the convention arrived at a Bill was introduced into this House and passed. That was the proceeding under the old International Labour office. I would like my hon. friend to explain wherein this present body is going to act in any different way or wherein it has power to go beyond that?

Mr. ROWELL: Take the very point that my hon. friend mentions; why does it appear on this agenda?—because although

some countries may have adopted legislation as a result of the Basle conference, the convention was not adopted by all the nations represented there, and it is necessary to have further action taken. What are the powers of the labour conference. Take the eight-hour day and the forty-eight hour week. I mention this as an illustration simply because it was the one that excited the greatest interest. The conference appointed a commission, consisting of five representatives of governments, five representatives of employers and five representatives of employees. They met, considered the whole question, and finally agreed upon the terms of a draft international convention covering the question of the eight-hour day and the forty-eight hour week. I do not now intend discussing these terms because I am only discussing the procedure. Upon the convention being submitted to the Conference, for the final vote, it was adopted by a two-thirds vote. Then it became an obligation on all members of the Conference, whether they approved or disapproved of the terms of the convention to sumbit the convention to the competent legislative authority in their respective countries for action. The obligation is to submit the convention for consideration and the action which is finally taken must depend upon the public opinion in the countries concerned. But it does ensure that the convention shall go before competent legislative authority in each country for consideration and action.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There can be no final, binding effect except with the approval of the parliaments of the different countries concerned?

Mr. ROWELL: That is all and I submit that was all it was wise to do.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Certainly.

Mr. ROWELL: They were not constituting, as some of the continental representatives desired, an international industrial or labour parliament with power to enact legislation binding all the nations of the world. They only went so far and no farther, namely, that each government should obligate itself to submit this convention to the competent legislative authority.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is exactly what was done under the old International Labour office.

Mr. ROWELL: All right, then; if my hon. friend was satisfied with that, he should be entirely satisfied with this.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am.

Mr. ROWELL: Under these circumstances I do not see what is to be gained by labouring the point.

Mr. EULER: Might I ask the minister whether the necessary two-thirds vote was obtained on the eight-hour day?

Mr. ROWELL: It was carried by a vote of 90 to 2.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It has no effect in so far as this country is concerned until the legislatures of the different provinces act upon it?

Mr. ROWELL: It has no effect in so far as this country is concerned until it is submitted to the competent legislative authority of this country.

Mr. EULER: The Government is under obligation to bring in legislation on that matter?

Mr. ROWELL: The Government is obligated to submit it to competent legislative authority. I do not want now to enter into the discussion. We will have plenty of opportunities of discussing the question of the eight-hour day and other matters and I do not think it is well to enter upon that discussion when we are dealing with other matters at this time. Now, I wish to go back to the first matter with which I was dealing and to say that in both the League of Nations and the International Labour organization Canada has the same status in the assembly and the conference as has every other member of these assemblies. Canada is also eligible for election to the council of the League and to the governing body of the international organization. In the labour organization Canada was actually elected a member of the governing body. The question of her status is not theory; it is a question of actual accomplished fact.

Our position and status in the League has been called in question by the reservations which have been adopted in the American Senate, and I think it is only right that I should bring the matter to the attention of the House, because it is a matter of vital concern to Canada. The reservation dealing with voting rights is generally known as the Lenroot Reservation. It is as follows:

> The United States assumes no obligations to be bound by any election, decision, report, or finding of the Council or Assembly in which any member of the league and its self-governing dominions, colonies, or parts of the empire in the aggregate gives more than one vote, and

assumes no obligation to be bound by any decision, report, or finding of the Council or Assembly arising out of any dispute between the United States and any member of the League, if such member, or any self-governing Dominion, colony or part of empire united with it politically has voted.

Hon. members will see that this reservation contains two distinct proposals. First, the United States assumes no obligation to be bound by any election, decision or report in any dispute before the Council or Assembly in which any member of the League and its self-governing Dominions give more than one vote. The second part of the reservation deals with a dispute to which the United States is a party, and it states that it will not obligate itself to be bound in any such dispute if more than one vote is given by any member of the League and any self-governing Dominions or Colonies politically united with it.

With the latter part of the reservation there is no ground of complaint, because it simply sets out what we understand to be the effect and meaning of the Covenant as it stands. It is the first part of the reservation to which we cannot accede, because it challenges our whole position and status in the League. If the United States can claim that it is under no obligation to be bound by any decision in any dispute in which it is not a party, then all the other nations should be entitled to take the same position.

That reservation has since been somewhat modified, and as recently voted on in the Senate is in this form:

Until Part I, being the covenant of the League of Nations, shall be so amended as to provide that the United States shall be entitled to cast a number of votes equal to that which any member of the League and its self-governing dominions, colonies, or parts of empire in the aggregate shall be entitled to cast, the United States assumes no obligation to be bound, except in cases where Congress has previously given its consent, by any election, decision, report, or finding of the Council or Assembly in which any member of the League and its self-governing dominions, colonies, or parts of empire in the aggregate have cast more than one vote.

In considering this reservation, Mr. Speaker, one must bear in mind the terms of the preamble, which, as originally drafted, was as follows:—

That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the Treaty of Peace with Germany concluded at Versailles on the 28th day of June, 1919, subject to the following reservations and understandings, which are hereby made a part, and condition of this resolution of ratification, which ratification is not to take effect or bind the United States until the said reservations and understandings adopted by the Senate have been accepted by an exchange of notes as a part and a condition of this resolution of ratification by at least three of the four Principal Allied and Associated Powers, to wit, Great Britain, France, Italy and Japan.

Subsequently Mr. Lodge gave notice of the following amended resolving clause:

That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the Treaty of Peace with Germany concluded at Versailles on the 28th day of June, 1919, subject to the following reservations and understandings, which are hereby made a part and condition of this resolution of ratification, which ratification is not to take effect or bind the United States until the said reservations and understandings adopted by the Senate have been accepted as a part and a condition of this resolution of ratification by the Allied and Associated Powers, and a failure on the part of the Allied and Associated Powers to make objection to said reservations and understandings prior to the deposit of ratification by the United States shall be taken as a full and final acceptance of such reservations and understandings by said Powers.

The effect of this resolving clause is that none of the reservations that may be adopted by the United States Senate, can go into effect unless they are accepted by all the Allied and Associated Powers. And they may be accepted by the Allied and Associated Powers by the failure of any one of these Powers to dissent within the time mentioned in the resolving clause.

If, therefore, final action, should be taken in the form now proposed, the question which would face every nation party to the Covenant would be: Whether they would or would not assent to the reservations proposed by the United States. If they failed to dissent their assent would be presumed. It is on that account that Canada feels that there is only one possible course open to her, namely, that if any country should say that its ratification of the Treaty was conditioned upon our assenting to our own position being impaired, our status challenged, and our right to vote denied, we as a self-respecting people could not give that consent. Mr. Speaker, we all recognize the great importance of the United States coming into the League of Nations. No country is more interested in the United States coming in than Canada. We should be the last people in the world to put any obstacle in the way of her entry. I am sure that is the sentiment of the country and of the House. But if the United States should finally say: "We will only come in on condition that you practically get out or have your status impaired," we can only reply: "Well, you have a perfect right to say that if you choose, but we, as a self-respecting people, have an equal right to say that

we cannot accede to your terms." This position the Government has made perfectly clear to the proper authorities.

What is the constitutional position of Canada in relation to the other portions of the Empire at the present time? Some hon. members have said: "You should not change the constitution in any respect without first submitting the matter to Parliament." With a written constitution you could submit to Parliament any change which required legislative sanction. But the constitution of the British Empire is not embodied in any document. It is not a dead thing; it is a living thing. It grows from day to day and from year to year; it develops to meet exigencies and new conditions as they arise. That has been the history of the development of the British constitution.

Mr. CANNON: Is not our constitution a written constitution?

Mr. ROWELL: We are working under the British North America Act, but that is not the whole constitution of the British Empire.

Mr. CANNON: Have we any other?

Mr. ROWELL: We have very important rights outside the British North America Act, as I shall be glad to show my hon. friend. Up to time that the British North America Act was passed in 1867 and for many years thereafter, none of the Dominions were taken into consultation by the representatives of the Mother Country in matters of common Imperial concern. The first time they were called in consultation was in 1887, twenty years after Confederation, when the first Colonial Conference was held. That was not a formal gathering such as the Imperial Conference later became, but it was attended by representatives of the different self-governing colonies of the British Empire, as they were then called. It was the initiation of co-operation between what were then called the colonies and the Mother Country on an Empire-wide scale. Because of its significance I wish to quote a few words from the Marquis of Salisbury, then Prime Minister of Great Britain, on the occasion of the initiation of this movement for co-operation and consultation throughout the Empire. He said:

> We all feel the gravity and importance of this occasion. The decisions of this Conference may not be, for the moment, of vital importance; the business may seem prosaic, and may not issue in any great results at the moment. But we are all sensible that this meeting is the beginning of a state of things which is to have great results in the future. It will be the parent of a long progeniture, and distant councils of the Empire may, in some far-off time, look back to the meeting in this room as the root from which all their greatness and all their beneficence sprang.

In that historic statement the Marquis of Salisbury saw into the future. He saw that the time would come when there would be co-operation between the Mother Country and the Dominions along lines much more important, far-reaching and significant to the future of the Empire and of the world than that which was exemplified by the preliminary meeting held in 1887.

The next important step in the development of our constitutional relations was in 1897 when the first Conference, attended by the late Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, was held. You will remember that in the session of the Canadian Parliament in 1897 the Government decided to grant the British Preference. That could not go into effect by reason of the existence of the Belgian and German treaties, and the matter was taken up during the sessions of the Imperial Conference in 1897. Speaking from recollection, I believe that a resolution was passed at that Conference urging the Mother Country to denounce those treaties. At that Conference it was agreed by the Mother Country that the treaties should be denounced, and they were denounced accordingly. When the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier returned to Canada after that meeting of the Colonial Conference he stated in very clear and very vigorous language what he conceived to be the result of that development. Speaking in Montreal, Toronto, and other parts of Canada, he declared that by the action of the British Government in denouncing these treaties Canada had become a nation and that her name was known throughout Europe and the world. The Conference of 1897 marked a great advance over the Colonial Conference of 1887.

Ten years more elapsed.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Do I understand the minister to say that as a result of these conferences and the fact that they are being held from time to time they have become part of our constitution? Suppose the British ceased to call these conferences, what would we do about it? What right have we to interfere?

Mr. ROWELL: There is a difference between legal right and constitutional auth-

ority. There is nothing binding Great Britain to summon these conferences; we could not compel her to do so. But it has become the settled policy of the British Empire to summon these conferences; and the basis upon which they are now called is a resolution passed at the Conference of 1907, assented to by the Mother Country and all the Governments of the self-governing Dominions. It is quite true that the British Government could ignore this resolution, just as they could repeal the British North America Act. They have the legal right to do so, but they have no constitutional authority to do so, it would provoke a revolution if they exercised their legal right so far as the British North America Act is concerned. No man in the British Parliament would be insane enough to make such a suggestion.

Mr. CANNON: Does the minister contend that Great Britain has not the constitutional authority not only to amend but even to repeal the British North America Act?

Mr. ROWELL: I said she had the legal right, but she has no constitutional authority to do so, because she has recognized now for nearly half a century the rights and privileges given us by the British North America Act.

Mr. CANNON: Does not the British North America Act exist simply as a law of the British Parliament?

Mr. ROWELL: The British Parliament has in theory the legal right to impose taxation on Canada. That is, the constitution of the Empire has never been changed so as to take away from the Imperial Parliament, its legal right to legislate for the whole Empire. But they have no constitutional authority to legislate for Canada, they have no right to levy taxes on the self-governing Dominions. That is recognized by every statesman of the Empire; it is questioned by no one. No publicist, no man in Great Britain with any respect for his opinion, would venture to suggest that the British Parliament had any such constitutional right.

Now, at the Colonial Conference of 1907, also attended by the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, it was decided to change the name from "Colonial Conference" to "Imperial Conference" and to give it permanent form. The following is the resolution:

That it will be to the advantage of the Empire if a conference, to be called the Imperial Conference, is held every four years, at which questions of common interest may be discussed and considered as between His Majesty's Government and His Governments of the Self-governing Dominions beyond the seas.

The Prime Minister of the United Kingdom will be ex officio President, and the Prime Minister of the self-governing Dominions ex officio members, of the conference. The Secretary of State for the Colonies will be ex officio member of the conference and will take the chair in the absence of the president. He will arrange for such Imperial Conference after communication with the Prime Ministers of the respective Dominions.

Provision is made for a permanent secretariat, and that the conference shall meet once every five years. This resolution marked a great advance in the development of what one might describe as the constitution of the Empire. During the twenty year period from 1887 to 1907, the more or less casual meetings of the Colonial Conference for consultation had developed into a settled organization with fixed periods of meeting, and with certain defined subjects of common Imperial interest for consideration.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The hon. gentleman speaks of constitutional right. Would not the term "constitutional practice" be more appropriate?

Mr. ROWELL: I am not concerned which term my hon. friend uses, because under the British constitution, constitutional practice develops into and becomes constitutional right, generates constitutional right. They become the conventions of the constitution and are just as binding, so far as the actual practice is concerned, as if we had a written constitution. It is because this constitutional practice can be developed into constitutional right, that the constitution of the Empire has proved itself so adaptable to meet all the changing needs and varying conditions which have surrounded the Empire in the course of its history.

In 1917, there was another and still more important constitutional development. In 1917 the Prime Minister of Great Britain called together the ministers of the self-governing Dominions for consultation on vital matters of policy—relating to the prosecution of the war. They met as equals as Prime Ministers of the nations of the Empire, to discuss matters of common concern to the whole Empire. Great Britain recognized that with the growth in power and influence of the Dominions, the time had come when the Government of Great Britain should frankly recognize that the Dominions had ceased to be in any sense States dependent upon the Mother Country,

and had become sister nations, standing on an equality with the Mother Country. It does not require, as I have already pointed out, any enactment of the Imperial Parliament to bring about that change; it has come about as a matter of constitutional practice. But certain constitutional adjustments will be necessary and provision was made for calling a constitutional conference in the future, as follows:

The Imperial War Conference are of opinion that the readjustment of the constitutional relations of the component parts of the Empire is too important and intricate a subject to be dealt with during the war, and that it should form the subject of a special Imperial Conference to be summoned as soon as possible after the cessation of hostilities.

They deem it their duty, however, to place on record their view that any such readjustment, while thoroughly preserving all existing powers of self-government and complete control of domestic affairs, should be based upon a full recognition of the Dominions as autonomous nations of an Imperial Commonwealth, and of India as an important portion of the same, should recognize the right of the Dominions and India to an edequate voice in foreign policy and in foreign relations, and should provide effective arrangements for continuous consultation in all important matters of common Imperial concern, and for such necessary concerted action, founded on consultation, as the several Governments may determine.

I hold in my hand the report of the War Cabinet of the Government of Great Britain for the year 1918, and under the heading "Imperial Affairs" on page 7, I find the following statement:

The common effort and sacrifice in the war have inevitably led to the recognition of an equality of status between the responsible Governments of the Empire. This equality has long been acknowledged in principle, and found its adequate expression in 1917 in the creation or rather the natural coming into being of an Imperial War Cabinet as an instrument for evolving a common Imperial policy in the conduct of the war. The nature of the constitutional development involved in the establishment as a permanent institution of the Imperial Cabinet system, was clearly explained by Sir Robert Borden in a speech to the Empire Parliamentary Association on the 21st of June, 1918.

The following is the extract from Sir Robert Borden's speech as set out in this official document of the British Government:

A very great step in the constitutional development of the Empire was taken last year by the Prime Minister when he summoned the Prime Ministers of the overseas Dominions to the Imperial War Cabinet. We meet there on terms of perfect equality. We meet there as Prime Ministers of self-governing nations. We meet there under the leadership and the presidency of the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom. After all, my Lord Chancellor and Gentlemen, the British Empire, as it is at present constituted, is a very modern organization. It is perfectly true that it is built up on the development of centuries, but, as it is constituted to-day, both in territory and in organization, it is a relatively modern affair. Why, it is only 75 years since responsible government was granted to Canada. It is only little more than fifty years since the first experiment in Federal Government,—in a Federal Constitution,—was undertaken in this Empire. And from that we went on, in 1871, to representation in negotiating our Commercial Treaties, in 1878, to complete fiscal autonomy, and after that to complete fiscal control and the negotiation of our own treaties. But we have always lacked the full status of nationhood, because you exercised here a so-called trusteeship, under which you undertook to deal with foreign relations on our behalf, and sometimes without consulting us very much. Well, that day has gone by. We come here as we came last year, to deal with all these matters, upon terms of perfect equality with the Prime Minister of the Unitel Kingdom and his colleagues. It has been said that the term Imperial War Cabinet is a misnomer. The word 'Cabinet' is unknown to the law. The meaning of 'Cabinet' has developed from time to time. I see no incongruity whatever in applying the term 'Cabinet' to the association of Prime Ministers and other ministers who meet around a common council board to debate and to determine the various needs of the Empire. If I should attempt to describe it, I should say it is a Cabinet of Governments. Every Prime Minister who sits around that board is responsible to his own parliament and to his own people; the conclusions of the War Cabinet can only be carried out by the parliaments of the different nations of our Imperial Commonwealth. Thus, each Dominion, each nation, retains its perfect autonomy. I venture to believe, and I thus expressed myself last year, that in this may be found the genesis of a development in the constitutional relation of the Empire, which will form the basis of its unity in the years to come.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: So that we may appreciate the significance of the matter, I should like to ask my hon. friend who speaks of equality of status amongst the self-governing Dominions of the Empire, whether that means that Canada's status is the same as that of Australia or South Africa.

Mr. ROWELL: And New Zealand?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What about India?

Mr. ROWELL: And of the United Kingdom. India's position is not the same.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: In what way does it differ?

Mr. ROWELL: Because India, as a nation, is not completely self-governing.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What about Newfoundland?

Mr. ROWELL: Newfoundland is completely self-governing and under the terms of the covenant of the League of Nations, Newfoundland will be entitled to apply for admission to the League.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Is not India given a place?

Mr. ROWELL: India is given a place by the Peace Conference itself. Therefore, her status cannot be challenged; but it is by virtue of the place given her in the League by the Peace Conference that she acquires her rights.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Is it not correct that in the League of Nations Canada's status is not different from that of India?

Mr. ROWELL: Canada's status is not different from that of the other members of the League. Once they are members of the League by international recognition and consent, as embodied in the Treaty, they have the same rights.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If I understand the minister correctly, he informs the House now that Canada's status as regards the League of Nations is identical with that of India.

Mr. ROWELL: No, I did not say so.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: But is not that true?

Mr. ROWELL: Once a nation is in the League, then under the terms of the League Covenant, it possesses all the rights of membership; but if India had not been admitted by unanimous consent by delegates at the Peace Conference, she would not be entitled to admission under the terms of the Covenant and Canada would. If Canada had not been named in the Treaty Canada would be eligible for membership under the provision for admission of new States. India would not.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I get this perfectly clear? At the present time has Canada in the League of Nations any rights or privileges which India has not?

Mr. ROWELL: Surely I cannot make myself any clearer that every member of the League of Nations has the same rights.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Then they have the same rights and privileges.

Mr. ROWELL: India, by special agreement of all the nations, has been given the same right in the League as France, Great Britain, the United States, every other nation.

I presume that the reason why India has been given this exceptional treatment is because of the size of India—a nation of 300 millions—secondly, because of the part India took in the war, the magnificent contribution her troops made to the war, particularly in the East; thirdly, by reason of the fact that at that time there was before the Imperial House of Commons a proposal which has since become law under which India, in some important respects at least, obtains the right to manage her own affairs—the greatest experiment in the devolution of power from the Crown to the people which Great Britain has ever undertaken. By reason of these exceptional conditions a special case was made of India, and she was admitted as a member of the League; but, as I said, if she had not been admitted she would not have been qualified for membership under the terms and conditions on which new members can be admitted. Canada is qualified; Canada comes within the qualifications. If she had not been named in the Covenant, she would have been entitled to apply for admission, and should have been admitted. Therefore, their status is not the same.

Mr. CANNON: The minister has mentioned the Imperial War Cabinet. Is it his opinion that under our constitution there can be a cabinet without a Parliament to which that cabinet is responsible?

Mr. ROWELL: As that point is discussed in the extract from the speech of the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) I do not think it is necessary for me to take up the time of the House to deal with it now. My hon. friend will be able to read the extract in Hansard.

I have pointed out the status which the Dominions have under the treaty. I want also to point out that the position the Government of Canada has taken on this matter is fully supported by the Governments of the other Dominions. I have before me the debate in the South African Assembly on the Peace Treaty and the statement of General Smuts. It is exactly to the same effect as the statement made by the Prime Minister and members of the Government to this House, namely, that the British Empire had become a commonwealth of nations, equal under a common sovereign. It is interesting to note that the objections made in the South African Parliament by Mr. Hertzog and his Nationalist associates were almost the same as those made in this Parliament, and the reply of General Smuts to the criticism of the treaty is substantially

on the same lines as the reply of the Government to criticism of the treaty here. In view of the position of General Smuts as a great constitutional lawyer, and of the part he took in framing the Covenant of the League of Nations, and also as the Prime Minister of one of the other dominions of the Empire, I am sure hon. members would like to have his statement upon Hansard.

Mr. SPEAKER: The remarks I made a moment ago apply also to this document. It can only be put upon Hansard with the unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. ROWELL: In moving the resolution to approve the treaty, General Smuts said:

The hon. gentleman who argued the previous motion last asked the question why there should be ratification by us, seeing that the British Parliament has already ratified this? He asked why we should trouble ourselves about this at all. Was it necessary for us, he asked, or was this merely a sham to put before His Majesty the King. Hon. members by arguing that way only show that they do not know what the constitutional position is to-day. We have nothing to do with the ratification by the British Parliament. We signed this Treaty in Paris through the Prime Minister and the Minister of Defence but His Majesty the King wishes the authority of the Union Parliament to ratify this. The King is not going to be influenced by the ratification given by the British House of Commons, and therefore the position is this, that until we have given the ratification which is necessary, until all the British Dominions who have signed this have agreed to this ratification, we are, so far as the British Empire is concerned, hanging up this final exchange which is necessary before this Treaty is brought into force. . . . . .

I remember when the report of our National Convention was made I made the statement that the most important thing about that document was the list of signatures at the end of it. And it is very much the same in regard to the Peace Treaty. For the first time in history the British Dominions signed a great international instrument, not only along with the other ministers of the King, but with the other ministers of the great powers of the world—(Hear, hear) —and although the tremendous importance of this great act has not yet been fully recognized there is no doubt that this Treaty, signed as it has been with parties to it not only representative of the King in the British Isles, but in the Dominions, forms one of the most important landmarks in the history of the British Empire. . . . The British Dominions did not fight for status. They went to war from a sense of duty, from their common interests with the rest of the world, vindicating the great principles of free human government. Not only has victory been achieved for the objects for which they fought, but, what for the British Dominions is equally precious, they have achieved international recognition of their status among the nations of the world. In a large sense this world is one of small nations, and certainly none of those had had larger results accruing to them from this war than the young nations of the British Empire. They have deserved this through the magnitude of their efforts. It has been proved and has never been challenged that two of the British Dominions—Canada and Australia—made a greater war effort than any other powers below the rank of first-class powers. Their achievements have been outstanding ones. Australia alone lost more than the U.S.A. They have, of course, lost heavily; they are handicapped with enormous debt, but they have at any rate emerged with victory, honour, and a new standing in the world in that they are internationally recognized to-day. No wonder after what they have done that their great performance all through the war, and especially towards the end of it the other powers and nations of the world were only too willing to welcome and recognize them within the new great family. It took some time for the position to be realized at Paris, because so many of the powers were under the same impression which, according to the debate in the House that afternoon, appeared to exist in South Africa, viz., that everything seemed to be under tutelage of the British Parliament and Government. They could not realize the new situation arising, and that the British Empire, instead of being one central government, consisted of a league of free states, free, equal and working together for the great ideals of human government. It was difficult to make people realize this, but afterwards they fully applauded, and their approval was given as embodied in this international document. No doubt new forms would have to be made. No one recognized this more strongly than the British Government itself, but, whatever the forms, there was no doubt whatever about the substance of the new status of the Dominions.

There is the other aspect—the recognition which is thereby given to British Dominions in the League. The British Dominions are equal members, both in the Assembly and also with a full right to be elected into the Council of the League. The Council consists of five great powers now, together with the representatives of four smaller powers, and among the latter which have to be elected on the Council of the League the British Dominions have the same right as any other power to be elected. I see in the American Senate some difficulty has arisen about that, and they think that it is giving too large a vote to the British Empire. There is no doubt that there are British Dominions important enough in the near future to secure a seat on the Inner Council, and I can well understand that in other parts of the world this enormous preponderance which the British Empire will enjoy, and which may be accentuated, is not looked upon with very great favour. This matter of our status in the League of Nations was not one of the original conceptions of it. It took the British delegation at Paris a good deal of time to hammer out this new machinery for the recognition of young nations. The Dominions felt very strongly that here was their chance, and that if there was to be a League of Nations on which the nations were to be equally represented, then that League should include the British Dominions. We were determined to see that that recognition was given to us, but we were equally anxious to see that nothing was done which would loosen the ties which bind together the British Empire. (Cheers.) We kept both these things clearly before our eyes. Still, we wanted our equality with the rest of the world recognized. We also wanted to remain in the British League of Nations, which has worked with such enormous success in the past—(cheers)—and has worked together in this war, probably becoming the real organizer of victory for all the Allies and the rest of the world. (Cheers.)

Fears have been expressed in certain quarters, and fears have been given expression to in South Africa, that the ultimate tendency of the League of Nations would be to break up the British Empire, but that is an entirely misleading idea. On the contrary, I can well imagine great dominions arising which may be as important as Great Britain in the world, and if that motion had been dropped there would have been a danger of the breaking up of the British Empire. We have secured an inner League, and the world has agreed to it.

In his speech in reply on the resolution General Smuts stated:

As regards the question of status, General Smuts said that until last year British ministers had signed all documents and dealt with all matters affecting the Dominions. But a change had come about in Paris, when representatives of the Dominions had, on behalf of the King, for the first time signed that great document on behalf of the Dominions. The change was that in future the representatives of the Dominions would act for the Dominions. This precedent had now been laid down for the future. The British Constitution was most elastic, and the precedent might bring about the greatest changes. Where in the past British ministers could have acted for the Dominions, in future ministers of the Union would act for the Union. The change was a far-reaching one which would alter the whole basis of the British Empire. In future all parts of the British Empire stood on exactly the same basis. (General Hertzog: In the past you would have been put in prison for saying that.)

There was no misconception among British statesmen as to what the position was, and it was on that basis that matters had been agreed to in Paris. . . . . The Dominions of the Empire would in future, therefore, stand on a basis of absolute equality. The British Empire would, therefore, be a league in which all the Dominions would be on an equal basis as regarded their Governments. The Prime Minister repeated that in the League of Nations, all the Dominions, with England, would stand on an equal footing, and would be recognized as such. The only difference would be that England would be a permanent member of the Central Council. Therefore, in future all parts of the Empire would equally be consulted in matters of war and peace.

I shall not take up the time of the House to quote Mr. Hughes or Mr. Massey, who took exactly the same position. Not only is that the position taken by the statesmen of the self-governing Dominions, but it is the position taken by the Government of Great Britain itself in reference to the effect of the Treaty of Peace. I have the statement of Lord Milner, Secretary of State for the Colonies made in an official statement issued by the Government of Great Britain, I shall be glad if it can be put upon Hansard.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must again draw the attention of the House to the fact that it is most unusual to incorporate in Hansard any document that has not been read in the House, but in view of the importance of this document, I take it that the House consents to its being incorporated in Hansard.

Mr. ROWELL: Lord Milner's statement is as follows:

The Peace Treaty recently made in Paris was signed on behalf of the British Empire by ministers of the self-governing Dominions as well as by British ministers. They were all equally plenipotentiaries of His Majesty the King, who was the "High Contracting Party" for the whole Empire.

This procedure illustrates the new constitution of the Empire, which has been gradually growing up for many years past. The United Kingdom and the Dominions are partner nations; not yet, indeed, of equal power, but for good and all of equal status. A time may come when one or more of these Dominions will equal or even surpass the United Kingdom in wealth and population, as they already surpass it in geographical extent. It is the paramount duty of British statesmanship to see to it that the free union between them and us, which has been so gloriously maintained during the war, shall be continued and strengthened in the years to come. If we are successful in that effort, the "Commonwealth of British Nations" will be the greatest instrument of peace and progress, the strongest influence making for freedom and civilization that the world has ever seen.

MAINTAINING WAR UNITY.

During the war unity of policy between the self-governing states of the Empire was maintained by means of the "Imperial War Cabinet," and during the peace negotiations in Paris by the "British Empire delegation." In both these bodies Dominion ministers and British ministers sat and deliberated freely together, under the presidency of the British Prime Minister, and the policy of the Empire was thus shaped by consultation between representatives of all its self-governing states.

FUTURE CO-OPERATION.

We have still to devise the means whereby this fruitful co-operation may be preserved in future, and the several independent nations of the Empire may always consult and act together on great international issues. The surest guarantee that such means will be found lies in a growing intimacy of intercourse between them. To foster that intimacy, to strengthen all the moral and material bonds which unite the different parts of the Empire, is a task to which we must constantly apply ourselves with the utmost energy. It is rendered easier by the progress of science, by inventions such as wireless telegraphy, the airship, and the aeroplane, which tend to annihilate distance. The encouragement of trade within the Empire, of migration within the Empire, the progressive improvement of means of communication by sea and air, are the methods by which we must seek to strengthen that community of interest and of sentiment, which is the only sure foundation of Imperial unity.

I have quoted these statements to show that there is complete unanimity between the Government of Great Britain and the governments of the Dominions as to the

constitutional status of the different nations of the Empire. It is not a question of conflict of opinion or authority. All are agreed that the status is one of equality, that we are nations all equal in status, though not of equal power, under a common sovereign, and bound together by interest and sentiment, by ties which, though light as air, are strong as iron in binding together this League of Nations which we call the British Empire or the Britannic Commonwealth.

It goes without saying that there must be some constitutional readjustments in order to put into more practical and workable form the new situation that has developed, and it was in order that that might be done that provision was made in the year 1917 for the calling of a special Imperial Conference. When that conference is held—we do not know yet when it will be called—these questions must come up for consideration, and the representatives of Canada and the other dominions will attend, not as representatives of inferior or dependent nations, but as representatives of nations which by unanimous agreement are equal in status with the Mother Country. Canada's representatives will attend the conference, not for the purpose of creating any new Imperial organization, but for the purpose of developing a system of consultation and co-operation which will absolutely preserve the autonomy of the dominions, and at the same time enable matters in which the dominions are vitally concerned to receive that attention and consideration by the dominions which, under the existing system, it is not possible to give them. I am sure all citizens of Canada desire to see this result secured.

What are the alternatives we must face if our position in the League could be successfully challenged? We may go back into the old colonial position where the Mother Country would deal with all matters of foreign policy and settle for us the issues of peace and war, matters in which we are vitally interested. That, to my mind, is unthinkable. It is incredible that a young nation like Canada, with the achievements of this war to her credit and with the future opening before her, will ever consent to occupy a dependent position with reference to any country.

Then, Mr. Speaker, what is the other alternative? If we cannot stand on an equality within the Empire, the other alternative is Canadian independence. I say—and in this I voice the sentiment of the Government—that we stand unhesitatingly and unequivocally for the maintenance of the British connection.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Why does my hon. friend limit that position to the Government? Why not say this Parliament?

Mr. ROWELL: I believe that is the position of this Parliament; I did not wish to convey any inference that any one differed. If we do not proceed along the line of equality of status and co-operation under a common sovereign, I submit that there are just two alternatives: Either dependency, with Great Britain controlling our foreign policy and the issues of peace or war, or independence, and we will not accept either alternative. If the reservation I have read, or anything similar in character, should be adopted finally by the Senate and approved by the President, and if it is stipulated as a condition of the ratification going into effect, that all the Allied Powers, parties to the Treaty, shall give their consent, and Canada gives her consent, she is relegated back into a colonial position and has not a voice and a vote among the nations of the world. That position is unthinkable; and we must, if we are to preserve our position and status and the unity of the British Empire, maintain our place in the family of nations.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Does the hon. member say that any action of the United States could alter the status of this country in the League of Nations?

Mr. ROWELL: Not unless we consent. If they submit as a condition of their ratification going into effect that we must consent, then the Government will not consent. In the exercise of our sovereign right to control our own affairs, we will not give our consent; hence the importance of Parliament standing behind the Government of Canada on this issue. Desiring, as we do, that there should be no misunderstanding, we thought the best way to avoid misunderstanding was to make our position clear, and this we have done to the proper authorities.

Mr. CANNON: Suppose Great Britain should accept these reservations, what would be our position?

Mr. ROWELL: I do not believe Great Britain would accept these reservations as against Canada's protest.

Mr. CANNON: But supposing she did?

Mr. ROWELL: If Great Britain did and Canada dissented, as she would do, by filing her dissent, the ratification could not go into effect, because it would not be assented to by all the Allied and Associated Powers.

Mr. FIELDING: Even though assented to by Great Britain? Does my hon. friend claim that the failure of Canada to assent to the reservations would put an end to the whole treaty?

Mr. ROWELL: If the United States insisted on its resolving words, it would put an end to the ratification, because Great Britain has no right to give consent on behalf of Canada.

Mr. FIELDING: Great Britain is a party to the Treaty distinct from Canada. For the purposes of this discussion, Great Britain and Canada are separate nations. The hon. member has asked what would be the effect of Great Britain assenting to the reservations. Surely the effect would be that Great Britain would remain in the League while Canada would leave it.

Mr. ROWELL: That would not be the effect, because Canada is in the League. The League has become effective by the ratification of the treaty and by its formal inauguration, and Canada cannot be put out except by her own consent. And even though the situation in Europe might be such as to influence Great Britain to give her consent, if Canada did not assent, ratification could not go into effect.

Mr. FIELDING: On the part of Canada?

Mr. ROWELL: The hon. member has missed the terms of the resolving clause which I have read. The United States might change its resolving clause so as to accept less than the assent of all the Allied and Associated Powers. Thus far it has not done so. The resolving clause as it stands at present requires the assent of all the Allied and Associated Powers, and if Canada did not assent ratification could not go into effect.

Mr. FIELDING: And the whole treaty would be abortive?

Mr. ROWELL: The treaty is in force to-day. The League of Nations is functioning and is carrying on its work to-day.

Mr. FIELDING: The treaty would cease to be effective as regards Canada if she refused to ratify it.

Mr. ROWELL: I do not wish to be at cross purposes with my hon. friend. I am sure he is only anxious to arrive at the truth, and that is also my desire. Let me go back a step. The treaty is in force by the deposit, of ratification, on January 10, by more than three of the great powers and by Germany. Under the express terms of the treaty it becomes effective on the deposit of these ratifications. The treaty going into effect brings the League of Nations into existence. The League was duly organized on January 16 and is operative to-day. Canada is one of its original members and has all the rights and privileges of every other member of the League. We have every respect for the opinion of the United States, they are entitled to say whether they will or will not come in, but they are not entitled to push us out without our consent, and we cannot be put out otherwise. This is the situation, and it is therefore not a question of our dropping out of the League, for we are already in it. If the United States adopted this clause the misfortune would be that they would come into the League because they had imposed a condition which could not be complied with.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not say that Great Britain will or should accept the reservations. I do not for a moment take that position; but if Great Britain should assent to the Lenroot reservations what would be our position under the treaty?

Mr. ROWELL: If my hon. friend will turn to the treaty he will see that the contracting party, so far as Canada is concerned, is the British Empire by its representative, His Majesty The King. The British Empire is composed of Great Britain, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, India, etc., and no one nation of that group has the right to give assent for all. The British Empire's assent, having regard to the constitutional practice that has developed, and in view of our acknowledged status cannot be given without our consent.

Mr. FIELDING: That is very debatable.

Mr. ROWELL: In order to avoid argument I read from the statement issued by the British Government itself to the British Parliament (the War Cabinet in part) defining our status. Now, when they made that statement, not only to us but to the British Parliament and to all the Dominions, how can it be contended that the Government of Great Britain could give an assent which would bind Canada even although Canada opposed such assent.

Mr. FIELDING: It is not a question whether they could, but would they?

Mr. ROWELL: I do not for a moment think that they would give an assent that would bind Canada. I feel absolutely con-

fident that I am speaking well within the mark when I say that the British Government would not think of doing such a thing. No public man in Great Britain would entertain such an idea.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What is the point of my hon. friend's remarks in regard to the United States?

Mr. ROWELL: What I desire to point out, so that the House will appreciate the position, is the fact that should the United States adopt the resolutions now before the Senate, and should the President give his approval, a situation would arise in which the question of the United States coming into the League or not might depend on the action of Canada. It would be a grave responsibility for us, in the face of the serious conditions in Europe and elsewhere, to say that we would not give the necessary consent. But because we believe, Mr. Speaker, that the question goes to the very basis of Canada's national position, and that her future depends upon it, we could not possibly give that consent.

I have felt it desirable to put the House in the possession of all the facts and I am sure we have the unanimous support of the House in maintaining Canada's status in the League of Nations. The adoption of this resolution by the House will be an intimation to the Government that the House approves the position taken by the Government on this matter of such grave importance to Canada.

The position won for Canada by her soldiers on the field of battle, maintained by her statesmen at the Peace Conference, recognized and established by the ratification of the Treaty of Peace, and the formal inauguration of the League the Government of Canada will maintain. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I understand that this stands for discussion.

Mr. ROWELL: I will move that the debate be adjourned.

Motion (Mr. Rowell) agreed to and debate adjourned.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

REPORT TABLED.

Report of the Royal Commission on Racetrack Meetings and Betting.—Hon. C. J. Doherty.

A NATIONAL EIGHT-HOUR WORKING DAY.

Resuming the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution of Mr. Burnham:

That in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that to the extent of the jurisdiction of this Parliament a national eight-hour working day should be established immediately, subject only to the right of express private contract.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE (East Edmonton): Mr. Speaker, last night when six o'clock was called I was in the act of pointing out to the hon. member for Prescott (Mr. Proulx) that the existence of shorter hours of labour did not by any means imply a reduction in production, and I was reading a passage from an authority already cited. I desire, Mr. Speaker, to continue the citation.

The last sentence which I gave to the House last night was this:

—that where the human element enters into production, hour reductions by no means necessarily imply a decrease in output. For instance, the Federal Industrial Commission of 1898 made special comparisons between the output of the bituminous coal mines before and after the introduction of the eight-hour day, and found that output even increased under the shorter work day. In Illinois in 1895 and 1896 under the ten-hour system, the average daily output for each mine employee was 2.53 to 3 tons; in 1898, 1899, and 1900, with an eight-hour day, the average output was 3.11 and 3.21 tons, though the proportion of coal mined by machinery was not increased.

In the New England textile industry, also, it was found that the shorter work day consequent upon the enforcement of the ten-hour law improved either the quality or quantity of the output, or both. Similar evidence has been gathered for a number of other industries, showing the beneficial effect of a full day's rest each week. This increase of output through increased efficiency probably largely explains why wages have seldom fallen, but have frequently even risen after a reduction of hours, and why the industries in which wages are highest are often those in which hours are shortest. Practical experience, therefore, gives weight to the old eight-hour league slogan: "Whether you work by the piece or the day, decreasing the hours increases the pay."

Now the principal objection to long hours of labour is that they tend to the breakdown of health, and again I desire to quote the authority in hand, because the mere assertion by one hon. member that a certain condition exists, and the mere contradiction of that assertion by another hon. member, is not going to get us any further with the subject. There is only one way to deal with it, and that is through the investigations which have been made regarding labour conditions. This authority states:

Under modern industrial conditions such excessive hours of work break down health. Even with short hours the strain of modern industry,

with its speed, its piece-work, its division of labour, involving the monotonous repetition of the same process, sometimes even of the same movement, is a heavy tax on the worker. But with the eleven or twelve-hour day, or the seven-day week, a man must go back to his job before he has had sufficient rest to recover from the excessive fatigue of the long work period, and a progressive decline in health results. "In my judgment," said a former official of a large steel company, "a large proportion of the steel workers, who from early manhood work 12 hours a day, are old men at forty."

Though it is the health dangers of long hours which are most often emphasized, the lack of leisure for family life, for recreation, for all the requirements of citizenship, is no less an evil. It should not be forgotten that the time spent in going and coming from work and the dinner hour often adds two hours to the length of the work day proper, and that an 11-hour day is likely to mean 13 hours away from home. Said a Pittsburgh steel-worker of the results of such a work day, "Home is where I eat and sleep." The ultimate effects of such hours of labour were thus summed up by the Supreme Court of Georgia, in upholding a Sunday rest law: "Without specific leisure, the process of forming character can only be begun; it can never advance or be completed; people would be merely machines of labour—nothing more."

I claim, Mr. Speaker, that this absolutely refutes the contention of the hon. member for Prescott (Mr. Proulx).

I now come back to the general proposition contained in the resolution before the House, that an eight-hour day should be declared in the Dominion of Canada. It appears to me that before you can go into this matter very fully some investigation must be had of all that is necessary to be taken into account, otherwise a declaration of that sort might not meet all the conditions existing in Canada. You have, for instance, the question of child labour, and at first sight one might be led to ask himself: Is there such a thing as child labour in Canada? Answering only for the province of Alberta, I can say that we have a local statute dealing with that particular subject. The question of child labour has been dealt with exhaustively in Europe, and the fight over it has been particularly severe in the United States. Again, in order to impress the House with the true facts of the case, and also to give data upon which we may base any action which may be thought desirable to take, I may be permitted to quote from the same authority what has taken place in the United States, and also to endeavour to show how the corporations there have sought to evade the statute governing child labour. This is the passage I wish to quote:

The first legislative regulation of the hours of labour in this country applied to children. In 1842 a petition was presented to the Massachusetts Legislature by certain citizens of Fall River, who pointed out that the existing hours of labour must be permanently injurious to the health of children and detrimental to their education, and prayed that prohibitory legislation be enacted. The agitation resulted in the passage during the same year of a ten-hour law for children under twelve years of age in manufacturing establishments. In the same year, also, Connecticut enacted a ten-hour law for children under fourteen in cotton and woollen mills.

By the beginning of the Civil war laws limiting the hours of children in manufacturing establishments to ten a day had been enacted in the five additional states of New Hampshire, Maine, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Ohio. The Connecticut statute of 1842 was, however, superseded thirteen years after passage by a new law which set back the limit to eleven hours, followed within a year by an amendment which still further lowered the standard to twelve hours a day. Like the first Connecticut law, the early Pennsylvania laws applied only to textile mills, but in the other states the acts covered manufacturing in general. The ages of the children affected varied from twelve in Massachusetts to twenty-one in New Jersey and Pennsylvania. In addition to the states already mentioned, Rhode Island enacted in 1853 an eleven-hour law for children from twelve to fifteen.

These early laws were, however, to a great extent unenforced and even unenforceable. The still frequent provision, for example, that only violations committed "knowingly" are punishable, which to quote a Government report has "put a premium on ignorance and....serve to balk the intent of so much labour legislation," originated in the Massachusetts law of 1842 and was copied in New Jersey and Rhode Island. In New Hampshire children under fifteen could work longer than the statutory ten hours if provided with the "written consent of the parent or guardian." In New Jersey and in Pennsylvania under the earliest laws, a child could not be "holden or required" to work more than ten hours a day, but if the child worked longer the employer, in order to escape all responsibility, needed only to declare that the extra labour was not required, but voluntary. Ohio even went so far as to legitimatize this subtle distinction by declaring that minors under eighteen might not be "compelled" but that minors under fourteen might not be "permitted" to work more than ten hours. Only in two states were any provisions made for enforcement; in Connecticut constables and grand jurors were to inquire after violations, and in Pennsylvania constables could take action—but only after complaint.

That is what took place in the United States as regards child labour. If I refer particularly to the United States, it is not because in England and in Europe generally there was not the greatest possible abuse in the matter of child labour. Some of you will be astounded to hear the following statement of an historian with regard to the development of child labour in Europe:

Terrible cruelty characterized much of the development of industrial capitalism, both on the continent and in England. The birth of modern industry is heralded by a great slaughter of the innocents. Like the Royal

Navy, the factories were recruited by the press-gang. Cottages and workhouses were ransacked for poor children to recruit the factory staffs, and these were forced to work by turns during the greater part of the night. As Lancashire was thinly populated and great numbers of hands were suddenly wanted, thousands of little helpless creatures, whose nimble little fingers were especially wanted, were sent down to the north from the workhouses of London, Birmingham, and other towns. These apprentices were flogged, tortured and fettered. The profits of manufacturers were enormous. At length Sir Robert Peel brought in his Bill for the protection of children.

With the growth of capitalist production during the manufacturing period, the public conscience of Europe had lost the last remnant of shame, and the nations cynically boasted of every infamy that reinforced capitalistic accumulation. Liverpool waxed fat on the slave trade. The child slavery in the European manufactories needed for its pedestal the slavery, pure and simple, of the negroes imported into America. If money, according to Marie Augier, "comes into the world with a congenital bloodstain on one cheek," capital comes dripping from head to foot, from every pore, with blood and dirt.

That is the indictment which has been levelled against the employer of labour in Europe, and the statutes of the United States show conclusively that there is matter for serious indictment against the people of that country as well. I repeat that little of that may be charged against our country, although Alberta has a statute dealing with the subject. The argument of the employers is that if you do not permit this class of labour it will be impossible for the employers to meet other manufacturers in competition.

In connection with the subject of this resolution, the employment of women must also be considered. I propose merely to mention a number of commissions or investigating bodies that inquired into the condition of women regarding labour, with a view to giving you an idea of what was the result in the end. There is the Report on Condition of Women and Child Wage-Earners in the United States, volume IX; "History of Women in Industry," by Helen L. Sumner, page 67; National Trades' Union, September 13, 1834, quoted in "Documentary History of American Industrial Society," by John R. Cummings and Helen L. Sumner; Treatise of Charles E. Persons on "The Early History of Factory Legislation in Massachusetts," in "Labour Laws and Their Enforcement," Susan M. Kingsbury; Report on Conditions of Women and Child Wage-earners in the United States, volume X, "History of Women in Trades Unions," by John B. Andrews; "History of Women in Industry," by Helen L. Sumner; Report on Condition of Women and Child Wage-earners in the United States, volume IX, page 73.

Briefly, this is what followed regarding labour conditions in the United States for women.

On January 1, 1916, the situation with regard to women's hours was as follows:

I. Eight-hour States.

State.	Hours a Day.	Hours a Week.
California	8	48
District of Columbia	8	48
Colorado	8	..
Washington	8	..
Arizona	8	56

II. States allowing more than eight but less than ten hours:

State.	Hours a Day.	Hours a Week.
Oregon	8½ mercantile.	50
	8½ offices.	51
	9 any other industry. (By rulings of Industrial Welfare Commission.)	54
Arkansas	9	54
Maine	9	54
Missouri	9	54
Nebraska	9	54
New York	9	54
Texas	9	54
Utah	9	54
Minnesota	9 manufacturing, etc.	54
	10 mercantile, etc.	58
Idaho	9	..
Montana	9	..
Oklahoma	9	..

III. States allowing ten or more hours:

State.	Hours a Day.	Hours a Week.
Connecticut	10	55, 58
Delaware	10	55
Massachusetts	10	54
Michigan	10	54
Ohio	10	54
Pennsylvania	10	54
Rhode Island	10	54
Wisconsin	10	55
New Hampshire	10¼	55
Wyoming	10	56
Tennessee	10½	57
Vermont	11	58
Georgia	10	60
Kentucky	10	60
Louisiana	10	60
Maryland	10	60
Mississippi	10	60
New Jersey	10	60
North Carolina	11	60
South Carolina	11, 12	60
Illinois	10	..
North Dakota	10	..
South Dakota	10	..
Virginia	10	..

Kansas (By Industrial Welfare Commission.)

IV. States having no laws regulating hours of labour for women: Alabama, Florida, Iowa, Indiana, Nevada, New Mexico, West Virginia.

The result therefore is quite satisfactory, and when you consider that in 1916 the agi-

tation by all these societies and trades unions brought about a general recognition of womenkind in United States.

In Canada very little has been done to improve the condition of the working woman. In connection with the resolution before the House the conditions as affecting women must be taken into account. The only case in which I have been able to find that action was taken in Canada touching the matter of working hours for women was the appointment of a Royal Commission at Toronto in 1907 to inquire into a dispute between the Bell Telephone Company and its operators. There evidence was given by physicians who declared that if the health of the workers was to be preserved the working day should not be longer than six hours spread over a period of eight hours. So that any legislation which is put on the statute book of this country with regard to the hours of labour must necessarily take into account the conditions under which women work.

Of course, it does not follow that because in some cases women demand a working day of six hours or even eight hours there are not employments in connection with which the hours may be extended over longer periods without impairment of health or safety of the employees.

So far as legislation affecting men is concerned, very little is to be found in United States or in Europe dealing with the matter of hours. The only data that I can find relating to the hours that men should work are in relation to such employments as transportation, street railways, mines and work done under great pressure of air. Representations have been made from time to time to Federal Governments relating to the hours of men on the ground that the State itself is responsible as one of the parties to the contract, but little has been accomplished.

So far as transportation companies are concerned, the labourers themselves are responsible to some extent for what they have obtained. On the other hand, corporations are quite ready to recognize the demands of the labourers, for the simple reason that in many cases an army of men is involved, and it is expedient for the corporations themselves to have the good-will and co-operation of the labourers. Take the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. They have never had any trouble so far as hours of labour are concerned because their employees constitute an army of three hundred thousand men or more, and it is of vital importance to Canada that there should be no tie-up in the work which these men are doing. The company has, therefore, established what is known as a system of runs, so that a man may not necessarily have to work much more than eight hours at a time; and at the end of his run he has an opportunity for rest, enjoyment and repose.

In the matter of mines and tunnels the Provincial legislatures all over the Dominion have passed laws with regard to conditions of labour, it being apparent that these were necessary to the protection of human life. There are, however, cases where a day of even eight hours is too long, and in that respect I wish to quote a number of cases where employment is limited to only one and one-half hours:

> The beginnings of such adjustment are, however, to be seen in the laws of New York and New Jersey governing work in compressed air. Under both of these statutes not only are daily working hours regulated by the degree of pressure under which the work is done, but they are divided into two equal periods, the rest interval between which also varies according to the pressure as follows:

If the pressure exceeds:	But does not exceed:	Number of hours' work in 24:	Interval between working periods:
Normal	21 pounds	8 hours	½ hour
21 pounds	30 "	6 "	1 "
30 "	35 "	4 "	2 "
35 "	40 "	3 "	3 "
40 "	45 "	2 "	4 "
45 "	50 "	1½ "	5 "

So that when this matter is to be taken into consideration, this Parliament must go into details as to what is the class of work to be performed. Even a universal law providing for an eight-hour day is not going to meet the whole situation in the Dominion of Canada. There is something else besides the consideration of hours; there is also the question of rest at meal time. The labourer should be given all the time necessary and a reasonable rest at mid-day. There is the further consideration of night work. In that respect all authorities agree that night work brings forth neither the quality nor the quantity, and that as regards women and children it is, in many respects, an occasion of danger.

In dealing further with this resolution, the House should take into consideration the question of holidays. As regards Canada, I do not think there is any difficulty now, because both municipalities and provinces have seen, I believe, that the labouring classes get a half day a week at all events; but authorities who have given this matter a great deal of study, claim that the holidays should be increased for

the labouring man and that provision should be made for absence yearly with full pay.

The Labour Conference which was held at Washington took up this question and approved what the authority that I have placed before the House says, because provision has been made in that report to define what is industrial undertaking in one class of work and what is industrial undertaking in another; makes provision for extra long hours in cases of accident or accident being apprehended and also deals with a certain number of cases where the Government is supreme. If the President of the Council (Mr. Rowell) intends to deal with that Conference at Washington, I shall not take up the time of the House in reading some of the provisions dealing with questions of labour. If the hon. gentleman will say that he will deal with that, I shall leave the matter alone.

Mr. ROWELL: I think my hon. friend had better continue his speech, and anything he covers, I need not repeat, if I find it necessary to say anything later on.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: There are, therefore, reasons why this Government should take into consideration legislation along those lines, first because the constitutional question has been dealt with, as I am informed through the medium of the press, and because the International Conference at Washington shows that it is the business of federal authorities to deal with such matters. There was adopted at Washington the following draft dealing with the question of the Treaty of Versailles of 28th June, 1919, and the Treaty of St. Germain of 10th September, 1919:

ARTICLE 1.

For the purpose of this Convention, the term Industrial undertaking includes particularly:

(a) Mines, quarries and other works for the extraction of minerals from the earth.

(b) Industries in which articles are manufactured, altered, cleaned, repaired, ornamented, finished, adapted for sale, broken up or demolished, or in which materials are transformed, including shipbuilding and the generation, transformation and transmission of electricity or motive power of any kind.

(c) Construction, reconstruction, maintenance, repair, alteration, or demolition of any building, railway, tramway, harbour, dock, pier, canal, inland waterway, road, tunnel, bridge, viaduct, sewer, drain, well, telegraphic or telephonic installation, electrical undertaking, gas work, waterwork, or other work of construction, as well as the preparation for or laying the foundation of any such work or structure.

(d) Transport of passengers or goods by road, rail, sea or inland waterway, including the handling of goods at docks, quays, wharves or warehouses, but excluding transport by hand.

The provisions relative to transport by sea and on inland waterways shall be determined by a special conference dealing with employment at sea and on inland waterways.

The competent authority in each country shall define the line of division which separates industry from commerce and agriculture.

This is a very important point in that there is a good deal of apprehension throughout the country that the effect of the declaration of an eight-hour day will be to infringe upon the rights of the farmer to make private contracts with labourers. Any legislation that is to be passed by this Dominion must be legislation in accord with the principles laid down in this concention and in accord with the principles enunciated in the Treaty of Peace and League of Nations:

ARTICLE 2.

The working hours of persons employed in any public or private industrial undertaking or in any branch thereof, other than an undertaking in which only members of the same family are employed, shall not exceed eight in the day and forty-eight in the week, with the exceptions hereinafter provided for.

(a) The provisions of this Convention shall not apply to persons holding positions of supervision or management, nor to persons employed in a confidential capacity.

(b) Where by law, custom, or agreement between employers and workers' organizations, or, where no such organizations exist between employers' and workers' representatives, the hours of work on one or more days of the week are less than eight, the limit of eight hours may be exceeded on the remaining days of the week by the sanction of the competent public authority, or by agreement between such organizations or representatives; provided, however, that in no case under the provisions of this paragraph shall the daily limit of eight hours be exceeded by more than one hour.

(c) Where persons are employed in shifts it shall be permissible to employ persons in excess of eight hours in any one day and forty-eight hours in any one week, if the average number of hours over a period of three weeks or less does not exceed eight per day and forty-eight per week.

Therefore provision must be made in any Federal Act that may be passed for cases where a man may work the maximum of week hours and still not necessarily put in eight hours every day of that week.

ARTICLE 3.

The limit of hours of work prescribed in Article 2 may be exceeded in case of accident, actual or threatened, or in case of urgent work to be done to machinery or plant, or in case of "force majeure," but only so far as may be necessary to avoid serious interference with the ordinary working of the undertaking.

ARTICLE 4.

The limit of hours of work prescribed in Article 2 may also be exceeded in those processes which are required by reason of the nature of the process to be carried on continuously by a succession of shifts, subject to the condition that the working hours shall not

exceed fifty-six in the week on the average. Such regulation of the hours of work shall in no case affect any rest days which may be secured by the national law to the workers in such processes in compensation for the weekly rest day.

ARTICLE 5.

In exceptional cases where it is recognized that the provisions of Article 2 cannot be applied, but only in such cases, agreements between workers' and employers' organizations concerning the daily limit of work over a longer period of time, may be given the force of regulations, if the Government, to which these agreements shall be submitted, so decides. The average number of hours worked per week, over the number of weeks covered by any such agreement, shall not exceed forty-eight.

ARTICLE 6.

Regulations made by public authority shall determine for industrial undertakings:

(a) The permanent exceptions that may be allowed in preparatory or complementary work which must necessarily be carried on outside the limits laid down for the general working of an establishment, or for certain classes of workers whose work is essentially intermittent.

(b) The temporary exceptions that may be allowed, so that establishments may deal with exceptional cases of pressure of work.

These regulations shall be made only after consultation with the organizations of employers and workers concerned, if any such organizations exist. These regulations shall fix the maximum of additional hours in each instance, and the rate of pay for overtime shall not be less than one and one-quarter times the regular rate.

An eight-hour day law cannot be passed so summarily as all this. Exceptions must be provided to cover cases where the eight hours may be exceeded. Labour must also be consulted. The International Labour Conference which sat in Washington passed a resolution declaring that before any law was passed relating to labour, or to questions of hours and wages in this or any other country, the labour organizations must be consulted. I believe that is the proper thing to do.

A great deal was said at the International Labour Conference in Washington regarding the question of unemployment. If we are going to deal with the question of hours, which involves the question of wages, we might as well deal also with unemployment and social insurance. I shall not discuss those questions to-night, but the Bill ought to deal with them, because these questions are all related to one another.

Before sitting down I should like to draw attention to the resolution itself. I am in favour of the eight-hour day, and to that extent I support the resolution, but the resolution in effect means this: That we should declare it desirable, to the extent of the jurisdiction of this Parliament to have a national eight-hour day established immediately, subject only to the right of express private contract. What is the use of making such a declaration and pass a statute when we leave it open for a telephone operator, for instance, to come along and say to her employer: You are not prohibited from making a contract with me under which I shall be obliged to work sixteen hours a day. If the State is concerned with the welfare of women, and that it is so concerned is evident from what I have read to you this evening, is it not absolute folly to ask us to put on the statute books of this country a declaration that we have a national eight-hour day, when the principle of that law can be contravened at any time by employer and employee if they choose? If we are going to deal with this question of the eight-hour day at all, it must be from the point of view of the necessity of protecting the individual, whether man, woman or child, from engaging in a longer working day than eight hours. It may be necessary to legislate that the working hours in some cases should be limited to six or even four hours a day, but it should not be permitted to an employer to contravene the law by entering into a private contract with his employees. Otherwise, the legislation would stand merely as a farce, and have no force or sanction behind it. A law that merely says that such and such a thing shall be established, that provides no penalties for its enforcement, that can be contravened at the will of employer or employee, would not meet the conditions at all. I believe that the resolution as drawn up is weak and futile and does not meet the case. It should be amended for the purpose of meeting the actual conditions as they exist in Canada, so as to come to the relief of the labouring men, or it should not be dealt with at all. In any event, I would hesitate to say that I would support any measure dealing with this question, affecting as it would the whole of Canada, unless the labour organizations are first consulted, because they are familiar with conditions that actually exist and as to which we have very little information.

In conclusion, I wish to say a few words on the attitude of our capitalists and manufacturers. Shortly after the English labour platform was issued, there was such a fear on the part of manufacturers in the Dominion of Canada that they immediately formed a committee composed of the principal manufacturers in the city of Montreal and district to consider what steps should be taken. That committee issued circulars to all members of Parliament, I believe, and

to all those they thought they could possibly influence, dealing with such questions as co-operation and various other phases of reconstruction that were being much discussed at that time, leading us to believe they were very anxious to do everything they could for labour. They even intimated in their pamphlets and circulars that in some cases labour had not been properly treated. What has become of these gentlemen? Nothing has been done. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean), then a member of the Cabinet, was chairman of a committee dealing with labour conditions throughout the Dominion, but so far as I know no report was ever made to this House. The Government must have secured data from various sources dealing with conditions throughout the Dominion, but I have not been able to secure any report.

I would point out that there is a great deal to be done by the manfacturers themselves. It is not by legislation alone that you can bring about remedies. There is always some way of evading the law, always some loophole, always something that has not been provided for. The courts might not be in sympathy with the legislation, and very often the labouring classes are not in a position to carry cases to higher courts. What we need in this country is a readjustment of the relations between capital and labour. There must be some disposition on the part of the employers to treat their employees properly, and once they have this disposition the same good relations will prevail between employer and employee in every other industry as prevail in the railway world. You see very few strikes or labour difficulties on the Canadian Pacific railway. Why is it not possible for other employers of labour to obtain the good will of their employees in the same way? It is not by legislation alone that we can have a perfect understanding between these two forces, And I exhort the men who, at the beginning of the reconstruction period, were issuing pamphlets and letters all over Canada admitting their own shortcomings and promising to do better for labour, to proceed immediately to fulfil those promises. If they do, the necessity for legislation will be dispensed with in a large measure. In any case, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully submit that the resolution as drawn would be null and void as regards any effect which it might have if it were law. I think that a committee should be appointed to consider the matter so that a proper act might be brought in which would take into consideration all classes of labour in the country under all conditions.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prince, P.E.I.): It has been intimated that an opportunity will be given later in the session for the discussion of the question of an eight-hour day, and I shall not take up much time this evening trying to consider the merits of that question on this resolution. My purpose is rather to point out that in dealing with industrial questions it is of the greatest importance that the meaning of a resolution such as this should be made perfectly clear. Anything either misleading or uncertain in the note sounded by Parliament as to what it proposes to do in regard to this great problem cannot work other than injury to the relations between capital, labour, and the community. This resolution may mean very much or it may mean nothing at all and I desire simply to ascertain its real significance.

My hon. friend who has just resumed his seat (Mr. H. A. Mackie) points out that the resolution concludes with the words, "Subject only to the right of express private contract." In other words, we are asked to enact an eight-hour day law, with the understanding that individuals notwithstanding shall have the right to enter into express private contracts in the matter of hours. I trust that the mover of the resolution will correct me if I am wrong, but I gather that the meaning of these words is that any individual who employs another may make a contract with him as to his hours of labour on any terms upon which the two are agreed. If that is not the meaning of the words I shall be obliged if the hon. member will make the position clear.

Mr. BURNHAM: The resolution is on all fours with the law that applies to the percentage which may be charged in case there is no percentage mentioned in any legal document or instrument. As the hon. gentleman well knows, the principle observed in such cases is that unless there is an express agreement to the contrary the legal percentage shall be considered as the percentage in the instrument. All this resolution proposes is that it shall be understood that the working day is eight hours unless there is an agreement to the contrary. It is not intended to deprive the working man or any other citizen of the right to make an agreement which he himself considers fair and just, and as for the compulsion that may be behind that, and which the hon. gentleman evidently fears.

I can only say that organized labour will take care of that matter.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think that the purpose of my hon. friend, so far as to afford an opportunity to members to express their views on the eight-hour day is concerned, has been well served. But the resolution itself, worded as it is, will not, I fear, be of any real service to labour. I may frankly say that I am pretty sure that labour would not regard very favourably a resolution of this Parliament approving an eight-hour day with the option to any one who might care to do so to make any contract he wishes in regard to the hours of labour.

Mr. BURNHAM: If the eight-hour day were enacted without this clause may I ask my hon. friend if there is anything on earth to prevent a man working eighteen hours a day if he chose?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If this Parliament enacted an eight-hour day as labour is demanding in certain industries, it would be necessary to provide certain machinery to see that the law was complied with. In many factories in the country to-day the working day is fixed at eight hours, and if in these factories any effort were made to work men for eighteen hours the owners would be liable to the penalty provided. Simply to pass a pious resolution saying that Parliament is in favour of an eight-hour day but also in favour of allowing the individual the right to make any contract he pleases in regard to hours is to raise a hope which it is impossible to realize.

Mr. BURNHAM: All this resolution does is to raise a presumption.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think my hon. friend's purpose is served in giving an opportunity for discussion, and in doing so I think he has undoubtedly rendered some service. But in pressing the resolution to a division, I think it would be wise that we should all understand that if we did vote for it we would not be enacting anything one way or the other that is material so far as labour and capital are concerned.

There is another clause in the resolution to which some attention should be devoted before a vote is asked upon it. The resolution refers to the extent of the jurisdiction of this Parliament.

That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that to the extent of the jurisdiction of this Parliament a national eight-hour working day should be established immediately

[Mr. Burnham.]

There is an old-time saying, Mr. Speaker, that it is not a wise thing to buy a pig in a poke; and I think my hon. friend will agree with me that it is equally unwise to legislate in the dark. Without knowing what the jurisdiction of Parliament is on this question of an eight-hour day, whether Parliament has a wide jurisdiction or no jurisdiction at all, I submit that it would be unwise to pass a resolution of this kind. My purpose, when I rose, was to point this fact out to the President of the Privy Council (Hon. Mr. Rowell) and to express the hope that when he speaks on the resolution he will inform the House whether the Government has considered the question of ascertaining what the jurisdiction of this Parliament is in the matter of eight-hour day legislation. I think it is important that that phase of the subject should be made perfectly clear before any considerable discussion takes place in Parliament on the eight-hour day problem. The one thing we are interested to know is, what is the jurisdiction of this Parliament in the matter. When we have ascertained that, we should proceed to the next step and say how far we think this Parliament should go under such jurisdiction as it may have. If the Government has not already taken steps to ascertain the proper jurisdiction of Parliament, I think it would be in the interests of labour and capital and, indeed, of all classes, that this should be done and that the House should be informed accordingly.

Mr. JOHN BEST (Dufferin): Canada at the present time, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, is trying to devise ways and means of increasing production and retaining its men on the farms, and this resolution, it seems to me, would have the effect of luring boys from the rural districts. It must be remembered that half of our population reside on the farms. It may be said that this has nothing to do with the farmers, but I do not see how we can deal with this matter without considering how it will affect the farmers. The young man is going to try and get the largest wages he can and to work the shortest hours. We are all doing that; we are all trying to make the most out of the shortest time. How the farmers are going to secure help to work twelve or thirteen hours a day when there is a legal eight-hour day is something I cannot understand. That is one of the principal reasons why there is this great exodus from the farms to the cities. Too many of our young men—and middle-aged men too—are going to the cities. Ask them the question and they will tell you that they are going

from the farm to the city because they cannot work the farms themselves and they cannot get help. I think that there should be no legislation put on the statute book at the present time that will take men away from the farms to the cities. Many men I know would be quite willing to stay on the farm if they could get help. But the farmer and his wife have perhaps got too old to work the farm; they cannot get help, and they are forced to give up the farm and go to the city. As soon as the war started wages became extremely high, young men went to the city, and you cannot get them to return to the farm.

I am not in favour of any class of men working extremely long hours. There are some kinds of work at which six, and probably four hours would be enough, but if these industries can hire men to work for whatever hours they wish, why should we put a law of this kind on the statute book? We are told that it is only for the factories, offices and shops. If that is so why not say that they can hire them for as many hours as they choose the same as the farmers can? We are told that the farmer can hire his help for whatever hours he wishes. That is all very well; I suppose he can, but the question is to get the men. Why do farmers work such long hours?—they are asked by the people in the cities and towns of Canada. City people are howling about the high cost of living, and I quite agree that it is very high. Farm products in many cases are high, but I want to say that the very moment you enact the eight-hour day you are going to increase the cost of living. If we attempt to work on the farms even ten hours a day we will reduce, in the first place, the production of milk and butter to the extent of one-sixth at least. When I was on the farm we tried to milk the cows at seven o'clock in the morning and at seven at night. We did that in order to milk them at a regular hour, twelve hours apart. If we wanted to have less milk or to put the cows dry we would milk them at intervals, probably sixteen hours apart. It is impossible to produce the same amount of milk, butter, cheese, wheat or grains of all kinds if we are going to have an eight-hour day. The difference between the farm and the shop and factory is this: They can get a supply of men and they can put on different shifts to keep the work going, but who could say that a farmer in this Dominion could hire two sets of men? It is impossible, you cannot get one, let alone getting two. Are you going to tie down the farmer, who has worked for fifty or sixty years twelve or fourteen hours a day, to an eight-hour day? If he is willing to give the wages to get men to work eight hours a day in the field must he and his wife work twelve and fourteen hours in order to feed the stock and milk the cows? This is a great injustice to the farmers of the country. If we want to put legislation on the statute book to take more men off the farm we could not devise anything more calculated to bring that about than the measure suggested by this resolution, and if we adopt it we are going to be up against a greater difficulty than many of us are aware of.

9 p.m.

I realize, the same as my hon. friend from Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) and many other members of this House, that there is a great clamour for short hours but the people living in the cities, as well as others, should not do anything that is going to injure the great basic industry of Canada, which is agriculture. I feel satisfied that many thousands will leave the farm if, as a result of this Bill being placed on the statute book, they cannot get farm labour. As I said before, a young man going out and seeking a job will say: I will look where I can get the most pay and the shortest hours. That will not be on the farm. With all respect to the labour men, I believe as the hon. member for Peterborough said, that they should be allowed to hire at whatever hours they wish, and I believe that that view is shared by many hon. members of this House. Therefore, the law would be no good; as the hon. the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) has said, the law would be a farce if it did not bind anybody. If you put a law on the statute book and say that we must stick to the eight-hour day you will ruin the farmers whereas if you put it the other way and say that the manufacturers or the employer can hire as he wishes the law will be ineffective. There are jobs that are so hazardous and extremely hard that four, six or eight hours would be sufficient for them, but out in the open air, where the conditions are favourable and conducive to health, there is nothing to hinder a man from working ten or twelve hours a day. We see masons, carpenters and other mechanics clamouring for eight hours a day instead of nine or ten. Any one who says that you can get as much work done in eight hours as in ten does not know what he is talking about. We have had too much of this practice of limiting the amount of work that a man can do in a day. Where

a man could probably lay double the amount of brick that another man could he is restrained, he is not allowed to work to his capacity, but he must only lay so many brick. There is no encouragement for the man who is willing to work and make an honest living. I would ask the members of this House to remember that agriculture is the basic industry of Canada, and that if you support this Bill you will do more to take the boys off the farm than could possibly be done by any other measure that could be brought before this House.

Mr. GEORGE BOYCE (Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I have always been a farmer and I know the conditions under which work on the farm is carried on. I think that this measure to limit the day's work to eight hours is one of the most dangerous that could be brought before this House, and I am of the opinion that before it is adopted it should receive the most careful consideration. The agricultural industry represents a production of $1,500,000,000, an amount which exceeds the production of all the other industries in Canada. Such an important industry as that of agriculture should be given due consideration and any measure affecting it so vitally as this one does should not be hastily dealt with. The House would do well to bear in mind the fact that four and a half per cent of the farmers and seventeen per cent of the farm labourers have gone to the cities. Why? Because of shorter hours and greater pay. A measure, such as is now proposed, to legalize the eight-hour day would be very dangerous from the point of view of agriculture. There is not a farmer who could get any hired help, no matter what price he offered, because the men would have gone to the cities for shorter hours and still larger wages. Eight hours a day is very short. For instance, how can you get a crop in if you start at eight o'clock in the morning and finish at five in the evening? How are you to take your harvest off within such working hours? And how are you going to get your seeding done? I know I could never get my farm work done within those hours, and I would very much like to see some of those men who are advocating the eight-hour day go out on the farm; undoubtedly it would teach them a lesson. It is an utter impossibility to talk of farming on an eight-hour day. I never was an advocate of long hours—I never went into the field earlier than seven o'clock in the morning, and I always left at six o'clock in the evening. If a man cannot stand that many hours in the field he is no good at farming; he should become an inmate of some charitable institution.

I think it would have been better had this matter not been brought forward. Factory men are well looked after by their local unions; and I say, let farmers hire as they can. There is no doubt that at the present time no farmer or his help has to work excessively long hours, but if this law goes into force it will 'cause trouble. If you hire a man for a month, six months, or a year, he will turn round and tell you that he has to work only eight hours a day, and if you want him to work beyond those hours you will have to pay him, not regular wages, but, I suppose, time and-a-half. We see that in connection with railroads and business concerns, and it is safe to assume that we farmers would be treated in the same way.

Our farmers do not work for fun—I certainly never did—and I want to tell you that just as soon as you pass this Bill your cost of living will rise fifteen or twenty per cent higher— and God knows it is high enough already. It cannot be otherwise. Again, look at the European nations; there is not one of them but has a twelve or fourteen-hour day. How are you going to compete with them? We will have 1878 conditions back again, when you could not sell a pound of butter for more than ten cents. I myself have sold oats at nineteen cents a bushel, and potatoes at fifty-five cents a bushel.

I trust, gentlemen, that before voting in favour of this resolution you will look into it very carefully. As a member of this House I am just as anxious for the welfare of our people as anyone, but if I voted for an eight-hour day I believe I would be voting against the best interests of the Dominion.

Mr. E. W. NESBITT (North Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I understood yesterday from the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) that this eight-hour question would be discussed at a later date, and I had no idea it was coming up to-day; in fact, it is not on the Order Paper so far as I could see.

The resolution reads:

> That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that to the extent of the jurisdiction of this Parliament——

Before pressing a resolution of this kind, would it not be wise for us to find out what is the jurisdiction of Parliament? I understand from certain legal authorities that there is a difference of opinion as to

whether that jurisdiction is within the provinces or the Dominion. Therefore, I am sorry that my hon. friend from West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) insists on pressing his resolution to a vote to-night.

Mr. BURNHAM: Might I ask the hon. gentleman, who does he suppose has jurisdiction outside the provinces?

Mr. NESBITT: Outside the provinces?

Mr. BURNHAM: Yes. Are there no lands outside the provinces?

Mr. NESBITT: Those lands are worked principally by the wolves; we have not much jurisdiction over them.

Mr. BURNHAM: You said we could have no jurisdiction.

Mr. NESBITT: I agree absolutely with my hon. friend from Dufferin (Mr. Best) that labour is perfectly safe——

Mr. BURNHAM: Oh, oh.

Mr. NESBITT: ——to be left alone to regulate its hours. Employers fully realize that the labour unions are quite capable of making arrangements as to the hours of labour in the various industries. Of recent years, so far as I know, there has been no trouble on that score. One business, on account of the work being very concentrated, may require very short hours of labour. We can leave it to the employers and employees to decide whether a man can do his best working four, six, eight or ten hours a day.

I think it would be a mistake for Parliament to pass a resolution of this kind, which commits us to legislation, until we know just exactly what jurisdiction we possess. As I said before, I think it is perfectly safe to leave the regulation of this matter for the industries concerned. I know industries that work their men in some branches in four-hour shifts only. I know of other industries where the shifts are six hours, and others where they are eight hours, depending on the amount of concentration required during the hours of labour. In some industries a man can work just as well ten hours a day as eight hours. Farming is an industry, as mentioned by my hon. friend from Peterboro, that has always worked ten or twelve hours, it being a type of labour that does not call for excessive concentration. If you watch farmers you will observe that as a rule they work very leisurely except at certain times of the year; for instance, during harvesting and haying, when for a few days they may work at considerable pressure if the weather is threatening or there is some other reason for haste. Under such circumstances you very seldom see men refuse to work even at night to save the harvest in the field. I do not think we should interfere with arrangements such as those. We have got to be guided by circumstances, and farming is very much of an industry, indeed, in this country—an industry of such vital importance that we should not attempt to interfere with its hours of labour in any shape or form.

If it is provided by statute that the length of the working day shall be eight or even ten hours, the probabilities are that men who are employed by the day and not by the year will work only during the hours specified by the statute. In that case, work on the farm would be thrown out of gear; because on the farm some of the men work certain hours and others have to work, or do work, longer. I cannot help thinking that it would be a great mistake for this House to adopt this resolution committing us to an eight-hour day for the whole of Canada. It has been very well said that so far as our industries are concerned we compete with many other countries. Of course, if all the countries which are signatories to the League of Nations accepted the eight-hour day, and it became universal, enabling all countries to compete on the same basis—except perhaps, in the matter of wages—it would be a different matter. But I think it would be a great mistake to adopt a resolution of this kind until we know exactly what our jurisdiction is and until we have discussed the matter thoroughly from the standpoints of the various industries throughout the country. I hope that the hon. member will not press his resolution to a vote; if he does, I shall be obliged to vote against it.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, in many respects I have a good deal of sympathy with the resolution. Labour has had the heavy end of the work of our country for many years. It is thought by many that the hours of labour could be reduced to the advantage of the general industrial community. But before giving my view upon that question I wish to touch upon the point raised by the member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) with regard to jurisdiction.

As I understand it, this House has not the jurisdiction to carry into effect legislation based upon such a resolution as that which has been submitted by the member for Peterborough (Mr. Burnham). The jurisdiction in the matter is confined largely

to the provinces. But I think that we would go a long way toward meeting the view of my hon. friend and giving an example to the provinces in connection with legislation which they might later introduce if we adopted a resolution providing that in all Government contracts of every description, whether carried out as piece work or as work sub-let to contractors, it be stipulated that eight hours a day shall be considered the legal working day for the men engaged in these enterprises. I have not studied the matter from the legal aspect, nor am I in a position to do so; but I believe that this would be a good step to take.

I do not think it would be any infringement upon the liberty of the subject or work hardship to any contractor or working man if, in accordance with the last few words of my hon. friend's resolution, the right to arrange for longer hours under certain circumstances should be accorded. There might be a case where an employee would be willing to work ten hours a day in order to bring about the completion of a contract at a given time, provided, of course, that the employee was recompensed accordingly. The proviso in the latter part of the resolution, therefore, is quite in order.

I believe that it is not possible for all industries to comply with any regulation establishing the length of the working day at eight hours. There are processes of manufacture in this country to which such a law could not be very readily applied. Six or eight hours of labour in certain callings takes far more out of a man than ten or twelve at some lighter work. I see a good deal of force, therefore, in the argument put forward by the member for Dufferin (Mr. Best) and member for Carleton (Mr. Boyce) with regard to the farming community.

I did not hear the address of the member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) on this subject and I do not know whether he made any allowances for weather conditions —these sometimes prevent the labourer from carrying on any work on the farm. For instance, in harvest time no work can be done in the field when the weather is wet. I am sure the member for Peterborough does not wish to suggest that if there are two or three wet days in succession the eight-hour day provision shall be considered as having been fulfilled even though no work at all was done. If, therefore, his resolution called for a forty-eight hour week instead of an eight-hour day, it would be better. For instance, one day might be wet and the next day fine, and the farm labourer could put in twelve or fourteen hours on a fine day if it were necessary to do so in order to save the crop, instead of saying: Well, it rained yesterday and I could not work, but it must be counted as an eight-hour day; and to-day I will only work eight hours. In fact, I am doubtful, as I have said, whether such legislation could be applied to the farming community; nor do I think it is desirable that it should. We should differentiate between the different industries. I come from an industrial city where from eight to ten thousand workmen are employed, and our factories are endeavouring to adhere very closely to the principle of the eight-hour day. In fact, the eight-hour day is actually in vogue in some of the best factories in our community; so that without legal enactment of any kind, labour and capital have in these cases agreed that eight hours is the workingman's day. But to other industries the principle could not be applied. Suppose a man is running a single machine which has cost his employer $15,000 or $20,000, and which represents the work of fifty, or, perhaps one hundred men under the old system of hand labour. The work that used to be done by the sledge hammer and the multiplication of sledge hammers is now done by a single machine which, when a button is pushed, strikes a twenty-ton blow. When that machine, therefore, comes to a standstill a large amount of capital comes to a standstill; and if the eight-hour day principle were applied to the industry in connection with which that machine was operated it might be necessary to run two shifts of eight hours each, perhaps even three shifts, in order that that machine might be worked to full capacity. If the eight-hour day had been in vogue during the war, how many of our requirements for munitions could have been fulfilled? Not very many. It was necessary to get the very highest amount of production, and that cannot be done by limiting the hours of labour to eight hours a day in all callings. But I am favourable to the eight-hour day; I believe that the system should be brought into effect in Canada so far as we are able to bring it into effect. As I understood the President of the Council (Hon. Mr. Rowell) to say, it is important that in legislating for an eight-hour day for Canada as a whole we have some regard to what the other nations of the world are going to do about it. We in Canada cannot, if we establish an eight-hour day, compete with our neighbours to the south if they work on a basis of ten hours a day. If Germany is going to work twelve, fifteen or sixteen hours, to say

nothing of Japan, China and other countries which underpay their labour and exact very long hours, the eight-hour day cannot bring about the best results. An international arrangement between labour and capital throughout the whole civilized world is the final consummation for the eight-hour day proposition.

Mr. BURNHAM: Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the Chinese must agree to this first?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I did not say so, but I say it is desirable that all nations so far as possible should agree to it. I hope we are a little more advanced than the Chinese, but they are coming up pretty fast and they are competing with us, and we must have some attention to what is going on in outside nations. That is the point I wish to make, and it should be taken into consideration. I am not clear as to what a day's work should consist of, but it should really consist of a certain product. A certain product should be turned out in a day's work. I know the hon. member for West Peterborough has a great regard for the ten commandments, one of which says: Six days shalt thou labour and do all thy work. Whether we can do that in an eight-hour day or not, I am not quite clear, but we are commanded to do six day's work in the week whether we are engaged as labourers or otherwise. Whether we are working with our hands or our heads, it makes little difference, everybody in this country is supposed to work for his daily bread. Labour has thought—and I think justly—that they have been oppressed somewhat in the past in being compelled to work too long hours. Therefore, while I have a very broad and strong sympathy with the resolution of my hon. friend,—and, in fact, I am personally committed to it, but that does not amount to much, because I am only a humble member of the House—I should like to see a large measure of legislation along the lines I have indicated.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE (Edmonton): Is there a commandment that forbids one from robbing a man of his health or killing him by making him run a fifteen thousand dollar machine?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Some of those expensive machines are run with less individual effort than is expended on very much lighter work, and take very much less out of the operator than does some very much lighter work. What is necessary is that the man should be very careful not to get his hand or leg or something of that kind into the machine. It requires constant attention and great activity on his part to see that he does not get hurt. The mere pressing of a button and stopping the machine when the operation is completed could be performed by a child, but it requires an expert man to know when the process is completed. I suppose the hon member is aware that the Workmen's Compensation Act is in force in Ontario, and if any manufacturer has a man injured in his factory, he has to pay very heavily, and, I think, rightly so. Therefore, the workingman is very well protected against accidents that may occur in factories, and an employer is obliged to pay what is considered a fair recompense to a man for the loss of any member of his body or for being maimed in any way whatever.

Mr. JOHN ALBERT SEXSMITH (Peterborough East): Mr. Speaker, I think it would be a great mistake to adopt this resolution just at present and to say that an eight-hour day was the legal working day for the labourers of this country. I have, however, no objection to the eight-hour day. My heart goes out to the labouring man of Canada and, in fact of the world, who works eight hours or ten hours a day or whatever number of hours a day he has to work and works hard. If present commercial and financial conditions in Canada will allow a citizen of this country to make a good living by working eight hours a day, aye, by working only six hours a day, then I say: Go to it, and let that be the working day, but I do not think circumstances will permit that. Never before in Canada were we looking and waiting and asking more anxiously for greater production, and I do not think I am saying anything wide of the fact when I say that there never before was a time when people wanted to do less and get more for the little they did. A few weeks ago I noticed that the Post Office Department of the United States sent out what one might call questionnaires to 200,000 different farmers asking them what that department could do to assist the farming community in the way of greater production or in getting labour on their farms. A short time ago they had received some forty odd thousand replies, of which over ninety per cent, if my memory serves me aright, indicated the intention of either quitting the farm altogether or curtailing it to such an extent as to permit the farmer to run it with his own labour. They said in their replies that the reason for their intention

was that they could not compete with the high prices paid in the city and the short hours. We all know that labour in this city, as in every city not only of Canada but of this continent, is shouting about the high cost of living. Some speakers have already said that they would not object to the eight-hour day if it were not applied to the farmer. I am not speaking particularly in the interest of the farmer; I am convinced that the farmer cannot operate successfully with an eight-hour day; but if the eight-hour day were applied generally in the industries in cities and towns, what would be the result? Why, you would not have in a county a baker's dozen of young men on the farms. Just last night, I happened to look over the municipal statistics for the province of Ontario, and according to the census statistics sent out by the department, from the end of 1915 to the end of 1917 there were 28,000 fewer people living in the rural municipalities. That means that 28,000 people had left the rural municipalities and, I suppose, had gone to the cities where probably they could get $6 for eight hours' work. Just in conclusion, I would say that I am heartily in sympathy with the very shortest hours of labour under which the work this country may be carried on successfully, but I do not think it would redound, physically, mentally or in any other way, to the benefit of Canada for our men to work six hours a day and play eighteen. Why, when Adam was put out of the Garden of Eden he was told "By the sweat of thy brow shalt thou earn thy bread," but nobody wants to sweat these days. While I am in sympathy with the labouring man, I think it should be left to the employers and the men themselves to work the hours they choose. If Canada could carry on effectively on a six-hour day, I would not object; but under present conditions, not only in Canada but throughout the world, I do not think that is possible. If this resolution is pressed to a vote, I do not think it would be wise for us to say by our action in this House that an eight-hour day should be the standard working day all over Canada.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Shelburne and Queen's): The hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) has brought before the House a very important subject, and it has been the means of bringing out a very interesting and instructive debate. I would indulge the hope that in accomplishing that my hon. friend had done all that he could expect to accomplish at the present stage. I do not quite see what good end is to be served by dividing the House on this matter. His resolution, naturally enough, does not enact anything. It expresses a broad general opinion in favour of the eight-hour day, and most of us, I think, are prepared in general terms to subscribe to that. I quite realize that for most occupations eight hours is a fair day's work, and if a man can avoid working more than that, in most occupations, it would be better for himself and I hope better for the community. But we have already declared in general terms that we subscribe to the eight-hour idea. It has been included, as the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) has mentioned, in the Peace Treaty which we approved a year ago. So we have already done in effect what my hon. friend asks us to do now, and that is to give a broad general expression of approval of the eight-hour system. It seems to me that before we can go beyond that we ought to have something more definite before us. We ought to have the Bill, because a man may be in favour of the principle of an eight-hour law, but when you come to apply it in detail, it may not be so easily worked out as some of us would like it to be. I do not think that my hon. friend by pressing this to a division can get one step further than he has already gone. We have already declared our approval of the eight-hour idea, and that is all my hon. friend wants us to do here. The President of the Privy Council in discussing another matter to-day told us that as a consequence of the discussions and conferences that had taken place rising out of the Peace Treaty the obligation rested upon every government that was a party to the International Labour Conference to bring forward legislation in favour of the eight-hour law, and of course it follows that he must bring forward a measure of that kind this session, so far as it is within the competence of this Parliament to deal with the matter. With that assurance, for that was the effect of the statement of the President of the Privy Council, I do not see what good we can accomplish by dividing the House at the present time.

Mr. BURNHAM: Do I understand the hon. gentleman practically to identify my resolution with the statement made by the President of the Privy Council?

Mr. FIELDING: It is not for me to put interpretations on the statement of the President of the Privy Council, except as they occur to everybody present. I do not

think I have misstated his position. I asked him to-day what would be the consequences of this Labour Conference, and he replied that every government that participated in the Conference is under an obligation to submit to its Parliament the results of the conclusions arrived at. Very well; the conclusion arrived at is favourable to the eight-hour law.

Mr. BURNHAM: Hear, hear.

Mr. FIELDING: And the President of the Privy Council told us in effect that the Government would be prepared to carry out its obligation.

Mr. BURNHAM: Certainly, and we will vote for the measure.

Mr. FIELDING: I am a little more patient than my hon. friend. I am willing to wait a little while until the Bill is before us in all its details.

Mr. DANIEL LEE REDMAN (East Calgary): Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I would care to give any opinion on the extent of jurisdiction which this House might have in this matter. Generally speaking, one would think that under the British North America Act, it was a matter primarily for the provinces to deal with. Whether our new relationship in the League of Nations gives the matter an international or a broadly national aspect is another question. There is no precedent to guide us, for these conditions have but newly arisen. However, the mover of this resolution has guarded against any question of jurisdiction arising, by limiting his resolution to the extent of the jurisdiction which this House may have, and so I regard it more or less as calling for an expression of general opinion in regard to the eight-hour day.

I think reason is largely on the side of the eight-hour day. A day's work may sometimes be too short, but many a day's work has been made too long in the past. Personally I think eight hours is a fair and reasonable working day, and I believe that in most instances you would get just as much work done in eight hours as in nine or ten. Making the working day eight hours would not limit production so much as do certain feelings which sometimes exist among working men. In some parts of Canada, for instance, among members of certain organizations, not labour organizations, but which have among their membership some labour men, there has been an absolute propaganda against production. That is the kind of influence we must be in a position to fight, and if we want to be in a position to fight unreasonable demands such as those for a six-hour or a seven-hour day, we must be in a clean position ourselves; we must give our opinion in favour of the things which are fair and the things which are right. I believe the eight-hour day is a fair and reasonable proposition, and I think it would be a mistake if this House declared itself as being opposed to it. I think it would be giving the wrong sort of leadership to the country, and would create feelings of unrest which would not tend to increase production. We have had a Factory Act in Alberta for the last year or two, which among other provisions limits the hours of work in many industries to eight. The Act has worked fairly well; there may have been some difficulties, but on the whole we have carried on, and I believe that with the better feeling and co-operation that came when labour was given this reasonable working day, we got greater production than when we forced the men to work longer hours. The eight-hour day will give them more time for recreation, self-improvement, and for looking after those interests which a man must attend to outside of his ordinary business. I have no hesitation in stating that I am in favour of the principle of the eight-hour day, but I realize that it would not be wise to make the law operative in some industries for some time to come, until they have got on a basis where they could carry on successfully under these new conditions.

Mr. ALPHONSE VERVILLE (St. Denis): Mr. Speaker, this is not a new question in this House, although to many members it may be new. An eight-hour measure was presented to the House in 1911, and got its second reading and was considerd in committee, but the dissolution of the House prevented the Bill from going through the Senate. In 1912 no Bill was presented; there was a change of Government. I presented that Bill myself in 1911 and was in hopes that it would become law. Nothing was done in 1913. In 1914 the war broke out. This resolution proposes nothing new. I believe my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) supported the Bill when it was before the House on the occasion I speak of, and he either said that it did not go far enough or that it went too far. If my memory serves me well, I am inclined to think his opinion was that it went too far. I think we should bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, the important fact that any legislation that may be introduced by any gov-

ernment in regard to the working classes should pay due respect to the welfare of the sound element in labour. As we all know, there are two elements of supreme consequence in the life of the civilized world to-day: One which is seeking to bring about destruction, and the other which is endeavouring to be constructive. And I think that the sound element of labour will assuredly win in the end. They are doing so in this country and also in the United States. Any legislation, therefore, which can be enacted for the relief of those who are now asking for an eight-hour working day will serve to create a better feeling and understanding in the country and will do more towards the reconciliation of classes and the restoration of peace than anything else. I think that any one who reads what is transpiring in this country and elsewhere will agree with me when I say that the unsound element—if I may classify certain people under that term—are not very numerous, although they are very noisy and will drag along with them large numbers of men who follow them inconsiderately, not really knowing where they are going. On the other hand, the sound element has been fighting to counteract the influence of destructive agencies and I believe that a great deal of success has attended the efforts of those men in the community who have tried to bring about peace and goodwill. It is no more than right that every consideration should be given to this question, which is one of the most important that could be brought before Parliament. My hon. friend from Brantford made the statement that the principle could be applied to public works. That was exactly the object of the eight-hour Bill of 1911. I am not prepared to say just how far the Government can go in its jurisdiction; but I am confident that during the present session we shall have a measure of this nature that will furnish an opportunity to discuss the merits of the eight-hour day. At the present time I do not think I need enter into that question.

Mr. CHARLES ROBERT HARRISON (Nipissing): I feel myself somewhat in the position of the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt), I had been in hopes that the debate would not come on at this time, because I have a lot of data in connection with the eight-hour day from different corporations proving that they have been more successful, and that their output has been even greater, under an eight-hour day than it was when they worked ten and twelve hours a day. Those data, I regret to say, I have not with me at this moment, and I cannot give to the subject that degree of justice which I should otherwise have been in a position to give to it. I cannot agree with the hon. member for North Oxford in the statement that labour organizations should look after the working hours for labouring men. Practically speaking, the labour organizations take care of the union men of the country, but there is a great army of labouring men and women who do not belong to any organization. I should therefore like to see some legislation put on the statute book affording those people whose occupations do not entitle them to membership in labour organizations some degree of protection. There seems to be an opinion, almost an apprehension, on the part of some members that Canada may be in the lead in enacting an eight-hour day; but there is no ground for this assumption, as the following extracts in regard to the eight-hour day movement abroad will clearly show:

United States—

In the United States, federal legislation providing for an eight-hour day in certain Government contract work existed prior to 1892, but it was vaguely worded and uncertain in effect. An Act of 1890 provided for a straight eight-hour day for labourers and mechanics employed by the Federal Government or by contractors or sub-contractors on public works.

Twenty-nine states of the union have enacted legislation reducing to eight hours the working day for employees in public employment or in private employment on contract work for national, state or municipal governments. At the end of 1918, fourteen states had enforced the eight-hour day for miners and eight states had forbidden the employment of men in smelting operations for longer than eight hours per day. Eleven states provide for an eight-hour day for men employed in industries involving special hazards.

By agreements between employers and workmen or by the award of an official labour adjustment body, an eight-hour day has been put in force in several industries. The members of the International Typographical Union won a concession on this point in 1906. An eight-hour day and forty-four week is the rule for the greater part of the building trades. The American Woollen Company, the largest of its kind in the United States, the United States Steel Corporation, the Ford Automobile Company and other large industrial establishments have adopted the basic eight-hour day.

Australia—

In Australia hours of labour are limited by law in the case of factories and shops, the general working week being forty-eight hours, and this period has been standardized in most occupations. A strong demand has now arisen for a week of forty-eight hours.

New Zealand—

In New Zealand the Factories Act, 1908, made the forty-eight hour week legal in all places of occupation where two or more persons are employed in the preparation of goods for trade or sale.

France—

In April of the present year, an Act was passed by the French Parliament providing that the working hours of all workers shall not exceed eight a day or forty-eight a week, or an equivalent limit over some period other than a week. The application of this principle to particular industries and localities is entrusted to the government.

Italy—

A working day of eight hours has been introduced recently in the metal, engineering and shipbuilding industries, and in the principle textile trades in Italy. An unanimous decision by the agriculturists and representatives of agricultural workers was reached in April, 1919, whereby the hours of work for agricultural labourers hired by the day were to be reduced to eight. Overtime was to be allowed under certain conditions at special rates.

I had an opportunity of going through the country with the Industrial Commission last year, and in the great majority of places we visited we found a demand for a shorter working day based on the desire for more leisure and energy to devote to things of life other than work, and a general approval of employers in this regard. In our report we mentioned such industries as farming, fishing and logging. These three were mentioned as being industries in which it is almost impossible to adopt an eight-hour day. I hope this motion will not be voted down. I expect that the question will come up in the House in the shape of a Bill and I will be prepared to say a great deal more on it than I have to-night. But if it comes to a vote I can assure you I am going to vote in favour of this resolution.

Mr. WILLIAM D. EULER (North Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, last year I asked the question of the Government as to whether they intended to enact eight-hour legislation. At that time a member of the Government gave the reply to the House that this Parliament had no power to enact such legislation. Since that time the principle has been embodied in the Treaty of Peace, and later still it was endorsed by the Canadian representatives to the Industrial Conference held at Washington. In the early days of this session I again placed upon the Order Paper a question as to whether the Government was still of the opinion that Parliament had no power to deal with this question, and also, if it was no longer of that opinion, whether it intended at this session to enact the eight-hour day. Up to this time no reply has been given to that question. During the debate this afternoon the hon. President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) who was one of the delegates to the Industrial Conference at Washington made the statement that the eight-hour day principle was endorsed at the session of the Conference by a vote of something like 90 to 2. He made the further statement that if a resolution of that kind was carried by a vote of at least two-thirds of the members of the Conference the Governments of the respective countries were obligated to translate that action into legislation. I inquired of the minister this afternoon whether it was the intention of the Government to bring in legislation to enact the eight-hour day in Canada and I received the reply, as perhaps most of the members of the House know, that there is still some question as to the power of Parliament to enact such legislation. It seems to me that the Government has had sufficient time since last year to come to some decision on this matter. Perhaps it is an uncharitable thing to say but the thought that is present in my mind is that the Gov-

10 p.m.

ernment is evading the issue or perhaps, in other words, is doing what it has done before, especially with reference to the daylight saving matter—it is passing the buck. It is true that the motion as framed has no binding effect. It still leaves it open to the men and the employers to bargain as to the number of hours they desire to work in a day. That may be quite true but it does affirm the general principle that in the opinion of the Canadian Parliament eight hours of honest work should under ordinary circumstances, constitute a full day's labour. With that sentiment I am heartily in accord. I am free to admit that in certain activities, such as farming and others which might be named, it would not be possible to conduct these activities on the basis of an eight-hour day, but I do believe that in industrial centres, such as the city which I have the honour to represent, the city of Kitchener, in many industries and perhaps in most, where the men must time their actions according to the demands of the machines which they serve, and which put in many instances an intense strain upon them, eight hours of real, strenuous, hard, faithful labour is sufficient for any man. I would also affirm that, while I believe that at the present time, succeeding the conclusion of the war, production is more necessary than ever it was before, yet man, after all, if he is not simply to consider living as existing, is entitled to just a little more than the hours of labour and the hours of sleep. I believe he might very well divide his life up into three shifts,—eight hours of labour, eight hours of recreation and eight hours of sleep. For that rea-

son I am going to vote for the motion if it is pressed to a division. Although it does not bind the employer and employee definitely, it does affirm the one principle that eight hours of real, hard work, constitutes a sufficient day of labour. While that principle has already been affirmed by the League of Nations and by the Industrial Conference in Washington, such an affirmation coming from the representatives of the people in the Canadian Parliament, will constitute a good deal of an object lesson and serve as an ideal for both employer and employee.

Mr. DONALD SUTHERLAND (South Oxford): Mr. Speaker, the motion under discussion moved by my hon. friend from West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) is certainly one the principle of which has engaged the attention of the people not only of Canada but of all the civilized countries to a very great extent for many years past. Organized labour has been agitating for something of this nature for quite a number of years. In many occupations, when labour organizations were first formed, it was absolutely necessary that some reforms should be made in the conditions under which they were operating at that time. I have listened to the discussion to-night, and the question to my mind is one of such great importance that I question very much the wisdom of hastily arriving at a decision on this resolution at the present time. Undoubtedly there will be other legislation dealing with it as it is now embodied in the Treaty of Peace and the question will clearly have to be dealt with by nations which are members of the League of Nations.

We have all heard it stated repeatedly that since the war has ended there is a good deal of insanity prevalent throughout the world. If there was ever a time in the history of the world when people required their sanity to enable them to carry on it is at this time, and under the conditions which have to be met. During the years prior to the war there was a worldwide movement from the rural districts to the industrial centres. This movement attained such proportions that it was predicted by far-seeing students of economics who had studied the question very closely that the day would soon be reached when this world was likely to find itself up against starvation.

The removal during the war of hundreds of millions of men from the productive activities of life to that of destruction has brought about a condition of affairs that to my mind is most serious. I am firmly convinced that should the world experience a short crop during the present year starvation will be experienced in many countries, and many people will suffer terrible privations as a consequence of the very low food supply.

I do not like to contemplate the effect that such legislation will have on agriculture, it having been already referred to. Personally, I firmly believe that the fixing of an eight hour day will ultimately benefit those who remain in agriculture, those who persist to the end, just as much as it will benefit those more immediately affected. I firmly believe that those who to-day are agitating for such legislation are going to defeat the very object they now have in view, that is, to reduce the cost of living. It is absolutely impossible to bring that about and do what they are now urging this Parliament and the Parliaments of other countries to do.

We have heard a great deal about organized labour, but the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Harrison) has referred to the fact that we have in this country a tremendous army of unorganized labour. And, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out again that it was somewhat significant that last year we had an International Industrial Conference in the Victoria Museum building which was supposed to deal with all such questions of labour and industry as we are discussing to-night and if possible find a solution for them, but at which this great army of unorganized labour was not represented, neither was the great basic industry of agriculture. I ask, Sir, whether that was a proper means by which to arrive at a satisfactory solution of this question?

An eight-hour day seems ideal, and under most conditions it is. As a matter of fact, it is much longer than a great many people work to-day. I could not help wondering whether the hon. member for Peterboro would compel some people to work eight hours a day, as he refers to this as a National Eight-hour Day. The Government of this country for many years past have established a national working day of much fewer hours. How many people do you suppose work eight hours a day in the Civil Service? Why, a whole army of them never think of working that many hours, and the Government by legislation made this possible many years ago,—they blazed the way so far as this agitation is concerned. But certain people doing business for this country have more than an eight or

a ten hour day and some of them get very little for their services.

I am going to use this by way of illustration, although it may lend strength to the argument advanced by the hon. member for West Peterboro. Personally, I may say that I have always been a strong believer in competition. I believe that it is as essential to proper development as anything could possibly be. But unfortunately there is a tendency on the part of this country and many other countries to enact legislation to keep people all their life in a sort of straight jacket or in the nursery, so to speak. There is too much of a tendency to legislate people into doing things whether they really feel disposed to do them or not. I have always believed that when boys and girls reach adolescence they become endowed with sufficient intelligence to be thrown on their own resources. One of the first things that a child meets with when it enters the school is competition, and I believe competition is vitally necessary to the proper development of the child. The fact that children are in competition with one another during the course of their education develops faculties which enable them as they grow up to make the best of their opportunities in life. Now we propose legislation that will make such competition unnecessary.

Legislation has been passed by many bodies of organized labour restricting the amount of work that a man shall do, so that he is held in check. Now, according to this resolution, it is proposed to say to him: You must work only so many hours a day. Work is what is required in the world to-day, and it does not matter how much we may be favourable to an eight-hour day, I believe it is absolutely essential that we should defer taking any action in the matter until we get on our feet again and have overcome some of the difficulties now facing us, the natural result of sacrifices due to the war.

The late James J. Hill, the sage of the West, some years ago stated that inside twenty years the world would be up against starvation. To-day the situation is a very serious and critical one indeed. It is somewhat significant that almost all those who have spoken on this resolution are not employers of labour to any great extent. I believe that the large employers and their employees are arriving at a satisfactory solution of their difficulties, and that Parliament is not called upon at the present time to enact legislation to make it compulsory for people to do what they ought to do by mutual consent.

Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of discussing this matter at length, but I want again to reiterate that these restrictions on output are bound to affect industries that may not be organized and have taken no steps to protect themselves. I believe the very fact that you make conditions so much more desirable in certain walks of life has a tendency to attract people to them, until eventually you have an over-supply, with the result that some other industry essential to the welfare of the community suffers. I am convinced that that is what is the matter with the world to-day so far as food production is concerned. It was the case in most of the countries in Europe prior to the war, it is the case in the United States to-day, as it is also the case in Canada. This condition has not come about quickly; it has been a gradual growth extending over many years, until it has eventually brought about the very thing that organized labour sought to obtain for itself, that is, the elimination of competition. Production has become so curtailed and supplies consequently have become so scarce that prices of food are abnormally high, unorganized industry is reaping advantages that it would not have secured had there been a great many more people in that class. That is the way it is affecting agriculture at the present time. As I have said, I am not too sure that those who engage in agriculture would suffer as the result of the establishment of an eight-hour day. But I do want to utter a word of warning against the danger which will threaten the lives of millions during the coming year if we curtail and restrict the production of food, which an eight-hour day will undoubtedly do. Weather conditions are variable and uncertain, and in view of the extent to which people are deserting agricultural occupations all over the world I think it would be foolhardy on our part to consider such legislation as is suggested by this resolution under present conditions.

On motion of Mr. I. E. Argue (Swift Current) the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Doherty the House adjourned at 10.20 p.m.

Friday, March 12, 1920.

The House met at Three o'clock.

VISCOUNT JELLICOE'S REPORT.

Hon. C. C. BALLANTYNE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved:

That 1,000 copies of the report of Admiral of the Fleet Viscount Jellicoe of Scapa on the Naval Mission to Canada be printed, 750 in English and 250 in French, and that Rule 74 of the House be suspended with reference to such printing.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING: I do not imagine that there would be any objection to the motion, but one is led to inquire what need there is for a motion of this kind. The Government are constantly bringing down documents and laying them on the Table; why is it necessary to delay procedure in order to have a motion put through the House for a small job of public printing?

Mr. SPEAKER: There would be delay until the matter was attended to by the Committee on Printing, if such a motion as this were not adopted by the House.

Motion agreed to.

BRITISH COLUMBIA INDIANS.

SETTLEMENT OF DIFFERENCES CONCERNING INDIAN LANDS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Minister of the Interior) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 13, to provide for the settlement of differences between the Governments of the Dominion of Canada and the province of British Columbia respecting Indian Lands and certain other Indian affairs in the said province.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Leader of the Opposition): Explain.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In the year 1912, a Royal Commission was appointed by the Government of Canada in pursuance of an agreement entered into between the British Columbia Government of that day and the Dominion Government, which agreement called for a reference to that Joint Commission of differences that had arisen in relation to a reversionary right in Indian lands claimed by the province, and in relation as well to supposed surplus lands belonging to different Indian reserves, and other matters. The agreement provided that the report of the commission should be sympathetically received by both Governments and, so far as deemed wise by each, adopted. By reason of the very great caution exercised in the commitments in the agreement it has been found impossible yet to ratify the findings of the Commission. The Dominion Government has been ready to ratify for some time—in fact, ever since the Commission reported. The British Columbia Government desires modifications. Negotiations are necessary. The Bill is to enable us so to negotiate and conclude upon the basis of the Commission's finding. The British Columbia Government has passed similar legislation.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INDIAN ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Minister of the Interior) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 14, to amend the Indian Act.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING: Explain.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This Bill contains many important modifications of the Indian Act. Its principal clauses look to a more ready enfranchisement of the Indian; I mean by "enfranchisement" the elevation of the Indian to the status of a citizen. The old Act in its original form contained certain provisions to that end which were very slow of execution. An Act was passed a year ago providing for a class of cases being more expeditiously dealt with. This Act is general in its terms and looks to the enfranchisement of all who are fit to enfranchise. Other clauses of the Bill make clearer provision for the compulsory education of Indian children. There are other minor clauses.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RESIGNATIONS FROM THE CABINET.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, since the last session of Parliament there have been two resignations from the ministry. May I ask the Acting Prime Minister (Sir George Foster) whether the Government has any statement to make to the House and through the House to the country concerning these resignations, and whether there is any correspondence in connection with them, which will be laid on the table of the House?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Acting Prime Minister): I will bring the matter up on Monday, if my honourable friend is agreeable.

IMMIGRATION OF IMPERIAL EX-SERVICE MEN.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Béauce): Mr. Speaker, I desire to direct the attention of the Government and of the House to a subject which in my judgment is of urgent public importance. I shall follow up my remark by putting a question. A despatch signed by "Windermere," published last night in the Montreal Star, refers to a debate that took place in the Imperial House of Commons in the course of which Mr. Briant, member for Lambeth, directed the attention of the House to the fact that two young men, one a discharged soldier and the other a discharged sailor, had proceeded to Canada and had been taken across the continent to British Columbia. He stated that after they had remained in British Columbia three days they had had to proceed to the United States, because they found that British Columbia was full of unemployed Canadian soldiers. In the course of his remarks Mr. Briant said:

> This seems to show that the Dominion Government is at fault in taking them right across the Canadian continent. The whole problem should be re-discussed between the British and Canadian authorities so that the emigrant be left with no reasonable ground for complaint.

According to the report Mr. Briant concluded by saying:

> If the members saw the muddles of the Canadian emigration officials as he had seen them in Canada, they would not be so enthusiastic over these British assisted passages.

Mr. Briant is one of the most prominent members of the British House of Commons, and in view of the fact that this is the season during which the tide of immigration is generally turned to Canada and also of the fact that the reputation of this country is seriously involved, I should like to ask the Government whether they have taken or intend to take some steps to remove this impression, whether it be based on actual facts or whether it be incorrect.

Hon. Mr. CALDER (Minister of Immigration and Colonization): I have no knowledge of the facts as set forth in the statement read by the hon. gentleman, and no intimation has come to me in any way, shape, or form with reference to the two persons mentioned, a soldier and a sailor. Moreover, there is very close co-operation at the present time between our officials overseas in London and the British authorities in reference to Imperial ex-service men who are coming to Canada. Some weeks ago there came to Canada a number of ex-service men who should really not have come considering the conditions existing in the country during the past winter. But that matter is now well under control, and no one of those men—I am speaking of those who receive assisted passages from the British Government—is permitted to come without the approval of our officials in London. So far as I know, the whole problem is now well under control, and I doubt very much if any incidents such as are referred to in that statement are likely to occur in Canada

Mr. BELAND: What about the "muddle?"

Mr. CALDER: The gentleman who made that statement—

Mr. JACOBS: Is not a Government supporter.

Mr. CALDER: — is privileged to make any statements he pleases as to what his view of the position is.

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE. AMENDMENT ACT.

On motion of Hon. N. W. Rowell (President of the Council), the House went into Committee on the following proposed resolution; Mr. Boivin in the Chair:

> Resolved, That it is expedient to provide that paragraph (c) of subsection (3) of section sixty-six of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act, as proposed to be enacted in the Bill entituled an Act to amend the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act and to transfer to the Commissioner of Dominion Police the powers heretofore vested in the Commissioner of Dominion Police, (Bill 2), now before the House, be amended to provide that the pension of a constable shall not exceed two-thirds of his annual pay and allowances at his retirement.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Will my hon. friend explain?

Mr. ROWELL: The resolution relates to the Bill now before the House which will come up for second reading to-day. The object is to correct a clerical error which occurred in the pension provisions of the Act passed last session. The basis of pensions for members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police is a certain percentage of their "pay and allowances." These words appear throughout the Act with the exception of a single subsection in which apparently, through some inadvertence, the words "and allowances" were omitted. This is simply to correct that subsection and bring it into harmony with the other provisions of the Act.

Mr. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver): I did not hear a single word the minister said, and I do not know whether he hears me, and in a reciprocal mood, I do not care very much whether he does or not, because no effort seems to be made to speak so that we can all hear. I could hear, Mr. Deputy Speaker, every word that you uttered, when reading the resolution and consequently I must say that the fault is not ours. I am going to add this further observation that I think the architects, while they deserve a great deal of credit for the beauty of this Chamber, lost sight absolutely and entirely of the use to which the Chamber was to be put.

I do not know whether my remarks are relevant to what the minister said or not, as I could not hear his remarks; but I wish to bring the attention of the Government to a matter that has already been brought to the attention of the House in connection with the pensions of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police. I did not know that this matter was coming up to-day or I should have been prepared to discuss it more in detail, but briefly my point is this: There are in Canada a large number of pensioners of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police, who, I understand, gave twenty or more years' service, and who, after having given this period of service, were retired and granted a pension. We all know that a man who has given twenty years, the prime of his life necessarily, to the service of his country in this particular branch or in any other branch, is certainly not fitted, at the conclusion of that period or on his discharge from the Force, to earn his living upon the ordinary labour market. That, I think, goes without question and without any doubt. The pensions of the older members of the force are based on the rate of pay that they received ten, twenty or thirty years ago as the case may be. You will at once observe, Sir, that the older a man is, and the less capable he is of sustaining himself, the smaller is his pension, because of the remote period at which it was granted to him and the small salary of that date, on which the pension was based. Consequently, there are a large number of veterans of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police who to-day are receiving very small pensions. This matter has been brought to the attention of the Government, and it may be that the minister said something about it when he was speaking, but that I do not know. It may be that the Government has reached some conclusion in this matter; but I wish to urge upon the attention of the Government and, in particular, of the minister, the fairness of the request of the veterans of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police. There are in the House a number of members who, I know, are interested in this subject, and who, I think, desire to give it their support. I should like to ask the minister if the request made by the veterans of this force that provision should be made for granting a bonus to supplement existing pensions has been considered and will be acceded to by the Government.

[Mr. Rowell.]

Mr. ROWELL: I may say I do not think the House, on most occasions at least, has any reason to complain that it is unable to hear me. I think my voice is usually heard in the Chamber, and regret if members were not able to hear what I have said. I explained that the object of this amendment was simply to correct a clerical error in one subsection of the Act passed last session, so as to make the subsection read that pensions to members of the Mounted Police shall be based upon their pay and allowances. That is clearly provided in the Act, but in one particular subsection, the last subsection relating to pensions, the words " and allowances " were left out. Although that omission was purely a clerical error, the words cannot be inserted without an amendment, and that amendment, as it relates to a charge on the public funds of this country, cannot be made without this resolution having been previously adopted by the House. That is the sole object of this resolution which, when it is approved by the committee, will come up for consideration when the Bill is before the committee of the whole House.

Referring to the point raised by my hon. friend (Mr. Stevens), there is no doubt, having regard to the present cost of living, that pensions granted some years ago upon the scale of pay then existing are not nearly so adequate to-day as they were when granted, and many pensioners are suffering hardships by reason of the change in conditions, and I sympathize with them in the position in which they find themselves. My hon. friend will realize, however, that it is not a simple matter to deal with. There are thousands of persons who have retired from various branches of the public service and who are receiving pensions granted in years gone by. Take, for instance, all the militia and Civil Service pensions that have been granted prior to the present time. These persons have made representations that their pensions should

be increased, but up to date, having regard to the other charges upon the revenues of the country, the Government has not seen its way clear as a matter of general public policy to increase the pensions that have hitherto been granted in the different branches of the public service. The same thing is true of judges, and in fact of all those who under the various laws enacted by this Parliament are in receipt of pensions granted under the conditions which prevailed prior to the war. It is true that this matter has been brought to my attention, and I brought it to the attention of my colleagues in the Government, but in view of the general situation we felt we could not deal with the pensioners of the Mounted Police in any different manner from that in which we dealt with all other public servants who had retired from the public service and are in receipt of pensions. The Government has not been able to see its way clear to make provision for increased pensions for all who have hitherto retired.

Mr. H. H. STEVENS: The minister must realize that there is a very great difference between the pensions that are being drawn by different members of the public service who have retired. The minister even mentioned judges. Justices of the Supreme Court upon retirement receive a pension of something like $4,500 a year. Surely the minister recognizes that there is a difference between the graded pensions of the Civil Service and the judiciary, and a pension of $30 a month granted to a man who has spent the best of his life in the public service on a salary on which it was impossible to save, and who now in his old age is practically dependent on this pittance from the Government. I would suggest, and I wish to press this matter strongly, that a solution could be found by increasing the pensions to the minimum on which a man could live decently. I do not know what that minimum would be, but certainly the pensioners of the Mounted Police and all other pensioners in the same position should have their pensions increased. I know a light-keeper who has served this country for thirty years in an isolated lighthouse, who is to-day receiving a pension of only $30 a month. That is not justice. Surely this Parliament is not going to deliberate on the finances of this country and disregard such a flagrant case of injustice as that. It will not do to dismiss this question by saying that the same conditions apply to the whole Civil Service of Canada, and that to increase the pensions would involve a sum too large to be faced. We are not asking the Government to raise pensions that are fairly adequate to-day, but I would urge the Government as strongly as I can to bring pensions that are obviously grossly inadequate up to a minimum that would give a man a reasonable chance to live decently. The Government are granting pensions to-day to the Mounted Police based on their present pay, of from $2 to $3 per day, whereas in days gone by the rate was based on the pay of 75 cents or 90 cents a day, so there is no sense or justice in the Government refusing to raise pensions granted in years past that are obviously inadequate to-day. I know many old pensioners who have no means of support except their pension and such doles as are handed out to them by charitable friends. That is not a desirable condition; it is not fair or just. While I do not desire to embarrass the Government with perplexing problems, I feel it my duty to urge as strongly as I can that the Government should bring pensions up to a standard of decent living in the case of those receiving only a small amount.

Mr. J. H. BURNHAM (Peterborough): I have no hesitation in embarrassing the Government in connection with this matter. Until this Government or any other understands that the basis of remuneration for fair work is human life and not simple arithmetic, there will be no contentment or justice or common decency in the country. The trail of the serpent is over it all. It is profiteering in another way—inversely, if you like, but nevertheless it is so. Until we appreciate the elementary fact that good honest toil is worthy of good honest and decent recompense, and that one man requires just as much of the necessaries of life as another, no matter whether he is at the head or the foot of an organization, we have not appreciated the very elements of civilization, we lack brains. It is almost incredible that after 2,000 years of Christianity and preaching we have reached such a miserable stage that we have no regard for a man's life and livelihood, but hand out to him just the dole that happens to be opposite his name. On the other hand, I have noticed that people with big salaries and big positions to keep up are always sustained in their position by Governments and the people generally. That sort of thing simply breeds discontent in the country. It is one of the very great things in British public life that the British understand these facts, and are anxious to see even the humblest toiler get at least fair play and reasonable comfort. In this coun-

try we are too much inclined to pass over all that sort of thing with a sweep of the hand, and I say we had better embarrass the Government, and embarrass it rapidly and deeply until it reaches the understanding that life is the basis of reward and not simple arithmetic.

Mr. R. J. MANION: I wish to support what my hon. friend (Mr. Stevens) has said, because the sooner this or any other Government recognizes the principle that a man who has given the greater part of his life in the service of his country is entitled to a pension equal to a living wage, the sooner they will have the people of this country solidly behind them. Last year the special committee appointed to deal with soldiers' civil re-establishment, under the chairmanship of my hon. friend (Mr. Calder), brought in a recommendation in favour of higher pensions for certain classes of dependents of soldiers who were not getting an adequate pension, but no action has been taken by the Government in that regard. I think it is a very live question. All these helpless people, whether they be dependents of soldiers killed at the Front, or men who have retired from the Mounted Police or of any other branch of the Civil Service, should be looked after and given an adequate living wage by this Government.

Mr. W. D. COWAN: In Regina, where I live, and which has been the headquarters of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police ever since that body was established, we have probably a larger percentage of Mounted Police pensioners than has any other city in Canada, and I find that some of their families are suffering real hardship. Most of these men are so old that it is utterly impossible for them to do any work to speak of. We all know that it is a matter of the greatest difficulty for a man between the ages of fifty and seventy to get any sort of remunerative employment at any time, and it is particularly difficult for these men to obtain work, because their employment in the service has been of such a nature as to render them unadapted to other occupation. Those men to-day in Regina have pensions ranging from thirty to fifty dollars a month on which it is absolutely impossible for them to exist in any state of decency. Hitherto they have not complained very much, but they feel a grievance now that pensions have been increased for men henceforth entering the force. They were quite prepared to struggle along as best they could, but now they feel that they are being unjustly discriminated against; and for that reason they are to-

[Mr. Burnham.]

day somewhat—indeed I might say, quite —antagonistic. A goodly number of them have interviewed me on the subject and I had intended to bring the matter personally to the attention of the President of the Privy Council. So far, however, I have not had an opportunity to do so. I would emphasize as strongly as possible the view of the hon. member for Vancouver, and urge that adequate attention be given to this class of pensioners. Personally I think it is beneath the dignity of this Dominion to expect married men who have spent twenty years or more in the service of the country to live on from thirty to fifty dollars a month, when because of the very character of their services every other form of occupation is now denied them.

Mr. C. W. PECK: I desire to associate myself with the remarks of the hon. member (Mr. Stevens) on this subject, although I do not intend to enter into any lengthy discussion of it. I have contended repeatedly in this House that the pensions of our soldiers are inadequate, and I intend to continue to do so until something is done. I have some faith in this Government that it is favourably disposed—and I think that if we can fully impress upon them the necessity for increased pensions they will appreciate that necessity and do something. I endorse what has been said in favour of the pensioners of the Northwest Mounted Police in both the regular and the overseas forces, and I trust that the Government will this year take the question into earnest consideration and deal with it effectively. At present I am ashamed of the pensions that are paid, notwithstanding the fact that they are larger than those paid by any other nation. I think, indeed, that it is to the glory of Canada and its Parliament that we have put through pension measures which are the most liberal in the world. But for men of this class everything possible should be done. History has proved that the soldier has always been scandalously treated in the matter of pension, and Kipling and other writers have shown that people have always been ready to applaud the soldier and glorify him when he stepped to the front rank in the hour of danger, but that when it came to a question of pension they were always rather stingy. I think therefore that everything should be done so that none of the dependents of the men who have served the country either at home or overseas will suffer want, but will have proper provision that will afford them a decent livelihood, and care for and educate their orphans.

Hon. Mr. FIELDING: I think the question is somewhat broader than it appears on first view. Hon. gentlemen have spoken of inadequate pensions granted to the retired members of the Mounted Police, but there are also other classes of pensioners in Canada. For instance, there are plenty of judges still living who were appointed years ago under the old system of pensions, and the same remark applies to civil servants generally. Their pensions were all fixed in former years when salaries were perhaps more adequate compared with the cost of necessaries than they are to-day, and the recipients are no doubt suffering considerable hardship at the present time. I appreciate the remarks that have been made in regard to the Mounted Police, but the question of pensions is a very large one and naturally moves one's sympathies. It is not a question concerning the Mounted Police alone, but one that affects the whole pension list of Canada.

Hon. T. W. CROTHERS: I have no objection to the Bill proposed by the President of the Privy Council. I am one of those who for many years have thought that the Royal Northwest Mounted Police, having regard to the character of their work, have never been adequately paid—double the wage they got would not have adequately paid them. Their salaries have been shamefully inadequate, and if the Bill suggested by the President of the Council will secure these men any more recompense, I wish it every success. Speaking generally, however, in regard to pensions, apart from those which are given for military service, I want to disassociate myself from several statements that have been made.

One or two hon. gentlemen have referred to men who have "given their lives in the service of the country." Well, there may be some, but I cannot put my finger at the present moment on one who has "given" his life. Speaking generally, they have not given their lives in the service of the country, although I think there are some exceptions. Those in the service of the country are receiving larger pay than men doing equally hard work in other lines of employment. Talk about giving their lives! Why, as soon as there is a vacancy there is a scramble of hundreds to get it because they know they are going to be paid more than they could earn anywhere else. I want to repeat, Mr. Chairman, that there are exceptions. I think we have some men—comparatively few—in the public service who are not sufficiently paid, and I would be among the first to increase the salaries of such men. But on the whole, apart from military service, I am opposed to the principle of pensions or superannuation. Two young men come to Ottawa, let us say—one goes into the Civil Service at a larger salary than he would get anywhere else in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, and when he has served twenty or twenty-five years he expects to be superannuated and put as a charge upon the country for the rest of his life. The other young man, of equal ability and education, goes into a private concern, a bank or some mercantile establishment, and after his service of twenty or twenty-five years, with a smaller pay than his more fortunate friend in the public service, notwithstanding that he himself has had to provide against old age and the inevitable rainy day, if he does not want to be thrown upon an institution of charity, he is nevertheless obliged to contribute to the support of the man who has gone into the Civil Service and draws a pension. This is absolutely unfair, I contend.

We have no trouble whatever in filling all the positions in the Civil Service, with the exception once in a while of a position of technical character. Let me reiterate, Mr. Chairman, lest there should be any misunderstanding, that these remarks do not apply to those men who served the country in the hour of peril. Nothing is too good for those who risked life and limb and passed trying days for the preservation of freedom. I will do everything I possibly can to assist such men. Generally speaking, however, I disassociate myself from any contention that the pension or superannuation list should be enlarged.

Mr. BUREAU: What is the object of restricting the pension to two-thirds of the annual pay and allowances at retirement?

Mr. ROWELL: The pension is two-thirds based on the years of service. A man does not become entitled to pension as a matter of right until he has served a certain number of years. If he has served twenty years he becomes entitled to a pension as of right on the basis set out in the Act. If he has served for ten years and is retired by reason of physical disability, there is power to grant a pension, but that is the basis upon which the pension is granted—two-thirds of the pay or salary that he is receiving.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not understand why you make it two-thirds. There are cases where men are entitled to more than that. When they retire they are not all absolutely in the same position. Some men may retire after twenty years and be abso-

lutely unfit for anything else and two-thirds of their salaries would be insufficient to keep them. In some cases it might work an injustice if you had a hard and fast rule that two-thirds will be the maximum to which they shall be entitled. I do not think you would be doing justice to these men as a class.

Mr. ROWELL: It has always been the law, both in connection with the Mounted Police and the Permanent Force that where a pension is granted based on the period of service, the pension should be based on a fixed percentage of the salary paid. It is not a disability pension. If this were a disability pension, it would be based on the character of the disability. This is a pension for length of service, and in that case the pensions have always been on a uniform basis, being a certain percentage of the salary received proportionate to the length of service. In this respect there is no change in the law.

Mr. FIELDING: I would not like the observations of my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) against the whole principle of superannuation to pass without some word of dissent —I will not say protest. I am afraid, however, that the view which my hon. friend has taken is the popular one. A great many people will ask that question, as the hon. gentleman did: Why should two young men coming to Ottawa fare so differently? One of them goes into the public service and ultimately gets a pension, while the other goes into private service and gets nothing. In spite of that, if the Government have any intention of introducing a measure to restore the principle of superannuation I would like to help them, and I do not want the observations of my hon. friend, which are against that view, to pass unchallenged. It is not a question of what is just to the individual; it is a question of what is just to the public service. You cannot expect to get good men to remain in your service either in public or private life unless you see that they have adequate salaries, and unless you have some reasonable provision by which you can give them something for the rainy day. Even with the larger private employers to whom my hon. friend has referred, that principle applies. He spoke of the banks. All the banks and other large financial institutions have found it necessary to adopt pension systems, not for the sake of the individual, but in order that they may secure efficient service. I have a case that came to my knowledge—I will not mention the name—

[Mr. Bureau.]

of a well known official in connection with one of our Government departments, and in this I speak of my own experience. As minister it came to my knowledge that he had been offered a very handsome salary to leave the department. He did not leave. He did not say anything about it; he was a modest, unassuming man. When I met him I said I was very much pleased that he had decided to remain in the service. He said: "I am remaining in the service because, among other reasons, I have been contributing some years to the superannuation fund, and with the supplement which the Government is making to that, I will one day be able to retire." If we had not had that superannuation arrangement, that man, one of the most valuable officials in the service of the Government, would have gone to New York, where he would have received a much larger salary than he was getting in the public service. From my own experience and from my observation of my successor's work, I know that in the Finance Department we have been losing valuable men because we do not seem to be able to pay them adequate salaries in comparison with what they are able to receive outside. I was, I am free to confess, a minister in the Government that changed the superannuation system. We had for many years a superannuation system. It was claimed that it had been abused. How far that was correct I do not need to assert, but at all events that was the impression throughout the country. In consequence of that impression, an impression that men had been pushed out of the service to make way for friends of the Administration, there was a strong feeling against the superannuation system, and when the Liberal Government came into power in 1896-7, in view of that prevailing sentiment, we made a change in the Superannuation Act. We decided that superannuation should remain with respect to the old officials, but that thereafter there should be none. As respects all the officials, with the exception of those of the Militia Department and Mounted Police who seemed to have fared better, the members of the Civil Service of Canada, since 1896-7, have had no place on the superannuation list. There was a retirement fund established as a sort of substitute. It was entirely insufficient. It is only a system of compulsory saving, and all the Government pay is a slightly higher rate than the common rate of interest. But this retirement fund is insufficient to enable a man to retire with a reasonable degree of comfort. There are many men in the depart-

ments, who may have done excellent work, but who are kept there when they are no longer efficient, simply because there is no arrangement for their retirement. It is not so much in the interest of the individual as in the interest of an efficient public service that I am free to say that I think the then Government made a mistake in that respect, and I am willing to help the present Government to correct the mistake. The illustration which I have given confirms that view, and there have been many such cases. If you want to keep good men in the public service you must hold out some inducement to them. The chances of men saving up for the rainy day, whether in the Government service or private service, are not very good. All our large financial institutions are recognizing that. My hon. friend from Elgin referred to the banks. If a young man goes into a bank to-day he comes under a superannuation system; if he goes into the service of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, or into that of any of the larger corporations, he comes under the operation of a superannuation system. I do not want to enlarge upon it. I simply say that not only in regard to the individual himself but in regard to the efficiency of the service, it is a sound policy to have a superannuation system, to which the official should make some contribution himself. I am sorry to differ from my hon. friend from Elgin. I know he has the popular end of it, and I rather suspect that some of my good friends who sit on what are called the cross benches may sympathize with the hon. gentleman. But, in the interest of efficient public service, every civilized nation has found to-day that it is necessary to have a superannuation system, and I hope we will have it in Canada.

Mr. CROTHERS: My hon. friend has insinuated that the stand I have taken is a popular one and that probably I likely had some personal interest—

Mr. FIELDING: I will state at once to my hon. friend that I did not say anything of the kind and I did not mean to convey any such impression.

Mr. CROTHERS: The implication was made, and repeated, that I had taken the popular side on this matter. I may inform my hon. friend that I have never sought to take the popular side on any question. The hon. gentleman has referred to one case where a gentleman in the Civil Service was offered a larger salary and went to other employment. I covered instances of that kind when I said that there were some members of the Civil Service who were not sufficiently paid and whose remuneration ought to be increased. Let me tell my hon. friend that one swallow does not make a summer.

I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that when the Government, of which he was a prominent member, abolished superannuation, in 1897, I think it was, they made a mistake. I do not think they made a mistake by abolishing the system but they should have substituted something for it.

One plea in favour of superannuation is that there are gentlemen in the Civil Service who, perhaps because of an extravagant family, live beyond their means, spend every year all they earn, and when they have reached the age of sixty-five or seventy and ought to be retired in the public interest, it is said "they have been in the public service for twenty-five or thirty years, they have no means, we cannot put them out and therefore they must be retained, after they have survived their efficiency." I think that position ought to be met but, in my judgment, it should not be met out of the public exchequer. The man who is in the public service ought to provide for old age in the same way as does the individual who is in private employment. It is said that these men do not do it and that they will not do it. Well the Government can compel them to do it. What I suggest is that every man who enters the Civil Service should be taxed on his salary—not to afford a retiring allowance such as my hon. friend refers to, because I quite agree with him that is not adequate at all—but he should be insured by the Government on premiums paid by himself just in the same manner as men in private employment have to provide for their children or for old age or for a rainy day. I ask would not such a plan as that meet the case? Let the civil servant contribute enough each year from his salary to enable the Government when he reaches the age of sixty-five to retire him on an allowance adequate to his station in life and protect him during the remainder of his life. In such a case as that the civil servant would be independent and he would have paid for this insurance himself out of his own salary. We seem to lose sight of the fact that where a man is superannuated —always excepting the men who have fought for their country—he is in a humiliating position, not to use even stronger language; every time a man holds out his

hand for something he has not got, a little bit of his manhood oozes out of the end of his fingers. As I see it the members of the Civil Service should be compelled, in the way I have suggested, to make provision for old age. Then they will be entirely independent of anybody. No good reason has been assigned by my hon. friend in his remarks why the civil servant should be relieved from what is an imperative duty in the case of the man in private employment of making provision for himself and family. There is no justice that I can see in granting him relief from such responsibility.

Mr. FIELDING: The system we now have is a system of contribution to the superannuation fund.

Mr. COWAN: It seems to me there is absolutely no comparison between the cases submitted by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) and many of the cases now cited. I agree with the last speaker that the man who is in receipt of a sufficiently large salary ought to save enough to provide for old age. But what are you to do with men who serve in the mounted police for years on a stipend of seventy-five cents or a dollar a day? I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Crothers) how a man could save enough from a per diem wage of that amount to keep himself and family when old age comes? What we want is provision to meet the case of those men who have left the force after a service of many years, and are now trying to live in various parts of Canada on $30 or $50 a month—men who have reached the age of fifty, sixty, or seventy years. It is a past condition with an existing obligation that we have to deal with. These men have served their country for years on a daily pay of fifty, sixty, or seventy-five cents or a dollar and they found it absolutely impossible to put any money by. Some of these men married when they were in the service—perhaps they should not have done so but they did—and have wives and children dependent upon them. I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crothers) to inform me how they could save enough out of their pay to make provision for their old age?

Mr. CROTHERS: I repeat my previous statement that I think the members of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police have never been adequately paid,—I do not think they receive one half of what they should receive and perhaps their superannuation allowance is not sufficient. I have no objection to making suitable provision for the members of the force.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Boivin): Before any further discussion takes place on this resolution I must remind hon. members that speeches in committee must be strictly relevant to the question, clause or resolution under discussion. The present resolution deals with pensions for the Royal Northwest Mounted Police, and any discussion of superannuation or retiring allowances for Civil Servants is entirely out of order.

Mr. STACEY: I labour under the disadvantage referred to by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Stevens) inasmuch as I scarcely know whether or not any remarks I may make will be strictly apropos of the real subject of discussion, as I have not heard what has been said, but before stating my views I wish to throw out a suggestion which possibly is worthy the consideration of the Government, and incidentally of the leader of the Opposition. Would it not be possible for the members of the Cabinet and the leaders on the Opposition side to occupy as seats of honour the centre benches in this Chamber.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. STACEY: There is no special virtue I presume attaching to the seats which they occupy at the upper end of this Chamber, consequently the centre would be the natural and the logical place for the leaders on each side to sit. If they are agreeable to that change being made I am sure it will meet with the hearty approval of practically all the other members of the House.

As to the question of further recognition of the services rendered by the Royal Northwest Mounted Police, the position taken by the minister that they must be put upon the same basis as other employees of the Government may be technically and perhaps legally and otherwise correct. But I wish to point out that the members of the Northwest Mounted Police during the last half century have stood between civilization and chaos in the country west of the great lakes, and they are deserving of special consideration, not as a matter of charity, but as a matter of right, honour and common justice. Those who know the work of these men in the Northwest will answer in the affirmative every question as to their having served the country faithfully and well. I grant that in some cases the men were lead to join the service

through motives of adventure or possibly through a desire to lead a life in the open. These motives may have served them for a time but now they have to face the sterner realities of life; with the cost of living as it is to-day the glamour of the past entirely fades away and they are face to face with serious responsibilities and obligations. Of all the classes of the people who have served this country, at any rate west of the great lakes, the Northwest Mounted Police deserve at our hands special consideration and anything in the line of pension or bonus which it is within our power to give them. I trust, therefore, that the House will grant them the prayer of their petition so far as it is reasonable and right.

Mr. STEVENS: I again suggest that a minimum should be fixed in regard to these pensions applicable to the old veterans whose pensions are now based upon the absurdly low sum of 50 or 75 cents a day. I am somewhat disappointed that the minister has not vouchsafed any intimation that he will give the matter further consideration. I may be trespassing upon my rights as a private member in urging this point so strongly, but at the risk of incurring the minister's displeasure I wish to press the matter and to advise him that I have a little bit of the stick-to-itiveness of the Cornishman, for I am one by birth. If he does not vouchsafe me an answer today, I shall bring the matter up at the first opportunity when the Royal Canadian Mounted Police estimates are before the House. I do not wish to be disrespectful, but the matter merits the attention of the Committee and some further statement by the minister.

Mr. A. W. BUCHANAN: I wish to say a word on behalf of the members of this force who in the by-gone days went out into the western country, endured great hardships and practically saved the western plains for Canada. These men are entitled to generous treatment. Many of them are in need of increased pensions; I know that from personal experience. I do not want to try to force upon the Government or upon the country any unnecessary expense, but I do say that as long as these men give efficient service to the country Parliament should look after them in a decent and respectable way. I have particular reference to the pioneers in the force who went out there at a time when it was difficult to get men to serve the country. The services rendered by these men should be recognized.

Mr. J. A. MAHARG: Except in the case of officers high up in the force and who would be permanently stationed at any one place, only single men are enlisted in this force. The men are handicapped, therefore, because of its being practically impossible for them to settle down, provide a home for themselves, and lay up a little competence for the future. In that respect they are in an entirely different position from any other employees in the public service. The minister would be well advised not to follow strictly the wording of the resolution. I am not aware of what their pay is now, but in the early years these men were paid 50 cents a day and you can easily have an idea of about how much they could lay by as a competence for old age at that rate of pay. The resolution provides that pensions shall not exceed two-thirds of the amount of the annual pay and allowances. I do not think that is fair; as my hon. friend (Mr. Stevens) says, a minimum amount of pension payable to these men should be established.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Rowell, the resolution was referred to the Committee of the whole House to be considered in connection with Bill No. 2.

On motion of Hon. N. W. Rowell (President of the Privy Council), Bill No. 2, to amend the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act and to transfer to the Commissioner of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police the powers heretofore vested in the Commissioner of Dominion Police, was read the second time.

Mr. A. R. McMASTER (Brome): Mr. Speaker, before the House goes into Committee I should like to say a word on the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion for the second reading of the Bill has been declared carried. We can cancel the Order if the hon. member so desires, but perhaps it would be better under the circumstances that he make his remarks in Committee.

Mr. McMASTER: If I shall not be out of order in doing so,—because my remarks will be of a general character—I accept that suggestion, Mr. Speaker.

The House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On Section 1—Powers of Commissioner of Dominion Police transferred to Com-

missioner of Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

Mr. McMASTER: The matter which I wish to bring before the committee deals rather with the general organization of this force than with the item now under discussion, and I crave the indulgence both of the Chairman and of my fellow members if I do not hold as strictly as I should to the letter of the clause under consideration. During the recess, since last session, two disturbing matters in connection with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, have come to the public attention, and I am taking this opportunity of bringing them before the minister in order that he may either free our minds by telling us that we are misinformed, or state that such things will not occur again. It was reported in certain parts of the press of Canada that the Mounted Police, who had been the upholders of British traditions throughout the Northwest for the last generation, had made a raid upon a library in Alberta, removing therefrom books which dealt with socialism. I do not know whether the New Testament was amongst the books removed from that library, because we all know that the early Christians had all things in common and were in that sense the first socialists. But we understand that books such as Plato's Republic were removed from the shelves of that library. If this be true, this constitutes a very sad reflection upon the mentality of the Canadian people and the wisdom of those in charge of the Mounted Police. I hope the minister will be able to assure me that my information is incorrect; but if he cannot do so, I hope he will assure the committee that such practices will not be countenanced in the future, and that those guilty of them will be brought to a speedy reckoning.

The next matter which I heard about came from somewhat further to the East. It happens that in the city of Toronto there is an organization called the Daughters of Canada, which has for its objects the creation of a national spirit and the study and investigation into Canadian matters. With the objects of this association no patriotic citizen can find the slightest fault. The information that comes to me in connection with this is that on a certain day, I do not know what day, an official functionary of, I understand, the Dominion Police—I do not know whether he was a mounted man or not—came to one of the ladies interested in this association and said: "What is this 'Daughters of Canada'; we have heard unpleasant, disturbing comments upon this organization; we have read in the press comments about this organization, and we want to know what it is." This sort of thing may be quite in place in Russia, but it has no place in Ontario, nor in any other part of Canada. I bring these matters before the committee; I cannot think that the minister has any sympathy with such goings on, and I hope either he will be able to tell us that our information is incorrect; or, if it be correct, that he will put a stop to all such proceedings, for of all the liberties which we need to preserve on the North American continent are liberty of opinion, liberty of free discussion and liberty of free investigation. Without those very bases of liberty, no true national liberty is possible.

The CHAIRMAN: Having allowed the remarks just made by the hon. member for Brome, I am sure the committee will give its unanimous consent that the minister make the required reply, but I must afterwards insist that the committee hold itself strictly to the clauses under consideration. I may point out to the hon. member for Brome that his remarks would not have been in order even upon the second reading of this Bill; that the proper time for the remarks would have been upon a motion to go into Supply or when the Estimates of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police were under consideration in committee.

Mr. ROWELL: With the general principle which my hon. friend (Mr. McMaster) has laid down, I have no quarrel whatever; I believe in freedom of thought, opinion and speech just as firmly as he does. I think I shall have no difficulty in relieving my hon. friend's mind in reference to the matters which he has just mentioned. I first learned of them, or, that there was any talk about them, by reports in the press, and I regret to say that statements do appear in the press that require investigation before one accepts them as absolute facts. In reference to the so-called raid on a public library, I have not heard of one in Alberta; I did see a report in the press that a raid had occurred on a public library in Saskatchewan. I do not know whether that is the one to which my hon. friend refers or not, but it is the only one that has come to my attention. It came to my attention through the press and I asked for a report upon it, and I am very glad to give the committee the facts in connection with the so-called raid. Hon. members will recall that, under the censorship orders which were in force during the period of the war, but which have since been repealed, certain

books and pamphlets were put on the prohibited list, because they were considered to be of a treasonable, or seditious character, or were of such a character as would tend to militate against Canada's war effort. There was an American publishing house which published large numbers of those books, and as I recall the matter, the Department of the Censor, after prohibiting a number of those particular publications found that this publishing house was sending in books of a different character, books to which there had been no objection, but was accompanying those books by those seditious pamphlets that were on the prohibited list. The Department of the Censor reached the conclusion that the only way to deal effectively with this house—it was Kerr and Company, of Chicago,—was to prohibit any books published by this house from coming into Canada. This house, it so happens, did publish Plato's Republic; it did publish books to which there was no possible objection; but it was part of the duty of the Mounted Police, the Department of the Censor having as a matter of public precaution prohibited all the publications of this house from coming into Canada, to assist the Department of the Censor and the Department of Justice in carrying out those orders. It was brought to the attention of the Mounted Police that there were books published by this house in the library in Regina, and they were asked to investigate the matter. They did so; they spoke to the librarian about the matter, and the statement that there was a raid upon the library is absolutely incorrect. There was no raid upon the library; they interviewed the librarian; they were given some of the books; and the police transmitted such as were considered possibly objectionable to the office of the Chief Censor at Ottawa in order that they might be passed upon.

Mr. McMASTER: What did the police think were possibly objectionable?

Mr. ROWELL: I did not see the books, and I do not know what it was thought was possibly objectionable. The matter came to my attention only after the event, and these are the facts.

Mr. PECK: Not the New Testament?

Mr. ROWELL: Not the New Testament. So that my hon. friend will see that the whole story in the press, inspired no doubt by those who wanted to criticise the action of the Government in connection with the censorship regulations, was without any real foundation and the reflection on the administration of the police was wholly unwarranted. The police were simply carrying out an order promulgated by the Government for the protection of public interest during the war period, and were investigating the character of these books.

Now let me deal with another matter my hon. friend has mentioned. I first heard of it this week. I find that here also my hon. friend's information is at fault. What happened was this. A request was made to the Superintendent in charge of the police here in Ottawa for the addresses of the officers of the Daughters of Canada; an innocent request, but, frankly, one that I do not see any particular reason why the police should have carried out. The police went to the headquarters where this association met, at the Y.M.C.A., and ascertained the addresses of the officers in order that they might transmit them to Ottawa. They did ascertain and transmit those addresses, and so far as the police is concerned, that is all that was done. I regret to say, however, that an officer of the Y.M.C.A., not knowing that the police had gone there simply for the purpose of ascertaining the addresses, reached the conclusion that possibly there was some objection to this organization, and, therefore, when they made application to hold further meetings he offered some objection to it. The moment the matter was drawn to the attention of the police they said: "There is absolutely no objection. There is no reason why this society should be investigated; we are not investigating it; there is no complaint against it." I regret that by reason of the inquiries, made by the police for a perfectly innocent purpose, any inconvenience was caused to the ladies connected with this society. My hon. friend and the House may rest assured that the Mounted Police are preserving the best traditions of the force, and will continue to do so in the days that lie before us.

Section agreed to.

On section 2—Constable after ten years may be pensioned if infirm, after twenty years entitled to pension.

Mr. ROWELL: I now move to amend subclause (c) of subclause (2) by inserting after the words "annual pay" on line 20 the words "and allowances."

Mr. STEVENS: Would the minister not also consider including a provision providing a minimum pension applicable to those who have retired on pension in the past, as well as to those retiring in the future?

Mr. ROWELL: I appreciate what the hon. member has said, and what other hon. members have said in support of his suggestion, and I am quite prepared to bring the matter to the attention of my colleagues and ask that it be further considered. Certain facts have been brought out this afternoon indicating conditions of greater hardship than had hitherto been presented to me in connection with this matter. It is only right, however, to say that when I brought this matter to the attention of my colleagues before, the view was that we could not deal with the Mounted Police apart from the larger problem which has been discussed. I shall be glad to give the matter further consideration, but I do not wish to hold up the Bill, for if we reach the conclusion that something further should be done on the lines suggested by my hon. friend, I think it should be dealt with in a separate Bill. I am afraid it would have to be part of a larger matter than simply the Mounted Police.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. ROWELL: I should like to make an announcement in connection with the work of the police which I am sure will gratify the House and the country.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Before the minister proceeds with that, can he tell the committee how many men there are at present who will be entitled to receive pensions under this clause?

Mr. ROWELL: I cannot give my hon. friend that information with respect to the men who are now receiving pensions under the law as it existed prior to the Act of last session, because I have not got it here. Those are the men to whom reference has been made by hon. members of the House who have advocated a change in the law to increase their pensions. Since the legislation passed last session increasing pensions, I do not suppose that up to date half a dozen have retired. When they will retire, of course, I cannot say. A man is not entitled to retire of his own volition until after twenty years' service. There are quite a number in the Mounted Police who have served twenty years. As a matter of fact the majority of the men desire to continue. There are a limited number of men in the service who have served for thirty years, but I cannot give my hon. friend the number of those who have served for any definite period. I regret I have not that information.

Section agreed to.

[Mr. Stevens.]

On the Title:

Mr. ROWELL: The matter which I desire to mention to the committee arises out of the visit of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales to Canada. While His Royal Highness was in Western Canada, the Mounted Police provided him with an escort in the various cities which he visited; and, like other distinguished visitors, he evinced a very great interest in and appreciation of the work of the Mounted Police. I am glad to say that I have received a cable from Sir George Perley, Canadian High Commissioner, to the following effect:

> With His Majesty's approval, Prince of Wales has graciously consented accept position Honourary Commandant Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and His Royal Highness asks me tell you how pleased he is to be associated with force in this way.

Needless to say the Mounted Police greatly appreciate this conspicuous evidence of His Royal Highness' favour.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The people of the Dominion, as well as the Force, will, I am sure, appreciate the honour which has been thus conferred upon that body by His Royal Highness. Most of the hon. members on the other side have spoken of the force as the "Royal Northwest Mounted Police." That title has much in the way of historic significance and naturally brings to mind past associations and traditions to which considerable importance is attached, particularly by those who reside in the West. There is a considerable body of opinion in the country which favours the retention of the old title. I should like to ask if the Government have further considered that matter.

Mr. ROWELL: The Bill of last session simply changed the word "Northwest" in the title to the word "Canadian," the title now being "The Royal Canadian Mounted Police." As the work of the force has been extended into Eastern Canada, I am sure that members of the force in the West, as well as the people of the West, who are good and true Canadians, will be quite prepared to accept the change. The matter was carefully considered, and the approval of the executive officers of the force was secured before the change was made. Generally speaking, I have found that it has met with a great deal of public approval, although I am ready to admit that a few representations have been made to retain the old title.

Mr. McKENZIE: I should like to have some information in regard to the ticket-of-leave question referred to in the first section of the Bill. Is any material change contem-

plated in the procedure with regard to people who obtain ticket-of-leave? We know that Mr. Justice Archibald, as an officer of the Department of Justice, had to do with obtaining tickets-of-leave for certain prisoners throughout Canada, in whose welfare he has shown a very deep interest in seeing that they observe the regulations, secure proper employment and become as far as possible good citizens. I rather fear that this paternal care which Mr. Justice Archibald has exercised will not be continued under the new régime with an official who cannot possibly be as familiar with this system as is Mr. Justice Archibald, who was practically the originator of it. I should greatly like to be satisfied that this system will not deteriorate in any way, and that the service rendered to men who are unfortunate enough to be sent to the penitentiary will not cease by reason of the change.

Mr. ROWELL: I am pleased to be able to assure the hon. member that no change is contemplated in the method of administering the law. The change here proposed is simply to vest in the Chief Commissioner of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police the duties which have hitherto been vested in the Commissioner of Dominion Police.

Bill as amended, reported and concurred in.

THE CURRENCY ACT, 1910.

On the motion of Sir Henry Drayton (Minister of Finance) the House went into Committee on the following proposed resolution, Mr. Boivin in the Chair:

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend The Currency Act, 1910, by providing (a) that the standard for gold coins shall be the same as at present, that is to say, that of one thousand parts by weight nine hundred shall be of fine gold and one hundred of alloy; (b) that the standard for silver coins shall be such that of one thousand parts by weight eight hundred shall be of fine silver and two hundred of alloy; (c) that provision be made for the standard weight, fineness and remedy allowance of silver coins; and (d) that silver coins heretofore struck by authority of the Crown or by order of the Governor in Council shall continue to be current and a legal tender.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The object of this resolution and of the proposed legislation is simply to prevent the coinage of Canadian silver being accompanied by a loss, and to a small degree to restore the position of the Mint, in regard to coinage, to what it was under former values. During last year there was a very extraordinary increase in the price of silver. Silver ran from 80 cents an ounce up to as high as $1.41 an ounce, and silver at 80 cents was comparatively high compared to what it could be bought for at the time Canada started silver coinage. Under the Act, our coinage has a fineness of 925; that is, out of the thousand points 925 are pure silver and 75 alloy. When Canada first started her coinage operations, with a coinage of that fineness there was a resultant profit to the Mint of seventy-seven cents, plus a decimal which I have forgotten. As a result of the tremendous increase in silver values which occurred last year, that profit of seventy-seven cents would not only have disappeared but we would have been coining silver actually at a loss of 4.7 cents per ounce.

The matter is an important one. The coinage operations have become very large. The Mint has a very heavy duty now thrown upon it and is turning out an immense amount of coinage. The original expectations of my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) when he, as father of the Mint commenced operations, have been far surpassed. With a view to giving the House an idea of the seriousness of coining silver at a loss, or indeed at an approximate loss, I will give the figures for 1914, which may be taken as representative, or fairly characteristic, of the coinage operations. For silver alone they amounted to $734,000 in 1914, while last year the demands for silver coinage were such that the duty was thrown on the Mint of turning out new silver coinage to the amount of $3,258,000. Of course, in so far as the silver content of the coin is concerned, as the House well knows, that is an entirely arbitrary matter. It is a matter which turns not upon the value of the coin as such, but rather upon the question as to what will make a good coin. Different countries have different standards of fineness. Our standard has been 925, the standard of Great Britain 925, and the United States 900, while that of the Scandinavian countries—which we now propose to adopt—the Straits Settlements and some other countries, is 800. To-day legislation is even advanced in Great Britain—I forget whether it is actually through the House or not—to reduce the fineness of the British silver coin to 500.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not think that there is any question but that the minister is adopting a wise policy in this matter. As to the question of profit or loss, in bygone years there was only one side to it—we always made a profit from the coining of silver. Now we have reached the stage when, as the minister points out, owing to the advance in the price of silver, it is an absolute loss to us. I do not suppose that any object would be gained by continuing on that line. I am glad to learn from my

hon. friend that not only in respect to the coinage business, but in other respects, the Mint has proved a very valuable adjunct to the Department of Finance during the period of the war. I entirely agree with the action he is taking in practically reducing the quantity of silver, so that if we do not make a profit we may at least guard against a loss. Did I understand my hon. friend to say what profit he hoped to make?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We hope to get a profit of 17.3 cents.

Mr. FIELDING: In bygone years the profit was so large that sometimes it was a question as to whether we would be justified in treating silver as specie on a gold valuation. However the volume at that time was not very large. Occasionally reference has been made to the use of nickel in coinage. There is something to be said in favour of a nickel coinage in Canada purely from reasons of national pride. Canada is the largest nickel-producing country in the world, and it seems strange that when we have this valuable mineral at our doors we should not use it. I do not say that in the way of fault finding, but rather as a matter of inquiry. Our five-cent piece is rather too small a coin to be useful. One can lose it very easily, and it is not easy to handle. I have no urgent view to express, but I would suggest for the minister's consideration that we might utilize nickel for making the five-cent coin at all events. I entirely agree with the view that hon. gentleman has taken with reference to this measure.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I very much agree with the remark of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding). I had thought of making the remark myself, as it is desirable that nickel should be introduced immediately into the coinage of Canada for the reasons specified by the hon. gentleman. We have about 85 per cent of the world's supply of nickel and its use in coinage would be a good advertisement in itself. A nickel coin would be very much easier to handle than the very small five-cent piece that we have. It is hard to keep track of that coin—though, for that matter, it is hard to keep track of any money these days. Nickel is a metal that is very substantial. I hope the minister will at an early date consider the suggestion that has been made. It may not perhaps be introduced into this resolution, but it should be introduced in the near future because it seems to me to be a most desirable thing. The minister did not state that we have been bothered with the reduction of coinage by reason of the fact that it is being absorbed by foreign nations, but I imagine that a great deal of it has been shipped to other countries and melted down into bullion. I have seen it stated in the newspapers that when it is reduced into bullion it is worth more than the face value of the coin. If that is the case I cannot understand why we should consent to being robbed of our silver on that basis. Another explanation is that silver is worth three times what it was before the war. It was worth from 40 to 43 cents an ounce in 1914, while to-day it is worth about $1.40. Although it has over three times the value that it had a few years ago we have been putting practically the same amount of silver into the coin that we did originally. That means a loss. I do not know what the relative value as between gold and silver is. We always used to hear about the relative value of 16 to 1. The minister might tell us what the ratio would be as between silver and gold. Is it 13 or 14 to 1? I have very great pleasure in supporting what the minister proposes to do. I think it should have been done earlier.

Mr. McMASTER: Before the minister replies to the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt), I have a suggestion to make that he can reply to at the same time. The minister said that the United States had a certain standard of fineness for silver coinage, that Great Britain had another, and that we propose to adopt the standard of the Scandinavian countries. Would it not be advisable for the different civilized countries to get together and have a common standard of fineness for silver coin? If I mistake not, the fineness of gold coins is pretty nearly the same. I think that the amount of gold in the 20 franc piece is about the same as the amount in the sovereign. I would like to hear the minister express his view as to the wisdom and practicability of having the different nations get together and establsh their silver coinage on the same basis of fineness.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: In answer to my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) as to the silver and gold ratio, he would be a very able man, but I do not think he would be an accurate man, who would say what the ratio of silver to gold was at the present time. It is a matter that is fluctuating constantly. Gold is about the only thing that is standing still. We know its value even if it is not standing still. But silver is something that is constantly

moving. We have no fixed ratio of value in this country as between gold and silver. The basis of Canada's currency is—or was—the gold basis. There is the same basis back of Canada's currency as there is back of that of any country to-day in the world, and that is the country's credit; because, as a matter of fact, there is no country that is to-day really upon a gold basis. Silver, so far as we are concerned, is merely token money. As token money the question of ratios really does not come up at all. Silver does not pass as currency in value because the coin is worth thus and so. In Canada it is merely a token of value which is adopted. In China where they are on a silver basis, their coin is of value having regard to its fineness and the amount of silver in it; but with us, as with Great Britain and with the United States, silver is merely token currency. At one time when my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) was looking after the minting of Canadian coinage he was making profit on his silver coinage of two and one half times the value of the silver that went into it. It is quite clear therefore that that coinage was token money.

Mr. McMASTER: Is it token money to-day?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think it is absolutely token money to-day.

Mr. McMASTER: There is the value of the silver in the coin.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is as silver, but as coin it is still token money. We may regard the token as too expensive, but the underlying measure of value was never the silver in the token; and the merely accidental fact that to-day silver has became more expensive than it was could not very well make a difference in the nature of the currency. As it is merely token money I do not think that very much is to be gain d by having a standard value for silver coinage. It may be a nice thing to retain as token coinage but I do not think it is a matter of any great importance. Of course my hon. friend is absolutely right in connection with gold. Its value is on such a basis of currency everywhere that the question of standard fineness is a very important one.

I am very glad my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) has made the suggestion in reference to nickel coinage. We have now a company in Canada that is going to refine nickel in this country, and very shortly after I knew it I brought up with that company the question of a supply of proper nickel blanks of Canadian nickel, refined and supplied by a Canadian nickel refinery, for the purpose of a nickel coinage. The matter is not quite far enough advanced to be able to say exactly when we will be in a position to get those nickel blanks and to submit a considered proposal to the House. If it is at all possible it will be submitted at this session.

Mr. PROULX: Does this change affect the face value of our silver currency in the United States?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It cannot very well do that except for one purpose. Our currency in the United States is handled in the ordinary way by bankers or by the express companies; they are shipping that coinage back into Canada. They are taking the silver mainly at a discount of fifteen per cent, allowing a value in American currency of eighty-five cents for our dollar in silver, but it is expressed back. As to the difficulty, which it is suggested is taking place, that is the difficulty resulting from the melting down of our coinage into silver, the hon. gentleman will see that for currency purposes it is not a national interest that the value should be considered for melting purposes of token coin. On the basis which is now proposed of 800 fineness it would no longer avail one in Canada or the United States to take our silver and melt it down. That is one of the reasons why it was necessary, apart from the question of cost, to reduce the fineness of our silver coinage. The value, therefore, of the silver coinage, having in view the question of melting it and returning it to bullion, is decreased. The hon. gentleman says it is a pity it was not done before. Well, it has been done and it is being done; we will not go on losing money. I think it was the last expiring governmental action taken under the much abused War Measures Act which enabled us to stop losing money on our silver coin.

Mr. FIELDING: On the question of token coinage it is worth while remembering that in principle there is no difference between bronze and silver. Our bronze coinage and our silver coinage are alike in that respect—they never professed to be based on intrinsic value. As the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMaster) has pointed out our silver coinage is better than tokens inasmuch as it is now worth more than an equal amount of silver. That however, arises only from a temporary condition.

Some years ago a great deal of American silver was circulated in Canada and there were many reasons why that was not very desirable. One reason was that these American coins were displacing our own silver on which we made a profit. Steps were taken to collect that silver through the banks and ship it away. The result was that for some years we have had little or no American silver in Canada. I think that is quite important. There is not the same inducement to-day for shipping it away, but I would ask my hon. friend whether the banks still continue to export American silver under the arrangement with the Finance Department.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We stopped paying the banks anything for that about eighteen months ago in view of the shortness of our own silver. When we return to normal conditions the former practice will again be adopted.

Mr. McMASTER: Under the Gresham law poorer money always drives out the better, and almost as a matter of economics the American importations have been leaving Canada and finding their way over to the United States.

Mr. BELAND: I would like to ask another question with respect to the new one-cent pieces which were provided for in a measure passed last year and which were to be much smaller in size than those now in circulation. I know the minister does not deal very much with these coins, but to me, and to a good many of my colleagues this coinage is a matter of some importance.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Possibly my pocket has been worn out by the large Canadian cent just as much as the pocket of my hon. friend. It is a coin I am very familiar with bearing in mind what the salaries of Cabinet Ministers are. However, the character of the coin is settled. The orders were given a long time ago for the necessary dies from Great Britain, but they are not here yet. We are doing the best we can to get them, and as soon as they reach here I do not think more than forty-eight hours will elapse before we will be turning out those one-cent pieces.

Resolution reported.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (Minister of Finance) thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 15, to amend the Currency Act, 1910.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

[Mr. Fielding.]

SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS.

JOINT COMMITTEE OF BOTH HOUSES ON UNIFICATION OF CERTAIN BRANCHES.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate requesting this House to unite with the Senate in the appointment of a Joint Committee consisting of an equal number of members of both Houses to consider and report upon the desirability of uniting certain branches of the two Houses performing similar duties and particularly the Law Branch, the Law Translation Branch, and the Debates Translation Branch, and, if in the opinion of the committee, it is desirable to unite any of the branches, to submit a scheme therefor, and that the Honourable Messieurs Belcourt, Dandurand, Dennis, Foster, Fowler, Sharpe and Thompson be appointed as members of such committee to act on behalf of the Senate.

GOVERNMENT ANNUITIES.

On motion of Sir Henry Drayton (Minister of Finance) the House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution, Mr. Boivin in the Chair:

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend the Government Annuities Act, 1908, and to provide (a) for the sale of annuities to any person resident in Canada; (b) for the increase of the total amount which may be paid by way of an annuity or annuities to an annuitant or to joint annuitants from $1,000 to $5,000 a year; and (c) for the increase of the rate of interest from three to four per cent per annum payable on moneys repaid to the purchaser or his legal representatives when the annuitant or the last survivor of joint annuitants dies before the annuity becomes payable and moneys have been paid or deposited as consideration for the annuity.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Mr. Chairman, the object of this resolution and the legislation to be based upon it is to make Government annuities more popular than they are at present, to stimulate public interest in them, and to raise larger sums of money than have been raised in the past under the Government Annuities Act. The changes proposed are not very great, but they are considered necessary by the department having the matter in charge in order to make possible a greater sale of the annuities, in the interest not only of the country but also of those who purchase them.

The first change is to provide that annuities may be sold to any person resident in Canada. The department desires to be in a position to sell annuities to any one in Canada; they do not want to be confined to selling them only to persons who can

prove domicile in this country. That is merely in the direction of removing a barrier which has stood in the way of selling these annuities.

The original intention in connection with the sale of annuities by the Government was to provide for an income to the annuitant of comparatively small amount. Of course, the first idea of the annuity was that it was entirely for the benefit of the annuitant, not of the country. That idea has long since been exploded, at any rate in so far as matters on this side of the Atlantic are concerned. The large insurance companies have gone very extensively into the business of selling annuities and in this connection are making very large sums of money. The sale of annuities ought to be a good thing for the Government; it is a transaction in connection with which the country ought to receive a large amount of money. If it pays ordinary commercial companies to sell annuities, it ought to pay, and I have no doubt will pay the country to sell them. Now, the total amount payable yearly by way of annuity has been $1,000; the department have requested that the amount be increased to $5,000 so that they may be enabled to do business with individual or joint annuitants to the extent of that amount.

Then there is the matter of the age at which annuities may be drawn. Under the present law no one can obtain payments under an annuity until he has become fifty-five years of age. That again limits the field in which annuities may be sold; and there would seem to be no reason for the restriction. The insurance companies do not impose any such restriction; they charge more, just as the Government would charge more for annuities payable at an earlier age. The profit obtained in connection with the sale of annuities which become payable at forty or forty-five when the charge is based upon a proper table of rates is just as good as that obtained in connection with the sale of annuities payable at fifty-five. The department, therefore, ask that that barrier also be removed.

The fourth matter covered by the resolution, that of providing for an increase of the rate of interest from three to four per cent per annum payable on moneys repaid to the purchaser or his legal representatives when the annuitant dies before the annuity becomes payable, is an important one. There are different kinds of annuities. There are guaranteed annuities, in connection with which a certain number of annual payments are payable after the annuity becomes payable whether the annuitant is alive or not. Then you have an annuity issued at a much lower rate under which the annuitant, if he dies before the date on which the annuity becomes payable, loses everything he has paid. Then you have an intermediate class which falls short of the guaranteed payment of annuities but which is entitled to a return of moneys paid with interest at three per cent. This intermediate class offers a two-fold inducement: It encourages savings and it guarantees their return with interest in case the annuitant dies before he attains the age at which the annuity is to commence. Now, at the time this rate of three per cent was fixed, money was a great deal cheaper than it is now, and the department says that in order to make effective any argument regarding the benefit of annuities from the standpoint of savings the interest rate should be four instead of three per cent.

Mr. PROULX: Would this apply to annuities that have been issued already?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No, this would not necessarily apply to any existing contract. All annuities turn upon contract.

Mr. FIELDING: The objects of those who devised the original annuity scheme are not quite the same as those of the Minister of Finance. The original scheme was devised for the benefit of the annuitants, whereas my hon. friend is devising a scheme for the benefit and convenience of the Government. He wants to draw more money into the public treasury, and I suppose no objection can be taken to that, because he needs it badly This Bill is designed, not for the benefit of the annuitant, but to get more money into the public treasury. It was never intended that this should be a scheme to compete with insurance companies. Inasmuch as it was a privilege that was granted, it was not considered necessary to give it to everybody. But I do not think any harm can come from extending it as my hon. friend suggests. Then it was intended that the annuitant should receive a moderate sum; I do not think it was intended that he should get $5,000; I think the original sum was $600—at all events, the sum was a small one. The scheme was never intended as one to compete with insurance companies, but to meet the case of many simple people who did not understand insurance, who had great faith in the Government and who would take up a Govern-

ment scheme when they might not take up an insurance scheme. Therefore, it was not intended to be a scheme to pay large annuities. My hon. friend is now going into competition with insurance companies. I do not know that any great harm can come from that, but it is quite evident that his viewpoint is not quite the same as that of the former minister who devised the scheme. No exception can be taken to the increase in interest in a given case. Money is worth more than in former times. Out of that, however, a suggestion arises, that I perhaps do not want to press too strongly. It seems to me that the argument that is used in favour of an increased rate of interest might also apply to an increased rate of interest on savings bank deposits. The rate of interest on savings bank deposits ought not, I grant, to be changed frequently. If you increase it, you cannot very easily take it down; and if there were a temporary hardness of the money market which would seem to make money dearer, I should not think that would be a reason why the interest on savings bank deposits should be increased. But where you have a continued condition running for years with a high interest value for money, I think the question of the rate of interest in the savings bank presents itself in a stronger light than in former times. I remember one occasion when a strong argument was put up to increase the rate of interest in the savings bank. I did not concur in the suggestion; but as a compromise I said this: We will create a Government stock of 3½ per cent, and if the people who have money in the savings bank attach sufficient importance to getting the higher rate, they can convert their savings bank deposits into 3½ per cent stock. I did not expect that very many would do that, and as a matter of fact very few did it. People who put money in the savings bank are of a class that does not understand finance; the question of rate of interest is not a very serious matter to them; what they want to know is that the money is there; that the Government is behind it, and they can get their money when they want it. I do not know, if my hon. friend were to increase the rate of interest on savings bank deposits, whether he would get much thanks for doing so. In the face of present conditions, however, where you have had a long period of years during which money has been getting dearer, and it is probably going to be dearer next year than this year, the minister might consider whether he would not be justified in increasing the savings bank rate.

There is another point. My hon. friend has intimated that the Government want to make this annuity system more popular. I do not know whether he has at hand any evidence to show to what extent people have taken advantage of this annuity scheme, but I think he is quite correct in implying that it is not very popular. I do not wish to introduce a note of complaint regarding his predecessor, but what happened was this. When this annuity scheme was devised, it was realized by its promoters that it was like insurance; that it was a good thing, but that people do not usually take out insurance until somebody goes to them and explains the matter—canvasses them. I suppose nearly three out of four members of this House will confess that their first insurance policies were taken out, not because they had the economic law in mind, but because some clever agent came and put the proposition before them. So we realized that if we expected to make this annuity scheme a success, we would have to do something to advertise it; that we would have to send men into the field to explain it, and we accordingly appointed a number of lecturers—I think they were called, agents,—canvassers to do that service. In the year 1911 a remarkable event happened——

Mr. McMASTER: A sad event.

Mr. FIELDING: —and a change of Government occurred. The Government that came into power decided that those lecturers were not necessary; that they were not any good, and the Government quietly dispensed with their services. Of course, it so happened that those lecturers had been appointed by a Liberal Government, and, perhaps, it would be wrong to suggest that that had anything to do with their services being dispensed with, but still the fact remains that the services of those lecturers, who were to be the canvassers to make this scheme successful, were dispensed with. We were told that the Government were going to substitute for that a better system; that they were going to make the postmasters of the country agents; that the postmasters were to give all the information. Soon after that information had been given out in the public press, I was in a large important town, a shire town down East—I shall not mention the name. I went to the postmaster, and I said: "I want information about the annuity scheme." He said: "What"? I said: "The annuity scheme." He said: "What

annuity scheme"? Well, I gave him a little outline of what it was, and I said that it had been announced by the Government in the public press and otherwise that this scheme was to be carried out by the postmasters, and I said: "I suppose you have some instructions in regard to the matter." He said: "I suppose I have." He agreed to look for instructions, and a day or two afterwards when I asked him about them, he said that he supposed they had come, but he could not find them. It is not surprising under those conditions that the annuity scheme proved a failure. I do not know what method my hon. friend has in mind of putting the information before the public; but I would strongly advise him, even at the risk of not having Liberal appointees, to adopt the principle of the insurance companies and to send somebody amongst the people to explain the whole scheme to them, and then he will not have to come before the House and say that the scheme is a failure.

Mr. M. CLARK: The conversation to which we have just listened as well as we could at this end of the room is very interesting to me as illustrating how careful Governments should be in taking up business that on the whole would be just as well—or in nine cases out of ten better—done by private individuals. I notice the original Act dates back from the year 1908, and I am pretty sure that if I had been in the House then I would have protested against the original Act, although I would have been a very young member, on the ground that it is not desirable on general grounds that the Government of a great country like this should undertake business which is being done by private individuals. I think that general ground is a sound ground. This is just another example of that system of paternalism which is proving such an attraction to the comparatively limited population of a country like Canada. The worse fault that is taking hold of people to-day, so far as I can see, is that everybody wants to be governing his neighbour; people have a passion for looking after other people, and by means of the Government. I endorse what has been said by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) as to the original intention of this Act, and I must say that I listened almost aghast to the remarks of the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) in so far as those remarks showed that, with a lightness of heart, he was prepared to embark upon a scheme of money-making on behalf of this Government, in the conduct of a business which, I repeat, is properly the business of insurance societies.

Where are we going to end if these ideas of the functions of a Government are to prevail on both sides and in all corners of this House? We shall end in the buildnig up of a top-heavy bureaucracy, that is where we shall end. Men of all political persuasions are telling our people that what this country needs at the present time is production, and any one who knows Canada knows that there is an ample field for the activities of individuals in almost any line of human endeavour. There is an ample field for individualistic enterprise, and that is what the country wants—individual effort, for their own sakes in the first place, and to the certain advantage of the country in the second place. If you keep on extending the sphere of governmental action you inevitably keep on increasing the number of your civil servants. We are told we have far too many already, and that we ought to economize by carefully reducing their numbers, and certainly by being most careful in making new appointments. I think that is so, but if every second man you meet from the Atlantic to the Pacific is seeking for a Government job, without any regard to the preaching of annuities or anything else, how are you going to increase your production? I want just in a sentence or two to warn my hon. friend (Sir Henry Drayton) against letting this idea of Government go too far with him. I am charmed with his first appearances in this House. His powers of exposition are great, but his political experience is brief, and I hope he will consult very frequently the Acting Prime Minister before he gives out such novel, radical, and I had almost said, Bolshevist doctrines. I suppose if we had a Soviet form of Government, everything would be in the hands of the Government, but I do think on the whole that annuities would be better handled by insurance companies than by any government that I can conceive of or have seen in Canada hitherto.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I can assure my hon. friend that I am very, very open to instruction in politics in every direction. I know I can get a lot of information from my hon. friend, and I hope he will be kind enough to give it to me from time to time. But with reference to this particular matter I really had the idea that Government annuities were supposed to be a good thing, and that they were not at all novel. My idea, I think, is not very far from the truth. Certainly I do not desire to have an army of

men trying to sell Government annuities. My opinion is that the Government annuity business should be either stopped entirely or put upon such a basis as will recommend itself to the people whom we are asking to invest in them. Every one will agree that the original idea of Government annuities was to help the people who bought them. But they do not help if the terms are such that it does not pay any one to take them out. Annuities were surely never intended to be issued upon a basis that would give the Government an infinitely greater return that it had a right to get. They were established for the purpose of encouraging and helping people to save. Of course, we need production in this country, but we also need saving, and probably need it almost as much as production. Production and saving ought to go side by side, but you are not going to help saving by offering only 3 per cent. We may, and I hope we will, get people to save by making the changes I have suggested.

Resolution reported.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 16, to amend the Government Annuities Act, 1908.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT AMENDMENT.

On the motion of Hon. C. C. Ballantyne (Minister of Marine and Fisheries), for the House to go into Committee on the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, That it is expedient to repeal sections eighty-five to eighty-nine, both inclusive, and section ninety-one of the Canada Shipping Act, chapter one hundred and thirteen of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, and to re-enact in lieu thereof:—

1. That every British subject who,—

(a) served as a master or mate of a sea-going or coasting sailing vessel of over seventy-five tons, gross tonnage, before the first day of January, one thousand nine hundred and twenty, for a full period of twelve months within ten years immediately next preceding the date of his application for certificate of service,

(b) produces satisfactory evidence of his sobriety, experience, ability and general good conduct on board ship, and

(c) passes the sight test and the prescribed examination in signalling, shall be entitled, on payment of the prescribed fee, to a certificate of service as a master or mate of a square rigged or fore-and-aft rigged sea-going or coasting sailing vessel not exceeding seven hundred and fifty tons, registered tonnage, according as his service has been (a) as master or as mate, (b) on a sea-going or on a coasting sailing vessel, (c) on a square rigged sailing ship or on a fore-and-aft rigged sailing vessel.

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

2. That in every such certificate of service the name, place and date of birth of the person to whom the same is issued shall be stated, and each certificate shall specify whether the holder is entitled to act as master or mate, whether the certificate is for sea-going vessels or for vessels in the coasting trade, and whether for square rigged sailing vessels or for fore-and-aft sailing vessels, and that it is not for any vessel exceeding seven hundred and fifty tons, registered tonnage.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (North Cape Breton and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I presume that this is the proper time to discuss the principle of this resolution. Legislation very much akin to what is aimed at by this resolution was introduced in the latter part of one of the sessions last year by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean), but it met with such vigorous opposition from hon. members, including myself, that the minister thought proper to withdraw the Bill. Now the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne) comes forward with a resolution, not exactly word for word, but on almost precisely the same lines as the legislation introduced by the hon. member for Halifax last year. We all know that a certain standard of education, experience and ability is required of professional men in this country. In the case of lawyers, doctors, engineers, or any other professional men, certain educational requirements have to be met, and certain experience must have been had before they are permitted to practice. I venture to say that captaincy and charge of ships has been regarded not merely as a profession in this country, but as a very honourable and very onerous profession for the last hundred years and more. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries now brings before this Parliament legislation that would do away entirely with educational requirements in the case of a man whose duty it is to take charge of a ship.

According to this resolution, if a man obtained a certificate ten years ago stating that he had served on board ship for twelve months somewhere in Canada, now, after the lapse of that time during which he may have done anything else and may have forgotten all about seamanship, he can claim a license as a captain qualified to put to sea with a crew. The sections in Chapter 113 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, Sections 85 to 89 inclusive, are very simple in their requirements and are not, I think, too exacting. If this proposed legislation were restricted to coasting vessels there would not be so much danger. But it is also contemplated to license such

men as I have mentioned to go across the ocean. What would happen to such a captain if he went to Liverpool? He might take his ship there but he would never be able to leave, because his certificate would be regarded as a mere "scrap of paper." He would have to show a certificate recognized on the other side by the Board of Trade. It is possible that the minister may have consulted the English Board of Trade and obtained their approval of this Bill. If he has not done so, I fear that the captains who may possess these unsatisfactory certificates will find themselves in difficulty in the Old Country. We know of instances in which engineers have gone from Canada to the Old Country with certificates that were good enough here but were rejected on the other side, and in this predicament competent engineers had to be secured to clear the ships from the ports in England. I earnestly submit that in order to take charge of an ocean vessel a man must have adequate knowledge of seafaring and be able to ascertain his position by the use of the proper instruments. So far as I am concerned, I desire it to be distinctly understood that I repudiate any responsibility that might accrue by the enacting of such legislation as this, for I think it is a most dangerous thing to put life and property in the hands of incompetent captains. The insurance companies of this country, I think, would refuse to insure ships or cargoes intended to be sent to sea under the control of men who were palpably incompetent in every sense, at least in the matter of training. The minister was not in the House when the Bill to which I have made reference was introduced. If he had been he would recall that both our own law and the English law on the subject were cited, and that after due consideration of the facts the hon. member who introduced the Bill deemed it wise to withdraw it. I am therefore surprised that within such a short time the minister should seek to establish such a low standard of seamanship in this country. In conclusion, I can only emphasize my protest and leave the responsibility entirely with the minister and those who may be disposed to implement this resolution by an Act of Parliament.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I was not present at the special session of the House when the then acting minister introduced the Bill in question, which was not similar to, but different from this. That Bill applied to sailing vessels propelled by auxiliary power, but this resolution does not apply to such vessels. It applies only to "sailing vessels," of a certain tonnage. Under the Shipping Act any master who served on a sailing vessel prior to 1870, if he were alive to-day, and were sober, experienced and of adequate ability and general good conduct, would be entitled to a certificate on the payment of the prescribed fee. The hon. member will at once realize that we could not expect men to be fit captains of sailing ships who had served prior to the year 1870, and this resolution seeks to repeal Section 85 of the Shipping Act, and to enact that any man who has served on a sailing vessel for twelve months within the past ten years and possesses the qualifications to which I have referred, in addition to a knowledge of signalling, shall be granted a service certificate. This is nothing new. We are merely bringing the Shipping Act up to date, and it is difficult for me to apprehend the reasoning of the hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) in his argument that the legislation proposed is unusual and hazardous.

I wish to say to the hon. member that the service certificate that shall be granted to an officer who desires to become a master of a sailing ship, should this resolution and the Bill that is to be based upon it pass, is a service certificate that will be recognized just th same as a competency certificate. There is absolutely no difference so far as recognition by the English authorities is concerned between the service certificate and the competency certificate.

With regard to the other clause, I wish to have section 86 of the Act repealed also because a mate cannot obtain a service certificate without going back as far as 1883. Surely hon. members will not object to the changes that the resolution calls for in order that both a master and a mate, instead of having to go back to 1870 for the master and 1883 for the mate, may, upon a service of ten years be capable of obtaining a service certificate. During the last few years captains and mates of sailing vessels have become very scarce; in fact; they were so difficult to get that during the war I had to take the necessary authority under the War Measures Act to grant service certificates to masters and mates of sailing vessels. My object in bringing forward this resolution now is to meet the absolute necessity that exists for more masters and mates by enabling them to get service certificates for sailing ships. The Act introduced at the special session

of the House was for sailing ships driven by auxiliary power. This resolution is confined to sailing craft only. There is another section of the Shipping Act—section 87—that I desire to have repealed. It provides that a vessel shall be only 100 registered tons and not over 150. The resolution stipulates that the tonnage may be increased to 750 tons. My hon. friend from North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) comes from a maritime province, and I am sure that he appreciates better than I do the fact that those experienced men who have been on sailing ships for a number of years, while they may not be able, owing to lack of education to pass the competency test and therefore obtain competency certificates, are just as good men and just as competent, providing that their eyesight is all right and that they understand signalling, as others who may be better equipped as far as education goes. But we cannot put men on sailing vessels who are seventy years of age. I therefore wish to repeal the clause so as to provide that masters and mates who have served, within the past ten years, for twelve months on board a sailing ship may be granted a certificate providing they have the qualifications that I have referred to.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If it is agreeable to the House I would move that we adjourn at six o'clock, but I would like, before we do that, to take Private Bills so as to get them one stage farther ahead.

On the motion of Mr. Duff the debate was adjourned.

SECOND READINGS—PRIVATE BILLS.

Bill No. 4, to incorporate Armor Life Assurance Company.—Mr. Griesbach.

Bill No. 5, respecting The Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Company.—Mr. Crowe.

Bill No. 6, respecting the Canadian Mining Institute, and to change its name to The Canadian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 7, to incorporate The T. Eaton General Insurance Company.—Mr. Mowat.

Bill No. 8, to incorporate The T. Eaton Life Assurance Company.—Mr. Mowat.

Bill No. 9, to incorporate Scottish Canadian Assurance Corporation.—Mr. Mowat.

Bill No. 10, respecting The Trust and Loan Company of Canada.—Mr. Cronyn.

On the motion of Sir George Foster, the House adjourned at 5.55 p.m.

Monday, March 15, 1920.

The House met at Three o'clock.

REPORTS AND PAPERS TABLED.

Amendment to Radio-Telegraph Regulation No. 92.—Hon. Mr. Ballantyne.

Report of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment.—Mr. Hugh Clark.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

BOARD OF COMMERCE.

*Mr. PARENT:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to abolish the Board of Commerce?
2. If not, does the Government intend giving said Board, by means of legislation, more powers with regard to either textile, dairy or newsprint situation?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1. The Government has not had under consideration any legislation with regard to abolishing the Board of Commerce.
2. Answered by No. 1.

ENLISTMENTS IN C.E.F.

Mr. GRIESBACH:

1. What were the enlistments in the Canadian Expeditionary Force, 1914 to 1919, by provinces?
2. What are the number of C.E.F. pensioners in each province, and the amount paid for C.E.F. pensions in each province, as of January 1, 1920?

Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

1. No definite information can be furnished until all documents have been returned from overseas and compilations made, but the following are the figures for enlistments, 1914 to 15th November, 1918, obtained from returns rendered by telegraph from the several Military Districts and allotted to the provinces from which such recruits were obtained:

Ontario, 245,677; Quebec, 82,793; New Brunswick, 25,864; Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, 33,342; Manitoba, 66,319; Saskatchewan, 37,666; Alberta, 45,146; British Columbia, 51,438; Yukon, 2,327; total, 590,572.

2. Number of C.E.F. pensioners in each province as at January 1, 1920:

Ontario, 25,660; Quebec, 6,111; Manitoba, 5,411; Alberta, 6,269; Saskatchewan, 4,585; British Columbia, 6,436; Prince Edward Island, 384; New Brunswick, 2,053; Nova Scotia, 3,315; total, 60,224.

Amount paid to C.E.F. pensioners in each province, as at January, 1920:

Ontario, $5,091,200.60; Quebec, $1,212,-483.51; Manitoba, $1,073,596.51; Alberta, $1,243,32.29; Saskatchewan, $909,709.85; British Columbia, $1,276,966.76; Prince Edward Island, $76,189.44; New Brunswick, $407,-335.73; Nova Scotia, $657,729.15; total, $11,-949,043.84.

VISIT OF CABINET MINISTERS TO CARLETON-VICTORIA COUNTY.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Is the Government aware that three members of the Cabinet visited the Carleton-Victoria county, New Brunswick, in the latter part of the month of October, 1919?
2. If so, what was the object of their visit?
3. Was the visit undertaken in connection with official business of the Government?
4. Was the object of the visit of these gentlemen attained?
5. Was a government private car used in connection with the visit of the ministers to Carleton-Victoria county, as above?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1. The Government is aware that three members of the Cabinet visited Carleton-Victoria county, New Brunswick, in the latter part of the month of October, 1919.

2. The object of their visit was to take part in an election for a member of the House of Commons which was being held at that time in that county.

3. I do not know that any official business was transacted by those gentlemen while they were there.

4. Whether the object of their visit was attained or not can be answered by each individual according to his wishes or his views. It was not entirely barren in respect to the efforts of some of these gentlemen.

5. A Government private car was not used for the expedition.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAY—OFFICIAL CARS.

Mr. FOURNIER:

1. How many official and business cars are there in use at the present time in operation of the Canadian National Railway system?
2. Are the operating expenses of these cars charged to Pullman account?
3. If not, to what account?

Hon. J. D. REID:

1. Forty-one official cars used by the management and superintendents in connection with operation over entire system of 14,000 miles.

2. No.

3. The expenses of the above cars are charged to operating expenses under the headings of administration and superintendence.

EXPULSION OF THE TURK FROM EUROPE.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. What is the policy of the Government on the question of the expulsion of the Turk from Europe?
2. Has the Government been consulted on this question?
3. If so, will the correspondence be made public?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL: The terms of the Treaty with Turkey have been under consideration by the Government and the Government has made representations in reference thereto. An announcement will be made in due course.

MILITARY EXPEDITION TO CHICOUTIMI.

Mr. SAVARD:

1. What were the costs incurred during the fall of 1918, in connection with the expedition of a regiment, in command of Lieut.-Colonel L. A. Beaubien, to Chicoutimi?
2. How long was the said regiment stationed at Chicoutimi?
3. How many officers and men comprised the regiment?
4. How many conscripted men were exempted from military service or obtained leave of absence?
5. How many defaulters were brought to Quebec by the police?
6. How many of such defaulters died in military hospitals?

Hon. Mr. GUTHRIE:

1. Pay and allowances, 15 officers and 234 other ranks, 19-9-18 to 15-11-18, $18,568.70; travelling expenses, $3,153.37; total, $21,-722.07.

2. From 19th September, 1918, to 15th November, 1918.

3. 15 officers, 234 other ranks; total 249 all ranks.

4. The number of defaulters dealt with by this detachment was 601, of which number 316 were granted leave owing to low category, 173 were granted harvest leave, 9 leave of absence, 98 sent to Quebec.

5. 98 defaulters were brought to Quebec by military police.

6. 4 of such defaulters died in military hospital; two of pneumonia and two of influenza.

THE ONE BIG UNION.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. What attitude has the Government taken toward the One Big Union?
2. Is it considered to be a legal organization?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1. The Government has not given any recognition to the " One Big Union."

2. The question of the legality or otherwise of this organization has not been determined as yet by any court decision in Canada.

ILLEGAL LOBSTER FISHING PROSECUTIONS.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish & Guysborough):

1. Have any prosecutions been brought during the calendar year 1919 for illegal lobster fishing?
2. If so, how many, and what is the gross amount of the fines collected?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. Yes.

2. 83 prosecutions; $2,350—also collected, $45 outstanding as time was given by the Justices for making payment.

STEAMER "33."

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish & Guysborough):

1. How much was paid into the Consolidated Revenue as the proceeds of the fish caught by Government Steamer "33" under the direction of Mr. J. J. Cowie, referred to on pages 46, 47 and 48 of the Annual Fisheries Report, 1918?
2. What was the gross cost of the said fishing operations for the said season, including coal, fishing nets and gear, wages, salaries, repairs, supplies, and expenditures of every description connected therewith?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. $1,780.57.
2. $10,384.94.

IMPERIAL PRESS CONFERENCE.

*Mr. TOBIN:

1. Has it been decided to hold an Imperial Press Conference in Canada?
2. If so, when and at what place?
3. Who are to be the officers responsible for calling the Conference and carrying it through?
4. How much is Canada contributing towards the expense of the Conference?
5. Is the Government aware that the Executive Council of the National Union of Journalists has declined the invitation to send a delegate to the next Imperial Press Conference?
6. Have the Provincial Governments been asked to help in financing the Conference, and if so, have all or any of them agreed to do so, and to what extent in each case?
7. Can Publishers be included in the Conference along with Journalists?
8. Has the Conference been changed from a Conference of Journalists as was intended to a Conference of Publishers?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. Yes.
2. Ottawa, August 4 to 7, 1920.
3. Canadian Press Association.
4. Under consideration.
5. No.

[Sir George Foster.]

6. Yes. Ontario and Quebec each $10,000. New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia, each $5,000.
7. The Government has no information.
8. No.

CANADIAN MISSION IN LONDON.

Mr. McMASTER:

1. What was the total expense of the Canadian Mission in London from its inception to its close?
2. What are the names of those to whom salaries equivalent to one thousand dollars per annum, and over, were paid, and the aggregate amount paid to each?
3. What was the number of those who were engaged with the Mission whose salaries were less than one thousand dollars per annum, and the aggregate amount paid to all?
4. What were the expenses of the Mission: (a) for office rent; (b) for house rent; (c) for food and household expenses; (d) railway transportation; (e) motor transportation.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1. The total expense of the Canadian Mission in London from its inception to the 31st January is $123,410.36.

2. The following are the names and amounts paid to those to whom salaries equivalent to $1,000 per annum, and over, were paid:

Armstrong, C. H. A., $5,407.11; Baillargeon, J. A., $916.23; Blackwell, F. V., $2,337.52; Boyle, J. W., $9,733.33; Douglas, F. P., $584; Gibson, L. C., $880.93; Hearn, G. J., $4,236.86; Henry, J., $2,447.76; Hervey, Gen'l C. F., $1,071; Lloyd, W. E., $722.17; McColl, H., $3,650.99; Matthews, M., $718.49; Walton, S., $5,266.65; Williams, $662.70; Younge, R. J., $6,759.16.

3. The number of those employed whose salaries were less than $1,000 per annum was nineteen, and the total amount paid to all was $7,816.40.

4. The expenses of the Mission were:

(a) For office rent, $7,412.26.

(b) and (c) No house rent was paid, but the members of the Mission received living allowances which total $22,752.57.

(d) Railway transportation is included in the travelling expense, the total amount of which is $9,329.58.

(e) The cost of motor and upkeep thereof was $3,411.05.

CANADA AND THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. McMASTER:

1 Is Canada to be assessed as a first class power for the expenses of the League of Nations? If so, to what expenses shall we have to contribute?

2. The Allies, notably Great Britain and France, have large armies in Turkey, Galicia, and elsewhere. Are these armies agents of the League?

3. Is Canada to be assessed for a share of their expenses?

4. What estimate does the Government make of Canada's share of whatever expenses of the League we are to contribute to?

5. What special provision, if any, is being made to meet such expenses?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. Canada is included in the first-class under the International Bureau of the Universal Postal Union and therefore contributes on this basis to the expenses of the Secretariat of the League of Nations as provided in Article 6 of the Covenant of the League.

2. No.

3. No.

4. The actual amount which Canada may be called upon to contribute will necessarily depend upon the number and classification of the States which ultimately become members of the League of Nations.

5. Expenses will be provided by means of an estimate submitted to the House.

GASCONS WHARF.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure):

1. Why was the contract not awarded and the work proceeded with on the wharf at Gascons, Quebec, after said work had been authized by Parliament, and after tenders had been called for by the Department of Public Works?

2. Does the Government intend proceeding with this work during the present season?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. and 2. Information will be given when Estimates are laid before Parliament.

BONAVENTURE PUBLIC WORKS ENGINEER.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure):

Who is the engineer at present in charge of public works in Bonaventure County?

Hon. Mr. REID: L. G. Trudeau is acting as District Engineer.

BONAVENTURE COUNTY WHARVES.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure):

Does the Government intend repairing the wharves at St. Omer, St. Bonaventure and St. Charles de Caplan, Bonaventure county, during the present season?

Hon. Mr. REID: Information will be given when the Estimates are laid before Parliament.

MATAPEDIA VALLEY HIGHWAY.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure):

1. Does the Government intend giving effect to the request made by a deputation of citizens of Matane, Bonaventure and Gaspé counties for further assistance towards improving the highway running parallel to the Intercolonial railway in the Matapedia Valley on the ground that most of said highway has been displaced to make way for the railway and is at present almost impassable for some twenty miles and more through territory unorganized municipally?

2. How much has been expended on this road by the Department of Public Works since 1911?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. No.

2. $10,497.12.

RESTIGOUCHE RIVER—INTERPROVINCIAL BRIDGE.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure):

1. Has the Government lately received a request for the erection of an interprovincial highway bridge over the Restigouche River at Campbellton, N.B., and Cross Point, Quebec? If so, from whom?

2. Has any action been taken or is any contemplated?

3. If contemplated, is it the intention of the Government to erect a highway bridge only or adhere to the original scheme of putting up a combined railway and highway bridge?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1, 2 and 3. No.

CAMPBELLTON—CROSS POINT FERRY.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure):

1. To whom has the contract for the interprovincial ferry between Campbellton, N.B., and Cross Point, Quebec, been let, at what price, and for what term?

2. Is the present rate an increase over the old one?

3. Are there new conditions in the contract as to the fares and hours of service?

4. If so, what are they?

5. Who were the tenderers and what were the respective tenders?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1 and 5. Contract not yet awarded.

2, 3 and 4. New regulations provide that for six hours during the day, at times of least traffic, one round trip only will be made every hour instead of every half hour. No change in fare except that tariff for one automobile with driver is fixed at thirty cents each way, this being the same rate as for a single team.

QUEBEC, ORIENTAL AND ATLANTIC, QUEBEC AND WESTERN RAILWAYS.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure):

1. Does the Government contemplate taking over the Quebec, Oriental and Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railways for the purpose of linking up these roads with the Canadian National Railway System?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure).

1. Have any complaints been received by the Board of Railway Commissioners in the last twelve months concerning the service given the public by the Quebec, Oriental and Atlantic and the Quebec and Western Railways?
2. If so, what action has been taken?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Yes. Complaints have been received from Messrs. the Hon. Chas. Marcil, Mr. John Hall Kelly, and others.

2. The complaints have been investigated by the Board with the railway company and the financial conditions disclosed do not warrant any additional service during the winter months to that being given by the Company.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure).

1. Has the Board of Railway Commissioners satisfied itself that the Quebec, Oriental and Atlantic and the Quebec and Western railways are sufficiently equipped in steam power, passenger and freight cars required for the business on these roads?
2. If not, does it contemplate doing so in view of the complaints made in this regard?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Yes. The Board has satisfied itself that the line is sufficiently equipped with steam power also sufficient passenger cars. The company depends upon other lines for freight cars the bulk of its traffic being through traffic with other roads.

2. See answer to No. 1.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure).

1. Was the suspension of the daily train and mail service on the Quebec, Oriental and Atlantic and the Quebec and Western railways, during the present winter, authorized by the Post Office Department or by the Board of Railway Commissioners?
2. Is a daily train and mail service at present given on these roads, Sundays excepted? If not, why?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. No. The time table was filed by the railway company in the usual manner and notice given to the public of the change of service.

2. No. The present service given by the company is a tri-weekly passenger train Matapedia to Gaspé, a mixed train service Matapedia to New Carlisle, and an accommodation tri-weekly New Carlisle to Gaspé Mail is carried daily between Matapedia and New Carlisle. The reason assigned by the company for restricted service is on account of its financial condition.

EDMONTON POST OFFICE—PARCEL LOST.

Mr. MACKIE (Edmonton).

1. Has the Postmaster General's Department succeeded in placing any responsibility for the disappearance of a parcel of money, fifty thousand dollars, from the Post Office in the City of Edmonton?
2. Has George Armstrong, Postmaster, been exonerated in connection with the theft of said parcel?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. The case is still under investigation by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

2. No charge whatever has been made against the Postmaster in reference to this loss.

ST. HERMAS POSTAL SERVICE.

Mr. ETHIER.

1. Were tenders called for the postal service between St. Hermas village and the C.P.R. station at St. Hermas, Quebec?
2. What mail carrier was in charge of this service before the calling of tenders for the new contract?
3. What was the amount of this contract?
4. Why were new tenders called?
5. How many tenderers were there, what are their names and the amount of their respective tenders?
6. To whom was the contract awarded?
7. At what price?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. Yes.
2. M. Lafond.
3. $348.00.
4. Contractor Lafond refused to renew his expiring contract on existing terms from 1st April, 1920.
5. Three: Janvier Lacombe, $396, reduced to $374; Euclide Levert, $587.50, reduced to $348; Zenon Filion, $600, reduced to $490.
6. Euclide Levert.
7. $348.

SKEENA RIVER SALMON HATCHERY.

Mr. DUFF:

1. Is the Government erecting and equipping a salmon hatchery on the Skeena river, British Columbia?
2. Is so, at what particular part of the river is said hatchery being erected?
3. Is it being built and equipped by contract or otherwise?
4. Were tenders asked for?
5. If so, what are the names of the tenderers and the respective amount of each tender?
6. When will the hatchery be completed?
7. Is the Williamson and Parry system for the propagation of salmon being installed in said hatchery? If so, why?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. Yes.
2. On Granite creek, Lakelse lake.
3. Built by day labour under the direction of the resident engineer.
4. No.
5. Answered by No. 4.
6. September 1, 1920.
7. No.

CITY POST OFFICES IN QUEBEC PROVINCE.

*Mr. SAVARD:

1. How many post offices are there in the following cities: Quebec, Three Rivers, Shawinigan, Grand Mère, Rivière du Loup?
2. What is the population of each of these cities?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. Quebec—Head office, four postal stations and nine sub-offices; Three Rivers—head office and two sub-offices; Shawinigan Falls—head office and one sub-office; Grand Mère—two post offices; Rivière du Loup—four post offices.

2. Population—Quebec, 108,366; Three Rivers, 23,000; Shawinigan Falls, 12,000; Grand Mère, 8,000; Rivière du Loup, 8,715.

INSTITUTIONS PROVIDED WITH MILITARY UNIFORMS.

Mr. SEGUIN:

1. How many institutions, colleges or schools in Canada, were provided by the Department of Militia with military uniforms for their pupils?
2. How many in each province?
3. What is the total number of students and pupils who have been so furnished with military uniforms at the expense of the Government?
4. What is the total cost of these uniforms?

Hon. Mr. GUTHRIE:

1. 230 (odd, partly worn and under-sized uniforms).

2. Nova Scotia, 9; New Brunswick, 20; Quebec, 21; Ontario, 106; Manitoba, 4; Saskatchewan, 34; Alberta, 21; British Columbia, 15.

3. Approximately 16,000, all of whom were only partially outfitted, not completely, as stock was available.

4. $63,841.90.

MILITARY INSTRUCTORS AT EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS.

Mr. SEGUIN:

1. What is the number of military instructors sent by the Government to give military instructions in the different educational institutions in the country?
2. What is the amount paid, by month, by the Government to these instructors?

Hon. Mr. GUTHRIE:

1 and 2. No military instructors are sent to educational institutions, except at the request of the educational authorities concerned, and then only when instructors are available.

At the present time there are only six permanent force instructors detailed to the physical training cadre, permanent. The special duty of these non-commissioned officers is to teach physical training in the various normal schools, at the request of the educational authorities.

In addition to these, there are two non-commissioned officers in military district No. 4, Montreal, and three in military district No. 5, Quebec, and one in military district No. 7, St. John, who are assisting in the instruction of cadet corps.

At any place where permanent troops are stationed, the general officer commanding might utilize the services of a permanent force non-commissioned officer to help with the instruction of cadet corps, if required to do so, and his services could be spared.

These instructors receive the ordinary C.E.F. rates of pay of their rank. The number varies from time to time.

C.G.S. "SIMCOE."

Mr. LEGER:

1. Was the steamer C.G.S. "Simcoe" built in Canada?
2. If not, where and when?
3. What was her gross net and deadweight tonnage?
4. When did she last undergo overhauling and repairs?
5. Was she a fit vessel for ocean navigation?
6. Was she a seaworthy vessel for the purpose which she was put to?
7. When and where was she lost?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. No.
2. Newcastle-on-Tyne, G.B., 1909.
3. Gross 913.38; net 437.63; deadweight, unknown.
4. October, 1917.
5. Yes.
6. Yes.
7. December 7, 1917, southwest of Magdalen islands, Quebec, in gulf of St. Lawrence.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY IMPROVEMENTS.

Mr. LEDUC:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to substitute electric locomotives on the Grand Trunk railway, to enter the city of Montreal from the western limits to Bonaventure station?
2. Is it the intention of the Government to reduce the speed of the trains to six miles an hour in entering the city of Montreal, west of Bonaventure station, so as to prevent accidents?
3. Is it the intention of the Government to put in execution the project of establishing an elevated railroad on the Grand Trunk line, for the protection of the public?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. When the Government get entire control of the Grand Trunk Railway system the whole question of Montreal terminals will be considered.

2. Answered by No. 1.
3. Answered by No. 1.

DIRECTOR OF CANADIAN NEWS SERVICE AT WASHINGTON.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. What number of employees are on the staff of the director of Canadian News Service at Washington?
2. What are their names and respective salaries?
3. To whom is the news supplied?
4. What has been the total cost of the administration of this office to date?
5. Out of what fund are the expenses of this office met?
6. Is it the intention of the Government to continue this service?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. There is no director of Canadian News Service at Washington, but there is a director of Canadian News Service at New York. The staff consists of five.

2. Their names and salaries are: Colonel J. A. Cooper, director, $5,000 per annum; F. Hudd, $300 per month; Mrs. E. B. Sprague, $25 per week; Miss D. M. Jones, $28 per week; Miss A. Roonan, $20 per week.

3. Supplied to the American Press.

4. (17th July, 1919-1st February, 1920)—$10,185.79.

5. The expenses of the office are met by equal contributions from the Departments of External Affairs, Trade and Commerce, and Immigration and Colonization.

6. An announcement will be made in due course.

EXPERIMENTAL FARMS IN BONAVENTURE.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure):

1. How many experimental or demonstration stations have been established in Bonaventure county?
2. Where are they situated, in whose hands are they placed, and under what conditions?
3. Have they been successful?
4. Is it the intention of the Government to establish any other stations? If so, where?

Hon. Mr. TOLMIE:

1. Two Illustration Stations are in operation in Bonaventure county.

2. One, of 10 acres, is carried on at New Carlisle by Mr. E. M. Legallais, of Paspebiac West P. O., and has been in operation since 1916. The other, consisting of 16 acres, is carried on at New Richmond, by Mr. J. B. Cyr, of Little Cascapedia. They are under agreement to follow certain crop rotations on this land, for which they receive $5 a year for each acre. (For precise terms of agreement, see Form of Contract attached).

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

3. The results at New Carlisle are considered as fairly satisfactory up to the present; and at New Richmond, quite promising to date.

4. The establishment of additional stations in Bonaventure county is not in contemplation at present. So far, it has been possible to carry on, in the whole Dominion, some 48 Illustration Stations in all, these being located in the provinces of Quebec, Saskatchewan, and Alberta. Naturally, in arranging for new stations in any province, an endeavour is made to give first consideration to large sections of territory without any stations at all in their midst.

REMUNERATION OF RURAL DELIVERY MAIL CARRIERS.

Mr. EULER:

1. Has the attention of the Government been drawn to the state of dissatisfaction existing among the rural delivery mail carriers because of the inadequate scale of remuneration consequent upon the increased cost of living?
2. If so, is it the intention of the Government to modify existing contracts and to increase the rate of pay to the rural carriers in future contracts so as to provide for relief as justified by said increased cost of living and the increased cost of rural delivery?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1 and 2. A number of appeals have been received from rural mail contractors for increased remuneration on account of the increased cost of living. Each appeal is considered on its own merits, due regard being paid to the present rate of remuneration and the date on which the contract was entered into.

The policy of the Government is to do everything possible to ameliorate the financial conditions of the rural mail couriers, but the Post Office Act makes it unlawful to increase the rate paid to a mail contractor without first inviting public tenders except when an addition is made to the regular service or when it can be shown that the quantity of mail matter which he is required to convey has increased to such an extent as to necessitate the employment of additional equipment and couriers.

If investigation shows that a contractor entered into his contract at a time so recent as to make it possible to foresee and consequently provide against the increase in operating expenses, there could be no good grounds for any drastic action by the Government to release him; but if on the other hand, the contractor entered into his obligations at a time when it was impossible to foresee the sudden rise in the cost of operation, and is consequently, through no fault of his own, carrying on his work at

a loss, steps are taken to invite tenders with a view to making other satisfactory contract arrangements which when completed would lead to his release.

CHARLEVOIX-MONTMORENCY CUSTOM OFFICERS.

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. How many custom officers are there in the county of Charlevoix-Montmorency?
2. What are their names, where do they reside, and where did they reside before appointment?
3. When were they appointed and at what salary?
4. Have the said salaries been increased since appointment?
5. If so, when and to what extent?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. Two.

2. J. G. Martel, Point au Pic, transferred from port of Quebec, December 1, 1917. Edouard Leclerc, St. Paul's Bay, at time of employment a resident of St. Paul's Bay.

3. J. G. Martel first employed at Point au Pic December 1, 1917, with salary at $1,000 per annum. Edouard Leclerc first employed at St. Paul's Bay April 27, 1910, receives $5 for each vessel entered and cleared.

4. No increase in salary granted since appointment at present station.

5. Answered by 4.

CANADIAN WHEAT SHIPMENTS TO GREECE.

*Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. How many cars, if any, are now loaded with wheat destined for Greece, but which cannot be discharged and relieved because Greece refuses to accept such wheat at a higher price than contracted for?
2. How long have said cars been kept idle on that account?
3. When does the Government expect to relieve these cars?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1, 2 and 3: It is not possible to say how many cars, if any, are loaded with wheat destined for Greece, but which cannot be discharged and relieved because Greece refused to accept such wheat at a higher price than contracted for. No cars are being detained at the present time, nor have any been detained for the last ten days on account of delay in loading the vessels at ports ready to receive the grain. There is now no delay on that account.

DOMINION CANNERS.

*Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Is the Government aware that the Dominion Canners form an important combine in this country?
2. If so, does the Government intend to suppress this combine by legal proceedings under legislation against combines which are contrary to the general interests of the consumers?
3. Is the Government aware that the Dominion Canners, last year, made profits whereby the directors were enabled to declare a 19 per cent dividend?
4. If so, why the Government does not confiscate a part of these profits extorted from the consumers of Canada?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1. The Government is not aware that the Dominion Canners form an important combine in this country.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. The Government is not aware of what profits were made by the Dominion Canners last year.

4. Answered by No. 3.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

How many of the 22,954 temporary appointments made by the Board of Civil Service Commissioners since the Armistice are at present on the pay rolls of the various departments of the Government?

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queens):

For a copy of all papers, documents, telegrams, correspondence and reports made between the Department of Naval Service and the Inspector of Fisheries in Prince Edward Island or any other party or parties regarding the sale of the lobster hatchery at Charlottetown, P.E.I.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

For a copy of all letters, petitions, telegrams and other documents relating to the retention in office, as a Fishery Overseer, of John A. Dillon, of Guysborough, N.S.

DISMISSAL OF JAMES CONNER.

Mr. R. L. RICHARDSON (Springfield) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, in the interests of the public service of this country and in justice to a discharged official, the Public Utilities Commissioner of Manitoba be authorized to investigate the summary dismissal, in the autumn of 1917, of James Conner, who for many years served the country as a preventive officer, and that he report his findings to this House, coupled with a recommendation as to what action should be taken in order that justice shall be achieved.

He said: Before the motion is put, Mr. Speaker, I desire to speak briefly to it. This is the third occasion on which I have made an attempt to secure justice for a faithful official. I have already told the story to the House at two previous sessions and I purpose to tell it again. I want to ascertain for myself whether or not justice can be obtained for an official who served this country as faithfully as he knew how for

twenty long years, and who was summarily dismissed, receiving notice, I think, on October 4 that his services were dispensed with as from the 30th of the previous month. I brought the matter to the attention of the House two sessions ago and was promised by the Minister of Immigration that it would be investigated and that justice would be done—I think he said that justice would be done. Nothing, however, was done in the case, and last session I again brought the matter to the attention of the House when the present Acting Prime Minister (Sir George Foster) gave his pledge that there would be a thorough investigation to the end that justice might be meted out to this official. Up to the present time, so far as I know, absolutely nothing has been done. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to cross the floor of the House and take a place with the Opposition, nor do I wish to ally myself at present with the party led by my hon. friend the member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar), but I do want to ascertain whether or not justice can be done by this Union Government which I have stood by with more or less faithfulness since its constitution. Of course, if justice cannot be obtained from the Government it may be necessary for me to organize a party of my own, and I will see that the right thing is done.

Mr. BUREAU: A one-man party.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Well, never mind. Some great movements have been started by eminent men, though perhaps they were not so great as the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau).

Mr. PECK: May I ask my hon. friend if he expects participating in the salary of the leader of the Opposition in the event of his crossing the floor of the House?

Mr. RICHARDSON: No. I am quite free to say to my hon. friend from Skeena (Mr. Peck) that if ever I attained to the position of leader of the Opposition I should not ask for nor expect any salary. I should take the position free, gratis and for nothing, and discharge its duties to the very best of my ability. But, joking aside, Mr. Speaker, I desire to present, as briefly as I possibly can, the facts of this case.

Twenty years ago, when the boundary was largely unguarded, I succeeded in inducing the Government to appoint a Scotchman named James Conner, who lived along the boundary, to protect the wood that existed in such abundance to the north. I think he received a salary of $200 a year, but he guarded that boundary with exemplary faithfulness. Later on, when it was necessary to have a preventive officer in that locality, Mr. Conner was appointed to the position, and I think he was given a salary of $600 a year. It is a long time since I represented that constituency, but Mr. Conner continued in that position as preventive officer with the salary I have mentioned. At a later stage I shall state what his collections were in order that hon. members may form some idea of his efficiency. When the immigration from the United States began to pour into that part of the country, Mr. Conner was appointed Immigration Officer with an additional salary of $100, and in that connection for twelve years he guarded the boundary. He looked after all the immigrants for twelve years, during which time immigration poured into the country. Now, a little over two years ago when immigration ceased and coincident with the time the Union Government was organized, a petty conspiracy on the part of some understrappers was hatched against Mr. Conner, and he was notified that his services would be no longer required. As I have already said, he received notice on the 4th of October, his dismissal taking effect in September. I wish hon. members would listen carefully to this statement, because I am sure their hearts would burn with the same indignation that filled mine when the facts were presented to me. Mr. Conner knew me and wrote to me telling me of the facts, and I wrote to the late John MacDougald, Commissioner of Customs, who informed me that the man was dismissed on the ground of economy, and that a man named Nesbitt had been sent from Winnipeg to take his place. I instituted inquiries and ascertained that Nesbitt had been appointed Preventive Officer under the Customs Department at a salary, I think, of $1,050 for one office alone, whereas this man had rendered admirable service for twenty years, the last twelve years of which period he had done work for the Immigration Department for an additional $100. Yet he was dismissed on the ground of economy, forsooth! I naturally was indignant over the whole matter, and after being elected I made an investigation that convinced me that there had been great injustice to an official whose services had been absolutely beyond reproach. I therefore brought the matter to the attention of the House, for I know not of any other way to obtain justice for this man. I am not engaged in wire-pulling with any minister or the officers of any department. As a member of the House I like to present

the facts of any case such as this right on the floor of Parliament, because I am satisfied that the sense of justice which must be alive in the mind of every hon. member must recognize that justice is imperative in this instance. The man has done faithful work for twenty years, and I am determined to urge his case, and to lay the circumstances before the House as forcefully as I possibly can, until justice is obtained.

When I found out what the facts were, as I have already said, I immediately brought the matter to the attention of the House and I received a pledge from the right hon. gentleman who is acting as Prime Minister. I may read from Hansard what took place in the House. In the course of my remarks I said:

> Mr. RICHARDSON: I felt I would keep at this thing to find out whether justice could be obtained in a case of this kind. If the position had been given to a returned soldier, probably Mr. Conner would have been perfectly satisfied and so would I.
>
> Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I will try my very best to give a declaration after what the hon. gentleman has been good enough to say about me. I do not know the least thing about the case except that I have heard the story of my hon. friend. I am not impugning that at all; it is, I dare say, correct, but I think I will have to ask my hon. friend to await an answer from the responsible head of the department—it is very dangerous work mixing in with the business of colleagues. . . . .
>
> Mr. RICHARSON: If the right hon. leader of the House will say that when the papers come down, if he is leading the House at the end of the session, he will make a declaration, I will subside at once.
>
> Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I can do that right away. A declaration will be made either by the responsible minister or by myself.

The papers came down, and what did they show? Did they show that this man was inefficient? No; they showed that one of these men in the conspiracy that was formed to injure Conner wrote to Thomas Gelly, Immigration Agent in Winnipeg, to endeavour if possible to fish up some information that this man was not efficient. Finally Mr. Gelly was compelled to report that Mr. Conner was entirely efficient. I looked over the reports, and found that the immigration inspector had reported the man as being highly capable, and I may inform the House that it would be impossible, if you went over the province of Manitoba with a fine-toothed comb, to discover a more thoroughly reliable man, a man of more unquestionable integrity and sterling worth than Mr. Conner. For the last thirty or forty years he has lived on the plains in Manitoba, having raised a large family of some ten children. With that family he has farmed some eight or ten sections of land, and in the early days, I may say, he used to be an engineer, running a threshing machine at three or four o'clock in the morning with the thermometer down to twenty-five and thirty below zero, in an effort to earn sufficient money to keep the roof over his family. I think, therefore, in view of all the circumstances, it is a matter of grave injustice that a man of strict sobriety and integrity should be summarily dismissed for inefficiency, when his career distinctly shows absolutely the reverse. It was not a matter of inefficiency, by any means, Mr. Speaker, there was a conspiracy hatched by understrappers in the department, and as a result of their machinations this man was dismissed from a post he had filled so well for such a long time. As I say, my indignation naturally burned over the affair, and I was impelled to bring the matter to the attention of this House on two previous occasions, and am bringing it again. No action having been taken by the responsible department, I am now asking that the Public Utilities Commissioner of Manitoba, a man of great probity, Mr. P. A. McDonald, who enjoys the implicit confidence of the community, be asked to make an investigation. It is due this faithful public servant that he be vindicated. He lies under the stigma of having been dismissed for lack of efficiency, and he should be vindicated without undue delay. He drew only a small salary and was a comparatively obscure official, but that is no reason why justice should not be done him by Parliament. In our eyes he ought to have the same protection as if he occupied the highest position in the land. Let us do him justice, Mr. Speaker; let us ascertain whether he was really inefficient. I simply ask that the Utilities Commissioner of Manitoba make an investigation into the matter. I think it is due to Mr. Conner that this step should be taken and that this House should know whether or not he has been improperly treated. I further ask that a recommendation be made as to what should be done in the premises. Mr. Conner said to me: "I am not asking that you shall give me my job back if there is a returned soldier who desires it, but I do ask to be vindicated." And that is what I demand this afternoon, Mr. Speaker. I am satisfied that no hon. member who has listened to the facts as I have recounted them will decline to support this motion. All I ask is that justice—simple common justice—be done to as faithful a public

servant as ever occupied a position in the public service of this country. I deeply regret that my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Bolton) is not here. He knows all about the facts. He promised me that he would second the motion, present the facts to the House and endorse what I have said.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry that the hon. member for Lisgar is not here because I understood the hon. member for Springfield to point in his direction and I named him as the seconder of the motion. Not being in the House, he, of course, cannot second the motion.

Mr. R. L. RICHARDSON: I am sure there is some man in the House who will second the motion.

Mr. DENIS: I will second the motion.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Certainly; I am sure the leader of the Opposition or any other member would second the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is purely a question of observing the rules of the House.

Hon. MARTIN BURRELL (Minister of Customs): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I am not familiar with the matter that my hon. friend has taken up but as I have only recently taken charge of the Department of Customs—

Mr. DENIS: I beg your pardon but I would like to make a few remarks with reference to this matter before the Minister speaks. The hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) opened his remarks by saying that this matter had been brought before the House for the third time. I am aware of it because this is the third time that I have heard him speak about this man Conner. I am not interested in the matter except for the sake of seeing that justice is done. Upon the declaration made by the hon. member for Springfield, it appears to me that he has established a prima facie case. I cannot understand a member of Parliament and a supporter of the Government standing up on the floor of this House and saying to the Government that he is here for the third time bringing up a matter, which at first sight, and on presentation of the case, shows a gross injustice done to this man James Conner. My hon. friend is now here for the third time asking his own party to do justice in a case where injustice is absolutely apparent. But the hon. member for Springfield goes further. He says that he is going to bring this matter up year after year until justice has been done to James Conner. I do not blame him for doing it, not because he is speaking against his own party but because I think that a member of Parliament who brings up a question like this owes it to himself, to his own responsibility and to his own dignity to see that justice is done. Consequently I would ask the Government to act in such a way that this question shall not again be brought before Parliament. This case with reference to James Conner is going to cost the country quite a lot of money if my hon. friend from Springfield who, I hope, may be a member of this House for many years, is going to bring it before Parliament year after year and we are going to sit here year after year listening to his appeals to his own party without his being able to receive any satisfactory answer from them. These are the only remarks I have to make and I hope the Government will see fit to give a satisfactory answer to my hon. friend and do justice to this man, James Conner, because if the facts as represented by the hon. member for Springfield are true—and no one has said so far that they are not true—there certainly has been gross injustice done to this man and it is up to us to know whether we are going to see that this injustice shall be remedied.

Mr. BURRELL: Mr. Speaker, I have very little to say on this matter. As I remarked just now to my hon. friend from Springfield, being somewhat new in the Department of Customs, I am not familiar with the subject except in so far as he has brought it before the House. I saw the return when it was brought down. My recollection of it is that it was a statement by the Deputy Minister of the Interior referring to the inefficiency of Mr. Conner. I think it is quite obvious that it would be rather unusual for this House to appoint the Public Utilities Commissioner of Manitoba to investigate this particular case but I see no reason, in view of the impression that this man has suffered an injustice, why there should not be some additional investigation to ascertain whether or not an injustice has been done. As far as I am personally concerned I am quite willing that that course should be taken. It is possible that the Civil Service Commission might look into it, or, if not it might be taken up by our own Department. I appreciate what the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. Denis) has said that it is not desirable that the time of this House should be taken up with matters of this kind being brought up again and again and I appreciate the

position of my hon. friend (Mr. Richardson) who believes that there has been a real injustice done and he would like to have it remedied. I shall be only too glad to expedite inquiry in any reasonable way.

Hon. J. A. CALDER (Minister of Immigration and Colonization): I would like to add just a word to what has been said by the Minister of Customs. It would appear that the Conner matter arose about the 5th October, 1917, and neither the present Minister of Customs nor I had anything to do with the incident.

Mr. RICHARDSON: That is right.

Mr. CALDER: Now as to the facts, because, after all, it is the facts that the House would like to have. I have discussed this matter on several occasions with the member for Springfield. It would appear that this man Conner had been in the public service for quite a while. He was in receipt of a salary of some five or six hundred dollars from the Customs Department, and in addition about $100 from the Immigration Department. The member for Springfield knows Mr. Conner, I understand, well—has known him for years, knows him as a very respectable, law-abiding, decent citizen of the very best type.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Hear, hear.

Mr. CALDER: Now on the other hand—whether it is true or not I do not know—the records of the department would indicate that in so far as Mr. Conner's services in the Immigration Department were concerned they were not looked on as satisfactory. I think the member for Springfield will bear me out when I say that the files of the department indicate that—not for a short period, but a period extending over a considerable number of years—

Mr. RICHARDSON: No, I entirely dissent from that statement.

Mr. CALDER: Well, that is a fact that will have to be ascertained.

Mr. RICHARDSON: The papers will show.

Mr. CALDER: I know that considerable stress is laid in the papers upon the file that Mr. Conner was responsible—and I think contrary to warning, if I remember rightly—for allowing in a band of gypsies, whose admission cost the country a very large sum of money. In addition to that, it was almost impossible for the department to get any return or statement from him at all, and this went on for a considerable length of time. I am not stating my view of the situation, I am merely trying to indicate what the departmental records show.

On the other hand, the member for Springfield has stated that there was a conspiracy on the part of certain understrappers in the department. Well, I do not know who were in the conspiracy, or why such a conspiracy should exist. I know that when I first took the matter up in the department, Mr. Cory, who was acting as deputy minister, and Mr. Scott, who has been Superintendent of Immigration for years, intimated that in their judgment Mr. Conner was not capable of carrying on the work that the Immigration Department expected would be carried on at that point. That is their view, whether right or wrong. However, it seems to me that in view of the position taken by the member for Springfield—and I do not blame him at all if he considers there has been a grave injustice done this man, and if he thinks that the facts and statements set forth in the departmental records are not correct—there is only one thing to do and that is to get the facts. It seems to me that those facts should be ascertained, not by the Public Utilities Commissioner of the province of Manitoba, but by some officer of the Federal Government who can be trusted to do that work. I do not wish to enter into any controversy at the present time over the facts—I am merely trying to intimate what the record is so far as the file itself shows it, and what the opinions of the officials of the department are, whether right or wrong, with reference to this man's work.

Although the member for Springfield has had the opportunity, as he had last year of looking over the whole departmental record, if he is not satisfied—if he considers that further investigation should be held, then I say we should grant that investigation in order to get at the facts.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Speaker, might I have the privilege, with the unanimous consent of the House, of saying a word or two further.

Mr. BUREAU: You have the right to do so, you are closing the Debate.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member for Springfield is exercising his right to reply. If any other member wishes to speak on this matter he should speak now.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I merely wish to state in reply to what the minister has said that this incident occurred before the Union

Government came into office. I was not seeking to cast any blame—of course the ministers know I was not—upon the Union Government, although the Union Government might fall just as well as any other government. I wish to make this further statement. I looked over the papers when they were brought down, and I found this extract in a letter written by the Deputy Minister of the Interior. That is what convinced me that there was a conspiracy. I will read the extract:

> I believe that your officer at that point—

Referring to Mr. Conner—

> —is very old, and, from what I can gather very inefficient. The Commissioners, who have been investigating our Immigration Service recommend that the duties of the two departments be combined and that Mr. Nesbitt be placed in charge, the cost of the service to be apportioned between the two departments.
>
> This is the matter about which I spoke to you over the telephone. Will you please let me have confirmation of this arrangement.

Why should the Deputy Minister of the Interior confer with the late John McDougald, Commissioner of Customs, over the telephone about the dismissal, the side-tracking, of this very decent man? Then there is the attempt to discredit him, and even the minister has fallen into the snare. The Minister of Immigration says Mr. Conner was inefficient and that he let some gypsies into the country. Now let us see about that. For twelve long years of the period that immigration poured into the Northwest from the United States, this man Conner looked after the interests of the public in connection with that department, he did it for $100 a year, and not a single complaint that I could notice was ever made against him—I will refer to the matter of the gypsies later on. So far as regards the complaint of not reporting to the Department Conner reported every month. The minister has probably taken his cue from some member of the Civil Service who has told or tried to tell him, not the facts, but a garbled story about the situation.

Now with regard to the gypsies, and that is a matter in regard to which the officials ring the changes against this old official, Mr. Conner. There were a number of gypsies who came to the province of Manitoba some years ago bringing with them $35,000. They should have made entry at Emmerson but they came to Mr. Conner who was the officer there. They had all this money, they had their horses, and they had a lot of effects, and Mr. Conner naturally thought they were settlers and he allowed them to go through. But when it was found that they had practised some deception—I think I am correct in my facts—at Emmerson the matter was reported to Winnipeg and these men were coralled, brought back and tried at the town of Morden. The minister says it cost the country a large sum of money but I do not think he knew what he was talking about. Just look at the position the Government was in at that time. The gypsies were brought up for trial at Morden. Do you suppose the Dominion Government offered any evidence against them? They did not even appear against these men at all, and they were dismissed and sent out of the country, and the cost was practically nothing—probably only a few cents or a few dollars to anybody. Then the officials start in to make it appear that Conner is an inefficient man. I think I have demonstrated to the satisfaction of this House that so far from Conner being inefficient he was the most efficient officer the department had in that country. Let me cite a few further facts, because it is worth while under the circumstances; I do not want this matter coming up every session, I want it settled right here and now. It is true the present Minister of Customs knows nothing about the matter; he has not held his present office during the last two sessions. But the Minister of Immigration and Colonization does know something about it and he might, I think—because I have great regard for him—and a personal liking—have seen that justice was done. He did not do that. The leader of the House (Sir George Foster) who enjoys the respect, I am sure, of every member of the House, gave his promise that justice should be done and I accepted that promise. I did so in good faith and I said "Now, at last, Mr. Conner will have a square deal," but I suppose in the multitude of his duties the Acting Prime Minister has neglected to see that Mr. Conner did get a square deal.

Now to show you to what extent this man Conner is neither inefficient nor useless let me read a few facts. At Bannerman, which is a little bit farther west than where he guards the boundary, the revenue in 1918 was $2,481, and the cost of collection was $2,317, very nearly the amount of the entire revenue. I do not wish to tire the House, but I would like the facts to be known. At Boissevain the revenue was $3,117, the cost $1,000; at Cartwright $604 and $900, so that the country lost $300; at Deloraine $2,145 and $900; at Killarney $1,260 and $900; at Crystal city $1,777 and $1,000; at

Morden $2,887 and $1,050; at Hasket $2,208 and the salaries $1,394. But at Snowflake, where this prime old servant James Conner looked after the revenue, the collections in 1918 were $4,622 or nearly double the amount collected by any other officer in that territory. At what cost to the country? He got only $650 as Customs Officer and $100 as Immigration Officer, so it cost only $650 to collect $4,622. Yet all the other men were let go scot free, while this faithful servant, who collected nearly double the amount of revenue collected by any of the others, was dismissed for inefficiency.

An hon. MEMBER: Have you got the figures for last year?

Mr. RICHARDSON: No. I do not know what the collections would be, but I suppose they would be about the same, although the salary has been doubled. On the grounds of inefficiency and economy this fine old public servant was dismissed and a man appointed in his place at double the salary. It is such an outrageous proceeding that I marvel that my motion is not accepted at once. I am tired of bringing this matter before the department officials. I want a recommendation that will do justice to this faithful servant. Let us vindicate him. Let us not turn him adrift on the ground that he was inefficient and too old to serve his country. How will you ever get faithful service unless you treat your most menial official justly? You must give him fair play or you cannot expect decent service.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that I have fully covered the ground. I do not at all like the suggestion that the matter should be left to the department, because it will simply be glossed over. Let us settle it now. Let us name some tribunal to investigate this case. I lay awake many hours thinking and I finally hit upon the Public Utilities Commissioner of Manitoba, a man of honour and probity, as the best gentleman to investigate and report on the matter. But if the Government knows "a better 'ole" let them go to it. I will accept any decent investigator, but I do not want to sit down without having a decision as to what shall be done. Let us have an investigation to ascertain whether this decent old man has been justly or unjustly treated, so that I may not be forced to bother the House with this case session after session. If the Government will put their heads together and name any other reasonable tribunal it will be acceptable to me, but I want the matter settled now.

Hon. MARTIN BURRELL (Minister of Customs): I would suggest to the hon. member that the other ministers and myself see him and arrange for some official, satisfactory to him, to deal with this matter.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Somebody satisfactory to me?

Mr. BURRELL: Yes.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I will be perfectly satisfied. That settles it then.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. member be allowed to withdraw his motion?

Motion withdrawn.

QUEBEC'S ANCIENT FORTIFICATIONS.

Mr. CHARLES GAVAN POWER (Quebec South) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the ancient walls and fortifications of the city of Quebec, having for all military purposes become absolete, it is expedient in order to better preserve these valuable heirlooms as a historical monument for future generations, that their upkeep and control be now vested in the National Battlefields Commission.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the subject which I wish to bring up for discussion to-day has been on the Order Paper for quite a long time. It is a proposal that the walls and fortifications of the city of Quebec be now taken from the control of the Militia Department and placed in an independent commission. I am pleased indeed to see the Minister of Militia and Defence (Hon. Hugh Guthrie) in his seat, and before I go any further I wish to tell him that this scheme has had the approval of his predecessor and also of Sir Sam Hughes, former Minister of Militia.

The walls and fortifications have become absolutely obsolete and useless for warlike purposes. They could not withstand a five minute bombardment by modern artillery. They would be, I imagine, more a source of danger than defence to those who manned them.

Hitherto their control and upkeep has been vested in the Department of Militia and Defence. This department, very wisely I imagine, is not too wasteful of the public moneys, and does not wish to expend money for the defence of Canada where such expenditure would be useless. Therefore I propose to rid the department of what to-day must be very much of an incumbrance.

By 7-8 Edward VII, Chap. 57, there has been created a body called "The National Battlefields Commission." This commission

was constituted because, according to the preamble of the Statute:

> It is desirable in the public interest of Canada to acquire and preserve the great historic battlefields at Quebec, restoring so far as possible their principal features.

To this Commission the Federal and Provincial Governments have at various times voted considerable sums, and societies and private individuals have generously contributed. I may say in passing that that Commission has performed splendid work in Quebec, as anybody who has been there recently may see. We have a splendid Battlefields Park on the Plains of Abraham, where formerly a wilderness existed.

Now, I propose, subject of course to any considerations of military necessity, that these fortifications be taken over by this Battlefields Commission. It is not my desire to hasten the Government into adopting any scheme that may be impossible or impracticable, and I quite understand that there may be reasons of State to prevent their taking the action I suggest; for instance, the Imperial authorities in handing over the citadel and fortifications to the Canadian Government may have placed some restrictions upon their use, but of that I have no knowledge. I simply wish to ask that serious consideration be given to this subject, feeling assured that the public service will be benefited and its efficiency increased without putting one cent more cost on the public funds.

I have already stated that the value of these fortifications for practical purposes is useless. We must not forget, however, that there attaches to them a very great sentimental value in the hearts of all Canadians.

It has been shown in the history of the past as well as in recent history that, while nations may be ruled by politicians and statesmen, they are never aroused to action; they are never impelled to the doing of good deeds, until their hearts are touched and their sentiment aroused. I imagine, therefore, that in forwarding such a movement as this we shall be helping our fellow citizens and the growing generation to appreciate the better their responsibilities as Canadians. A study of the deeds of our ancestors; a contemplation of the difficulties which they underwent; a perusal of our history, will bring to our people and to the growing generation a love of country which will better fit us to assume our national status.

The history of these walls is truly remarkable—remarkable from the standpoint of the antiquarian as well as from the standpoint of the historian; an object lesson to all of us; an object lesson to the growing generation—remarkable even from the standpoint of the soldier, because it shows that the art of defensive warfare has made wonderful strides within recent years.

In reviewing this history we may begin with the day when Champlain built at Quebec a rude stockade called "L'Habitation," fit only to repel the attacks of savages armed with bows and arrows, and go on to the time when they built on the crest of the cliff a castle surrounded by a moat and a wall, called "Chateau St. Louis." Many of you may not know where the Chateau St. Louis was; its site will be more familiar to you when I tell you that it is that of the present Chateau Frontenac.

In the time of the Governor from whom the Chateau Frontenac takes its name, it was decided to enlarge the walls and spread them over a much greater area. This was done partly by the inhabitants themselves, who feared the growing power of the English colonists and their savage allies, and partly under the direction of the French kings, who realized that in Quebec they had the strategic point from which their possessions in New France might be defended. The work, however—like most Government work, I am sorry to say—was placed largely in the hands of contractors, and the contractors of that day resembled very much the contractors of our day. We read that short quantities of earth were delivered; that stones were mixed with sand; that works had to be repaired before they were completed. We read also that a certain amount of ingenuity was exercised in the carrying out of some of the schemes well known to our own modern political camp followers, such as change of plan, extras, and so on. Evidently they knew all these things in the days of Montcalm and Frontenac. However, we read also that in spite of these things, the military governors and engineers such as Frontenac, Montcalm, Denère, Delary, Franquert, Ponteroy and others undoubtedly were honest and did their best under adverse circumstances to make these walls safe against the invader. One thing, though, is certain: Wolfe's artillery men, though not armed with pieces of the heaviest weight even for that day, had no difficulty in effecting large breaches wherever they chose.

During the English regime, Murray when he was besieged by De Levis and later Sir Guy Carleton when he was besieged by continental troops, found that their sole defence against the invaders was the stout

heart of the defenders. We read also that in the letters of the governors of that time innumerable complaints were made to the home office of the insufficiency of the defences and that frequent requests were made for assistants, for men, for engineers, for materials, in order to strengthen the fortifications of that city which was the last bulwark of British dominion on the American continent. No comprehensive scheme, however, was entered into until 1823, when the walls were built which enclose approximately their present area. Later still, between 1860-1870 the experience of modern warfare having shown that the only means of defence for a city was to be found in separate and detached posts situated at some distance, forts were constructed at Levis in a position commanding the river St. Lawrence. These forts have, I understand, proved to be of some utility during the recent war, and it is not my intention to ask that they be included in the plan which I propose.

It is not, however, so much the history of these bare walls and these crumbling stones to which I wish to direct the attention of the House to-day. I wish to emphasize the associations connected with them; to deal with a subject which certainly does not enter into the realm of practical politics and in connection with which there can certainly be nothing in the way of vituperation or recrimination. I hope that the House will bear with me for a few moments while I recall some of the events connected with these walls, and refer briefly to some of the men whose names are associated with them.

From the day in 1535 when Jacques Cartier, with a few scurvy-inflicted followers, entered the St. Charles river and wintered beside the Indian village of Stadacona, down to the day when the mightiest Armada which had ever crossed the Atlantic, sailed up the St. Lawrence, bearing thirty-three thousand men who with their comrades were in four years to make known the word "Canada" in regions and to populations where hitherto it was considered almost as mythical as the fabled Atlantis; whose deeds stand out pre-eminent even in a war of giants; whose heroism has attracted the attention and praise of the nations of the earth through nearly four centuries—Quebec has been the spot on this hemisphere where history was made, where heroes lived and died, where a continent was lost and won. It was here that Champlain, a soldier, sailor and statesman, first established a home and planted the Cross which was to bring to a continent the blessings of Christianity and civilization. From Quebec he set forth on those perilous journeys into unknown regions amongst unfriendly barbarous tribes which led to the discovery of the Ottawa river and the Great Lakes. Later he was succeeded by others of the same daring breed. Talon, Laval, Frontenac, all made their headquarters within these walls. Statesman and colonist, priest and educator, soldier and governor—all left on the colony the glamour of their personality and enriched our history by the shining examples which they have left to posterity. Talon, with the clear vision of genius, saw that a country hitherto popularly supposed to be useful only as an abode for criminals, adventurers and younger sons, or to be given over to the avaricious rapacity of the fur traders, could be made the home of a peaceful, happy populace, devoted to industry and the cultivation of the soil.

Laval, priest, founder and colonist, by a system of education, rendered this country at least to a certain extent independent of old France in arts, science, culture. By his firm insistence on the rights and privileges of the clergy, by his struggle on behalf of morality and decency, he raised to a higher plane the standards of living which here as elsewhere had been lowered by the licentiousness and debaucheries of some of the wilder spirits. He instilled into the people of French Canada that love of authority, that God-fearing simplicity, and sense of moral responsibility which are the characteristics of the people of the province of Quebec to-day.

A little later Frontenac arrived, during the darkest hour of the colony. He subdued the Iroquois, terrorized the colonial settlements into an honourable truce and answered the imperious ultimatum of a British admiral anchored before the walls of Quebec by a haughty and successful reply from the mouth of his cannon. He put an end for a century to come to the menace of a British invasion of Quebec. Then later came priests and missionaries, the Recollects and Jesuits, trappers and explorers. They lived and struggled and died within the shadow of these mouldering walls. Time after time the Jesuits, unaccustomed to anything but the best living in Europe, went out into uncharted country, faced death in a thousand horrible forms, and suffered martyrdom in order to bring to a new country the blessings of civilization. We must all recognize the courage of

the "coureur de bois," those hardy people who explored the Mississippi and were the first to discover our great West. Hon. members from the West should be glad to join with me in helping to reverence and perpetuate their memory by preventing the walls from which they started from falling into decay. Then came soldiers from Guinne and Picardy, descendants of whom are sitting around me in this Chamber today. These men must have viewed with gloomy foreboding the vast forests which lay before them. Little did they think that within a few centuries the trees whose shadows filled them with such a sombre feeling would be utilized to make fortunes for thousands of people.

Later on, from his lookout perched high above Cape Diamond, Montcalm must have looked very sorrowfully down the St. Lawrence at the mighty fleet containing the greatest force yet sent against the colony. He must have felt approaching the climax of the long struggle on the American continent between Briton and Gaul. Time does not permit me to dwell upon the trials and triumphs of the gallant Wolfe, nor upon the great battle of the Plains of Abraham, which so effectually decided the question of supremacy in Canada. Suffice it to say that the troops engaged were worthy foes, the reckless gallantry of France being matched by the calm courage and stubbornness of Britain. The prize, too, was worthy of the contest—the capture of the gateway to the northern portion of the American continent. The combat was so fierce, even compared with modern warfare, that four brigadiers on one side and three on the other were either killed in action or died of wounds, and both officers commanding were mortally wounded whilst gallantly leading their men to the attack. So closely are the names of these two heroes associated, one over-shadowed in his last moments by defeat, and the other dying at the moment of victory, that a single monument has been erected to commemorate their glorious struggle.

The city was to be besieged again. The following year De Levis, having avenged France in a battle fought on almost the same grounds as the struggle of the previous year, sat down to starve Governor Murray and a few troops into submission. The garrison suffered incredible hardships throughout the winter, but with the spring came the eagerly awaited British fleet, and the British flag was seen unfurled to the breeze. French colonial policy then collapsed and England became possessor of the vast territories which now constitute the brightest gem in the diadem of the Empire.

Quebec was besieged once more in 1775. Continental forces had overrun the whole of Canada, till only Quebec City still remained free from the heel of the invader. Sir Guy Carleton, by his energy and ability, so stirred the inhabitants, both English and French, that the city was put into such a state of defence that it withstood almost daily attacks from the forces of Arnold and Montgomery, till in the closing hours of 1775 the final assault was beaten off, and the bravest of the surviving Americans gave up his life attempting in vain to scale the cliffs.

Since that time, though the streets and squares have constantly echoed with the tramp of armed men, though the surrounding hills every day resound with the roar of artillery, no enemy has come within sufficient distance to give cause for alarm.

In another field, however, Quebec continued to be of the greatest importance to the Dominion. Here was staged the earliest debates on responsible government. Here was established for all time equal rights for the victor and vanquished in the matter of language and religion. Here sat the first Parliament of United Canada, and here, in 1864, were laid the foundation stones of our present Confederation.

In conclusion, let us remember that the facts which I have set forth are a large part of the history of all Canadians, no matter what their country of origin may be. The men whose deeds I have recalled are our common ancestors, and the newest Canadian as well as the descendant of fifty generations here, if he be proud of his country at all, should claim them and glory in their achievements and try to emulate them. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that no more befitting legislation could be adopted in the year of the opening of this magnificent new Parliament Building, which is a symbol of the growth into a mighty nation of the few provinces for whom these ancestors of ours laboured, fought and died, than to save from decay these crumbling walls in old Quebec, these mouldering stones, which witnessed their efforts on our common behalf.

Hon. HUGH GUTHRIE (Minister of Militia and Defence): Mr. Speaker, the motion which my hon. friend from South Quebec (Mr. Power) has just made brings to my attention for the first time this important question regarding the walls and fortifications of the ancient city of Quebec. When I first saw the notice on the Order Paper, I made inquiries in the department, but we

could find no record of any application having been made in the direction set out in the motion now before the House.

However, I have heard incidentally that Sir George Garneau, the Chairman of the Battlefields Commission, has asked some members of the Government that these walls and fortifications should be handed over to the Commission, and I may inform the House that at the present time the matter is under consideration by the Government and by the officials of the Department of Militia.

I must commend my hon. friend for the excellent manner in which he has brought this matter to the attention of the House in the motion which he has just moved, and also for the graceful, eloquent and charming recital which he has given to us of the history of the early days of this great country. I think many of us are far too prone to consider that the history of our common country begins about the year 1759, and far too many of us are either not informed, or else we forget that Canada has in reality a great history, an honourable history; a history adorned with all the colours of romance. From the year 1535, for nearly four centuries, perhaps the principle historic point of the whole country has been in and about the city of Quebec; and certainly not the least point of historic interest in that city, perhaps one of the most interesting of all, consists in the walls and the fortifications which originally were looked upon as an unconquerable stronghold, but which to-day under the conditions of modern warfare, would not be considered the slightest military importance. These fortifications, as I understand, came into possession of the Government of Canada under some express arrangements with the Imperial Government; but so far as my information goes, I do not think that there were any limitations whatever in the deed of gift or grant which would place any impediment in the way of the proposal to hand over these memorials to the Battlefields Commission. From the knowledge I possess of the matter—and I frankly admit that I am not very conversant with its details—I believe that the walls and fortifications are not now used for any military purpose and are not likely to be restored for such purpose by this or succeeding generations. The citadel itself is used for military purposes and troops are quartered there. The parade grounds are of course used, but the walls themselves and the fortifications connected therewith will not, I think, ever again be of any practical use to the Government or the Department of Militia. During past years, I understand, some expenditure has been made in the work of restoration, both by the Department of Militia and Defence and by the Department of Public Works. Just what that expenditure amounts to I am not at the present moment able to state, but I know that within the last three months instructions have been issued to have a survey and report made of the whole situation in connection with these walls and fortifications; and I think that in the near future some scheme will be developed and a plan devised whereby conferences will be held between officials of the department and the Battlefields Memorial Commission in order that satisfactory arrangements may be made for the handing over of these walls and fortifications to that commission. Plans have not yet been fully developed in that respect; they are still under consideration by the department and the Government. Personally, I think there should be no hesitation in carrying out the plan suggested in this motion. I am very glad indeed that my hon. friend in moving the motion stated that he did not intend to press it at the present time but brought it forward to-day with the idea of presenting the matter directly to the attention of the Government and of this House. He has done more than that. He has put upon the pages of Hansard a charming address—

Mr. BUREAU: Hear, hear——

Mr. GUTHRIE: —which I have no doubt will be very widely read in the schools and colleges of this country. He has given us a resumé of Canadian history which will be of great value, and he has clothed it in most charming language, simple and easy to understand. I think, therefore, he is entitled to the thanks as well as the congratulations of the House for the manner in which he has submitted his motion to day; and in adopting his suggestion to let the motion drop, I may assure him that the matter will be given the best of consideration of the Government.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (Simcoe North): I have no desire to prolong the debate on this motion, but I wish to correct a wrong impression that seems to have possessed the House in regard to this matter. I have had some experience in going over fortifications, and I know how those of Quebec compare with other fortifications of similar character. The city of Ypres held out throughout the war. After the British took possession of its fortifications, it was never taken by the

whole force of the German army united against it on several occasions, the British army having found refuge in the casemates and the old crumbling walls of the city of Ypres. Now, the walls of Ypres were just as decrepit, and were in the same condition when the war broke out between Belgium and Germany, as are the walls of the city of Quebec at the present time. The city of Ypres was taken possession of by the army and the casemates were utilized, and other works of a temporary character were built with the walls, with the result that Ypres became impregnable. And had it not been for the manner in which that city was held there is no doubt that the war would have ended in another way. The fortifications of Quebec as they stand to-day are far stronger and in a much better state of repair than were the fortifications of Ypres, and I have no hesitation in saying, as one who has seen the effect of war on the operation of fortifications of this kind, that any general who has had experience in defending fortresses in Europe would say that the form of the fortress of Quebec would lend itself to a defence that would be impregnable in any war that might occur in this country. Let us not make the mistake that these walls in Quebec are crumbled, ancient, and of no value. Behind them are rooms where men can go in casemates, which are far stronger and better than those in the city of Ypres. Th citadel of Quebec is impregnable under modern conditions. It is all very well to say that it could be blown up by artillery fire. Artillery might have some effect upon it—there is no doubt that it would have an effect upon it—but as to blowing it up or putting it out of business as a military stronghold, it cannot be done. For that reason the Government would be ill-advised to withdraw the garrison from the citadel and to remove the Quebec fortifications. The nature of the city, and of the fortifications of Quebec assure the protection of the St. Lawrence with the guns we have now. With some of those great howitzers which we have seen in Ottawa no enemy could come up the St. Lawrence beyond a point twenty miles from the city of Quebec. Before the war it was a common saying that the Canadian army was insignificant. People used to sneer at our soldiers and at the fortifications and armament of Quebec. In spite of all that, when the real, acid test of the war came the Canadian soldier was found to be just as good as any other soldier in the world and as far as the First Division was concerned its guns and its armament filled a gap in the life of the war but for which I doubt whether history would have been written in the way it is to-day.

Nobody knows what a day may bring forth. We even now have nations rattling the sword at Canada and trying to give us a little taste of their frightfulness. We may have trouble and we must be prepared for the next five or ten years to take our place in the ranks with our British brethren in case trouble comes to Canada or to the Empire. For that reason, instead of tearing down the fortifications of Quebec and withdrawing entirely the garrison from the city, we should maintain the fortifications in good order and keep the garrison there. The garrisoning of the city is so important to the protection of the St. Lawrence that I would strongly urge upon the Government to have a commission of Imperial engineers, men who have had experience of fortifications during the war, to go over the works and see what can be done with them. Walls of a poorer character in the city of Ypres withstood the full force of the greatest German guns and offered refuge for the British soldiers throughout the war. The riding school in Ypres, which was built with great underground places as refuges for soldiers, two hundred or three hundred years ago, served as a refuge for British soldiers during the war. The ancient engineers who built these walls and the men who built fortresses of the same character as that at Quebec understood their business very well and the modern engineer has not been able to improve very much upon their work. They knew how to build fortifications. There are old text books on fortifications which were used in the time of Marlborough and their teachings are still good to-day.

Amongst other nations the fortress at Quebec is looked upon as one of the great fortresses of the British Empire and it would be a mistake if the impression were to go forth that Canada was about to dismantle a fortress which is impregnable. At Halifax another great fortress stands overlooking the Atlantic ocean. For the purposes of war and defence the fortifications at Quebec are just as modern as any fortifications that could be designed to-day. All you would have to add would be outworks in the form of earthwork which could be done at any time in a day or two. I hope the impression will not go abroad, or that the Minister of Militia will not gain the impression, from the remarks which have fallen from the hon. member for Quebec city (Mr. Power), that the fortress at Quebec is useless, because there is no

better design to-day in so far as the citadel is concerned than that to be found at Quebec. Passages and galleries might be added underground but otherwise the works are perfect. The great engineers who designed that fortress knew how to construct a work of that character and the fortress is just as modern to-day as the bayonet is still a useful weapon.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before the hon. member for Quebec South rises to speak I must remind hon. members that he is exercising his right to close the debate and if any other member desires to speak he should do so now.

Mr. POWER: A word only in answer to my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. Currie.) I make no pretention of being a military authority as he is and therefore I do not intend to discuss with him the question as to whether or not these works are useless in time of war. All I can tell him is that that seems to have been the impression of the Militia Department.—

Mr. CURRIE: None of them have gone to war.

Mr. POWER: Nor is it the impression of one who is not a member of the Militia Department and who has gone to war. I wish to tell the hon. member that I put in a year at Ypres and I never saw a casemate or a wall there—I was in the trenches.

Mr. CURRIE: You could not have been in the hospital at the Menin Gate if you did not see one.

Mr. POWER: I shall close the debate and not enter into any recriminations. I shall withdraw the resolution on the assurance of the minister that this matter is receiving the attention of the Government and that an investigation of the whole question will be made. That will no doubt be satisfactory even to the hon. member for North Simcoe.

Motion withdrawn.

THE PENSION ACT—WIDOWED MOTHERS.

Mr. CHARLES GAVIN POWER (Quebec South) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient to amend the Act to provide Pensions to or in respect of Members of the Canadian Naval and Military Air Forces, 1919, so as to provide that the pension of a widowed mother of a Member of the Forces who has died on active service shall not be reduced on account of her income; and further that Pension shall be granted her of right whether or not there are other living children.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is a long way from the musty walls of the Quebec fortifications and the heroes of ancient Canadian history to the heroes of our own day and their dependents. I doubt whether I would have undertaken the task of discussing this matter had I not seen in his seat my hon. friend from London (Mr. Cronyn) who has always been very much interested in it from the same standpoint as I have been. Section 34, if I remember rightly, of the new Pensions Act allows a pension to the dependent widowed mother of a soldier killed in action. If she is not in receipt of any income the full amount of the pension is granted to her. Previously to last year should she have been in receipt of any earnings whatsoever the amount of these earnings were deducted from her total pension. To give you a concrete example: "Supposing a widowed mother is entitled to a pension of $600 a year, and that, as a washerwoman in one of the departments she earned $300 a year. Well, this was deducted from her pension; the Government paid her only $300. This obvious injustice was remedied last year in the Pension Act of 1919, but there still remains another injustice: We have deliberately excluded from the provisions of this amendment the widowed mother who is in receipt of an income of any kind—an income in stocks, bonds, pensions, insurance, et cetera—and we have left this matter entirely to the discretion of the Board of Pension Commissioners in cases of what they call extreme hardship. Now what I maintain is this: The widowed mother, whoever she may be, is as much entitled to the pension of right as the wife; that in many cases, in a large number of cases in fact, the mother is more entitled to a pension than the wife. The wife in a good number of cases may marry again, whereas the widowed mother is very often past that age—past the age where she may earn a living to augment her pension, and in such a position that she practically becomes an object of public charity. So that it is my contention that the widowed mother of a soldier should be allowed to obtain the same amount of pension whether she has or has not any income. We have heard in this House—I do not wish to revive old controversies because too much was heard of the matter last year—arguments with regard to the unmarried wife and respecting, as my hon. friend the President of the Privy Council would say "the wife by habit and repute." That I think was the last phrase we arrived at during the debate in question.

I do not wish to again revive the question of the wife "by habit and repute" but I imagine that the widowed mother of a soldier is more entitled to a pension than this wife by habit and repute. Let me cite a concrete case which I brought up in the House on a previous occasion, namely, the case of a young man, a barrister, who went away to the war as a private soldier, his people being well-to-do. During the war his father died leaving his mother not quite well off. Meanwhile the boy had attained the rank of Captain. He was killed and the widowed mother was granted a sum of $66 per month. About a year, or perhaps two years, after she had been in the enjoyment of this pension, what is termed "a visiting officer" called upon her and inquired whether she was being well treated. The lady was thankful for the $66 per month and told the visitor that everything was quite satisfactory, and that the Government had treated her very well. Then the lady visitor inquired "Have you any other resources?" "Oh, yes, I have a house in the country and I get $300 a year from that." "I see, $300." Deduct that from $800 and it leaves $500. "Have you got anything else?" "Yes, I draw $100 a year from insurance." Take that off also, making a total deduction of $400. This lady is left with $400 from the Government and her only son, that was her support and but for the war would now be earning a good income, has given up his life at the front. The age of this lady is such that she is utterly incapable of earning her living, and is practically left on the country. I maintain, sir, that in justice and fairness the widowed mother should be placed in the same position as the wife and no deduction of income should be made whatsoever. If the son has died at the front the widowed mother should get a pension just as when the husband dies at the front the wife gets a pension. We have debated this question before the Committee on Pensions and on two or three occasions we almost carried the point. We have not succeeded so far, and therefore I have deemed it my duty to bring the matter before the attention of the House.

Mr. HUME CRONYN (London): As the mover of the resolution has stated I have been much interested in this question, and he and I throughout the consideration of the Pension Bill fought strongly for more favourable treatment to widowed mothers. We were unfortunately in a minority in the Pension Committee, and when we renewed our struggle in the House an amendment was suggested to the Pension Act which I, at least, thought would have given relief. That amendment was dropped at the request of the minister in charge of the Bill. If my memory serves me right it was declared not to be in order for a private member to propose a resolution which involved the expenditure of public money; but there was another reason for delaying the amendment; it was hoped to get some information from the Pensions Board which would tell us just how much the proposed change would involve in the way of expenditure. From that time to this I have not heard whether that information was forthcoming, and as I did not know until this afternoon that the resolution was to be discussed I am not very well prepared to speak on the several points in issue. However, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Power) has explained, the widowed mother who is in receipt of an independent income from any source has deducted from her pension, which she would otherwise be entitled to, the amount of that income, and this, as he says, works very great hardship in certain cases.

On a former occasion I mentioned a concrete case of the sort where the widow of a clergyman, entitled to an annuity of $300, had for some time received a pension of $480 because of the death of her son at the front. Later on, under the regulations embodied in the Act, that $300 of annuity was deducted, and she received only $180 by way of pension. Other hon. members have similar cases arising in their own constituencies and these were also set out. Objection was raised that this was, in a manner, class legislation—that a widowed mother might be in receipt of so large an income that it would be absurd to further augment her living allowance. But that is easily guarded against if the amendment suggested were to be adopted. We could easily provide that if a widowed mother received a larger sum than her entire pension she would only be entitled to a certain amount. But even if it is class legislation I appeal to you, Sir, and to the House, that of all people in the world mothers should be entitled to a preference.

The mover of the resolution has made mention of the discussion with regard to unmarried wives. I know I was struck at that time by the objection made to the phraseology, which we of a somewhat cold-blooded race saw at first no reason against adopting. The objection was all the more curious too, because in the English language we have one word for wife and another for

woman, whereas my friends from Quebec use but the one word femme to denominate either a woman or a wife.

Now, I venture to appeal to both sides of this House on behalf of an even more sacred person than the wife—I appeal on behalf of the mother. For that reason alone I would urge, without going further into the matter, favourable consideration of the resolution moved by the member for Quebec (Mr. Power).

Mr. DANIEL LEE REDMAN (Calgary East): Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in accord with the resolution which has been moved by the member for Quebec (Mr. Power). As hon. members who have spoken on the resolution have said, this matter has been discussed by the Pensions Committee for the last two years. Last year we made a move along this line; that is, we said that when the mother earned any money by work it should not be deducted from her pension. This resolution goes one step further and asks us to state that if she has a private income it shall not be deducted from her pension. But all mothers are not included; the privilege is asked only for widowed mothers.

I am sure that nothing in connection with the Pension administration creates more difficulties, more misunderstandings and in many cases a feeling of greater injustice than the existing rule. As has been pointed out, it is necessary that in each case an investigator should make minute inquiries as to the properties or moneys which these ladies—usually aged—have, and often the investigators do not get the facts right, and in scarcely any case are they able to impress upon the people to whom they go the difference between them and some other widowed mother who perhaps lives in the same community. Consequently the impression is created that we are rather small, that the shades of difference we draw are perhaps what might be termed picayune. If it is a matter of money, one might point out that most of these widowed mothers are advanced in years, and the pensions will continue only during the remainder of their lives.

Last year the Great War Veterans and others came to us and asked for a gratuity for able-bodied soldiers. Our general answer was: "No, we do not believe in the principle of giving money to able-bodied men, because what money we intend to spend we wish to reserve for the dependents of soldiers." Now, I do not think there is any class more deserving than the widowed mother. We are only asking that she get the same consideration as the widow of the soldier, and we are limiting it to the widowed mother. Having regard to the attitude which we took last year, to the present rules which are not entirely satisfactory, and to the arguments which have been advanced by hon. members, and also to my study of the matter and my knowledge of it gained by contact with these people during the last few years, I have no hesitation in recommending this reform which in justice to the class concerned we cannot longer delay.

Mr. ARTHUR BLISS COPP (Westmorland): Mr. Speaker, I desire to associate myself with my hon. friend the mover of this resolution and with those hon. members who have supported it. I had not the privilege of being present at the meetings of the Committee that spent so much time in discussing and studying this question of pensions, but I have had some experience of it in connection with requests that have been made to me on behalf of widowed mothers, which requests I have taken up with the Pensions Department.

One of the strongest cases brought to my notice was that of a woman who had two sons overseas. Her husband was sick, and on one of her sons being killed in action a pension was given to the family. Finally the husband died, and after some investigation the pension was withdrawn from the widowed mother, on the ground that she had another son who was morally bound to support her—although he did not do so. If that is the proper ruling under the Pension Act, Mr. Speaker, I submit it ought to be changed so that the widowed mother may not have to depend upon charity, but may have that support by way of pension which her sacrifice richly entitles her to.

Mr. WILLIAM FOSTER COCKSHUTT (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, I have very strong opinions in regard to the subject matter of this resolution. I was not one of the committee that dealt with pensions, although I appeared before them on two or three occasions pressing for more liberality of treatment. Coming from a city that furnished between 5,000 and 6,000 men to the overseas forces, I feel that I have a good deal of experience in dealing with the classes that come within the scope of this resolution. I have had similar cases to the one just mentioned by the member for Westmorland (Mr. Copp) and some, I think, even stronger than that, and my heart has been pained and I have been actually almost

forced to tears listening to the widows' tales of their struggles to keep their families going. I do not know whether my letters will ever see the light of day, but during the last two or three years I have written the very strongest letters I am capable of to the Pension Commissioners, pointing out the cases of gross injustice which have been brought to my attention. Whether the treatment of such cases is in accordance with the regulations or not, I do not think that we as a country can afford to allow it to exist as undoubtedly it does exist at the present time. It continues after this committee dealt with it so exhaustively last year. Within the last few weeks I have had one or two cases brought before me, and I am going to give one, Mr. Speaker, in order that you may see how the Act works.

I cite the case of a widow who at the beginning of the war had a husband and two sons. The eldest son enlisted first and served almost throughout the war: He was practically the mainstay of the family before he went away and would have been so on his return. He served for upwards of four years, but in the closing days of the war he was killed. The second son went over later, and was severely wounded, his leg being shattered from the knee down. After both sons had gone the husband came home from a recruiting meeting and said to his wife: "There is still an appeal for men; they are wanted at the front; I feel that it is my duty to go." Though upwards of fifty years of age he volunteered for service and was accepted. On account of some trouble with his feet he never got overseas but he did serve at the Niagara frontier for a year or two. During that service he became inflicted with a trouble which, though not originating during service, was aggravated to such an extent that he had to be discharged and shortly afterwards died. Up to the present time that man's widow has received no pension. She lost her husband in the service or as a result of the service; her eldest son was killed at the front after more than four years of the most strenuous fighting, and the third boy, who had his leg shattered, came home and was able to qualify as a telegraph operator at a very good remuneration, I admit,—$90 a month. Well, this is what the Pension Board gave him; in respect of that permanent injury to a limb he is getting $4 a month by way of pension, the limitation of amount being on the ground that he was able to earn $90 a month as telegraph operator. The Pension Board also told him to hand over to his widowed mother $10 a month to help her to live. Now, I have in black and white from the Pension Board what is virtually an admission of these facts; and I say that my blood boils to think that this country can do no better for a widow than that. I know the facts in this case; I have submitted them to the Pension Board just as strongly as I am submitting them now, but I have failed to get any redress for that widow. She told me with tears in her eyes that she could not support her remaining children and herself under these conditions. The young man whose limb has been shattered is engaged to be married, and the final intimation I got from the Pension Board was that if the young man would get married they would consider the widow's case on its merits and that probably she would get some pension. I know of other cases of the same kind; if one son is left at home, the widow cannot get a pension. This country owes a duty to that widow who gave her husband and her sons in the great conflict; she should not be treated on a charitable basis. I understand that the widow of whom I speak has two other children at home. One of them is a boy of fifteen—he is not strong and may be in poor health for at least a number of years—the other is a boy of seven. This is not an isolated case; cases of this kind, I believe, are fairly common throughout the country. I know of another case where four sons out of five sustained casualties out of the war, two being killed and two wounded and because the widow had one son left she was told that there was no pension coming to her. I know of another case, a widow who is able to work in a bank. She has moved from Brantford to New Brunswick and is now in the constituency of the member for York-Sunbury (Mr. H. F. McLeod). He and I have done all we could during a period of two or three years to get the case of this widow considered by the Pension Board, but because she is able to earn something by working in the bank she has not been given a pension. The Pension Board evidently arrived at this decision by deducting the amount she earns from the amount to which she would otherwise be entitled by way of pension. This business of reducing the pension by this amount and by that until it is whittled down to nothing is carried on to such an extent that I really wonder why, on that basis and according to their argument, the Pension Board did not actually find the widow to be in debt to the country. In my judgment the whole thing has been

carried on from the wrong point of view. When a family have sacrificed husband, father or son, they have placed this country under an obligation, and that obligation is to see that want does not enter the house in which that family lives. It does not matter whether or not there is a prospect of help coming later. It is not fair to say that the members of a family must always stay in their old home until the parent is dead. I know three or four cases of young men who are engaged but who are obliged to stay at home practically as long as the mother lives. They dare not get married on the strength of the supposition that the Government will do the right thing, because they are afraid that the Government are not going to do the right thing in regard to pension. While we have treated our soldiers with the utmost liberality in connection with practically every service which they have rendered, when it comes to the matter of pension there is, for some reason, a kink in the system; they are not treated in a humane manner. I have had long experience in connection with pensions and have dealt with a very large variety of cases; and I can say that the Pension Board are either tied up by red tape or by regulations.

I have another grievance against the Pension Board in the way the pensions are administered. After a member has struggled hard—and it is a hard struggle to get anything like justice done by the Pension Board—I say, after a member has struggled hard, and has finally obtained a fairly satisfactory settlement for a widow, it may happen that the payments go on for three or six months and then you are suddenly wakened up with a jolt to find that the same thing has been undone. I have had that occur time and again. Now, in my judgment, after a thorough investigation has been made and a pension supposedly decided upon as final, it should not be open to the Pension Board to go back on the arrangement that has been made and to throw the whole thing into the air again as has been done time and again. I could mention names, but I do not think it is wise; I do not want to drag them into the publicity that the mention of them would give. But I know of cases where twice over a pension has been cut down, without any apparent reason, after having been, to all intents and purposes, finally settled and arranged between the Pension Board and the family on the basis of a thorough investigation. I say that this country is well enough off, badly as it has been hit by the war, to take care of all those who should receive pensions, The department, or whoever is responsible should limber up considerably, and not simply consider to what extent the Pension Bill for the year would be raised by appropriate action, but whether justice is being done to the individals and families they are dealing with. If it is found that justice is not being done and that the families have not enough to live on, I contend that it is the duty of this Government to set that matter right. The question my hon. friend from London (Mr. Cronyn) has raised is one that has often tripped me up when I have been trying to get pension cases settled. It will suddenly be discovered by the board or by some visitor who is mighty inquisitive, that the pensioner has a little income from somewhere, it does not matter where, and the pension is at once cut down by that amount.

I had one case recently where the board discovered that a widow, living in Brantford, who had been receiving a pension, I think, of $600 a year, owned two houses in Toronto. The rent of one house was $12 a month, and of the other approximately the same—about $25 a month from the two. When this fact was discovered by some inquisitive visitor, would you believe it, Mr. Speaker, the board deducted the whole amount of the rent from the $600 pension which the widow had been receiving for some little time, without making any allowance whatever for repairs, insurance, or even taxes. The whole rental from the two houses was deducted from the original pension, and I had to put up a considerable fight, which I did, before I got this injustice remedied. While the pension was not restored to its original amount, I did succeed in showing the board that it was not very business-like to assume, because a certain amount of rental is supposed to come in from a house, that it always does come in. Every hon. member knows that even if it does come in, there are a lot of other things to be considered, such as repairs, taxes and insurance, and the house may be empty for two or three or even six months. But simply because a widow has a house that is supposed to bring in a rental of $12 a month, the policy of the board is to deduct that amount as if she had the rental already in her pocket. The thing is absurd from a business standpoint, because rent for a house is not in your pocket until the cheque has been honoured by the bank, and then there are these deductions I have spoken of.

I hope this question will come up again. I do not think this will be the finish of it. I do not know whether the hon. member for South Quebec (Mr. Power) thinks it will be the finish of it if we pass this resolution. What we want is action. In spite of what was done by the committee last year I cannot take back anything I have said. I tried then to speak as strongly as words would permit in favour of proper treatment for the soldier and his dependents. Whether all the committee's recommendations are in full operation or not, I do not know, but I have certainly had some very severe cases since the regulations were put into effect last year. I have mentioned one case, and I could give others. In my judgment it is a shame that widows with dependent children who have lost a husband, or son, or brother in the war, who was their chief support, cannot have their cases treated in a reasonable way.

Furthermore, under the present regulations the woman who tries to help herself is penalized. The Government practically says that she should not have any income from any other source, and that if she has, they will deduct that amount from her pension. I say the country either owes these women a debt or it does not, and it is most unjust to make these deductions simply because a widow may have $200 or $300 or $500 coming in from a piece of property, to acquire which she has had to scrape for years. The pensions are much too small at the best, and are miserable at the worst. I am ashamed to mention the $3 or $4 pension. I have mentioned the case of a boy permanently disabled who receives a pension of only $4 a month. I say that if this Government cannot give a better pension than that to one who is permanently lame, it should not give anything. I would be ashamed to dole out such a small amount. I contend that this matter should be gone into thoroughly, and that every case of injustice should be considered on its merits by some competent authority. I know that there are some who will try to get out of the department more than they are entitled to receive, but don't let us think everybody is a robber; don't let us do an injustice to an innocent person because somebody else is trying to get a few dollars more than they should have. I am confident that the pensions that are being paid to the disabled soldier, to the widow and orphans, or whoever it may be that has suffered, will none of them be found to be over-generous, and a great many of them will be found to be entirely inadequate. At the risk of raising our pension bill five or ten millions per annum, I say this country owes it to itself and to its citizens to see that a grave injustice is not done to the widow and the orphan. I speak strongly because I feel strongly. I have been almost moved to tears in my office time and again by the relation of the facts alone, and I have felt that I ought to put my hand in my pocket and pay the pensions myself rather than let the poor widow go out of my office as she has had to go. I urge the House as strongly as I can to take active and adequate steps this session to see that the injustices I have spoken of do not continue any longeer.

Mr. ONESIPHORE TURGEON (Gloucester): Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with other hon. members in supporting the resolution moved by the hon. member for South Quebec (Mr. Power). I have had a number of cases in my county and town of the nature described by the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) and the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Copp). The widowed mother of a soldier who has given his life for Canada and the Empire should be entitled to receive her full pension, no matter what her circumstances may be at any time. I have had a case where a pension was refused to a widow because she had a son who had reached the age of eighteen. He had never been able to earn a living for himself, because he was not physically strong enough to do hard work, and did not have the education to do other than manual work. In another case, a widowed mother was refused a pension because she had a son living in the United States or in some distant part of Canada who had been away from home for years and years and was unwilling to assist in supporting her. I also know of cases where a certain amount of the pension has been deducted because there have been other sources of income. One widowed mother had been receiving a pension of $60 a month for a year or two—her son had been a captain—and then it was discovered that she was the owner of two or three acres of land from which she got a certain revenue, and her pension was reduced to $30 a month. After consideration of the circumstances, and as a result of representations made by myself, the commissioners raised the pension to $45. I am convinced that the commissioners themselves are in sympathy with the mothers and dependents of the soldiers, but they are precluded from the exercise of any generosity by reason of the regulations. I therefore join with other

hon. members in urging Parliament at this session to take such action as will effectively remedy the present unsatisfactory condition of affairs and give to the widowed mothers of the soldiers adequate consideration. There are very few wealthy women among the Canadian widowed mothers of soldiers, and we could not, I should imagine, be much worse off if we spent a substantial sum of money in granting them proper relief than we should be if the war had been lost. Let Canada show her generosity to those who made the supreme sacrifice, not only for her own safety but for the freedom of men the world over and for the honour of the Empire.

Mr. EDWARD WALTER NESBITT (Oxford North): I desire to point out to my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) that under the regulations no deduction is made in the case of a woman who is earning money. A man's pension is based strictly on the degree of his incapacity through service to earn a living in the ordinary labour market; and his pension having been once fixed, no deduction is afterwards made by reason of anything which he may earn outside.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: My hon. friend says that no deduction is made. Well, I can mention a case where nothing was ever granted and therefore nothing could be deducted. The case I mentioned from Fredericton is that of a widow who has now lost her only son, and because she is earning money in a bank her case has not been adjusted or even considered by the Pensions Board.

Mr. NESBITT: If she is earning money by her own effort it is not deducted from the pension she is entitled to.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: But she does not get any.

Mr. NESBITT: I cannot help that. So far as the Pensions Board is concerned, my hon. friend from Brantford and others must bear in mind that it is an administrative body. The board is appointed to administer the Act, and if there is anything wrong with the Act itself it is for this House to adjust the irregularity. It is the duty of my hon. friend from Brantford, if a committee is appointed this year, to bring before it the cases he speaks of.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I have already appeared twice before the committee.

Mr. NESBITT: If he does so, I do not think there is one member of the committee who will not assist him to have matters adjusted. Let me say, however, that I have never had to write a second letter to the board over any matter whatever after having once told them the exact facts, and having acted in accordance with the provisions of the Act. The Pensions Board cannot vary the Act any more than I, as a private member, can. They have to be bound by the regulations, and I think it is most unfortunate to blame them for doing properly what they consider to be their duty. My experience has been entirely satisfactory with the board, and any question on which I have written them they have endeavoured to attend to in accordance with the regulations laid down in the Act.

Mr. COPP: You had more influence.

Mr. NESBITT: I had no influence whatever.

Mr. GEORGE WILLIAM ANDREWS (Winnipeg Centre): The present discussion is one of very great importance to widowed mothers. Only last Saturday I received a telegram from an organization which is new to me, the Organized Mothers and Widows, in which they specifically called attention to the matter now under discussion. I do not think that this subject is at all new to any honourable member, for all of us, I have no doubt, have questions of one kind or another brought to our attention in relation to the position of widowed mothers who are in receipt of pensions, or should receive consideration. It was pointed out to me, on investigation, that the little change which I have suggested would cost the country $5,000,000. Hon. members will realize the necessity for the appointment of a committee of some kind to go into these matters. On the Order Paper there will be found a suggestion, which I trust will come before the House on Wednesday, that a committee should be appointed on the subject, which I think it is eminently desirable should be inquired into. I must agree with my hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Nesbitt) that the Pension Board is purely administrative, and I have found its members always very fair. But the fact that the matter I have suggested would cost $5,000,000 is, I think, ample evidence of its importance to the hon. members of this House. The pension, as far as I understand the matter, is based on the principle that no widowed mother shall have less than a living if she has lost her support by the war. If there are two women living side by side receiving, say $48 a month, and one is allowed to receive an income of $500, or $600,

or $700 a year, while the other has no opportunity to augment her pension, there might very well arise antagonism to what is commonly called "class legislation." To my mind, Mr. Speaker, the solution of the problem lies in raising the entire pension rate, which at the present time is too low.

Mr. C. W. PECK (Skeena): I rise to support the motion, as I have risen repeatedly in this House to express my sympathy with the mothers and widows of men who served their country in the late struggle. I shall not delay the House at this time with any lengthy discussion of the question, because I think that enough has been said. I am convinced that the Government have not closed the door upon any questions appertaining to the returned soldiers, and I think my hon. friend the Minister of Immigration (Mr. Calder) has expressed that determination. I have no doubt the time will come when the Government will appreciate the advisability of affording to this House an opportunity to discuss the subject from all possible standpoints. If, however, they do not grant that opportunity, then we shall bring the matter up in some other manner. I am sure they will give us a chance to go thoroughly into the question, for as I said before, and said advisedly, I rely on this Government to do everything humanly possible on behalf of the soldiers and the widowed mothers. I do not see within sight any other prospective Government that will be willing to do any more than this Government has done or can do. The very first question in regard to the soldiers should be that of pensions. I made this statement in my constituency; that the widows and orphans of the men, our comrades, who were left over on the battlefields of France and Flanders, should be given first consideration. I will not recite the case which I have in mind, but I may assure the House that there are many which should receive every consideration. I think the whole subject could be more advantageously discussed at a later date; and, as I have said before, I am convinced that the Government will grant an opportunity to discuss the question of pensions. We shall therefore await with anxiety their decision on the question, and if they can not grant ample opportunity to go into the matter then I shall take steps to bring it before the House.

Mr. THOMAS W. CALDWELL (Victoria and Carleton): Assuredly the question under discussion is one in which every man in this country is deeply interested; and while the motion has reference to pensions for widowed mothers, perhaps there are others who come within its scope with greater urgency and reason. I have in mind the case of a soldier in my constituency who at the age of 47 enlisted within a week of the outbreak of war. He was overseas two years and was severely gassed, returning home on the ship that took his three sons back to England to serve their country. That man was so anxious to return to civil life that he did not apply for a pension at that time, notwithstanding his severe suffering from the effects of gas. He was one of the old fellows who had considerable sand in him, and he would do a man's work, in spite of every obstacle or hardship which he could possibly surmount. In a very short time, however, his privations at the front told upon him and he had to go under medical treatment. He was sent to a medical hospital in St. John where he developed tuberculosis as the result of the weakening of his lungs from gassing. He was granted a pension of $5.50 a month at first, and after he had been in the hospital six months the doctors pronounced him 100 per cent disabled and he was granted a total disability pension. His case was reconsidered, however, and to-day he is receiving $5.50 a month. He has a family of three small children, one being an invalid, and the mother's time and care are taxed to their utmost. They have a home which they are in imminent danger of losing if they cannot meet the payments on it. This unfortunate man is at present in a military hospital, totally unable to do anything. The doctor has informed him that if he had come to the hospital when he was first discharged there would have been a fair chance of his recovery; but to-day, I regret to say, his condition is such that it is only a question of prolonging life. His pension was cut down on the ground that too long a time had elapsed from the date of his discharge to the time of his being pronounced totally disabled. I must say very emphatically, Mr. Speaker, that it would be an everlasting disgrace to this country if a man who had given such service, and whose family had given such service to their country were not granted an adequate pension to support his family, no matter what might be the cause of his disability. At the last special session of Parliament, I think, there was a sum of $40,000,000 voted for the patriotic purpose of supporting needy soldiers through the winter. In the early part of the winter this family applied for aid, and although

the man's certificate was filled up by two physicians, one who originally attended him, and another, the military doctor appointed in the town in which he lived, both of whom pronounced him 100 per cent disabled, the chairman of the local board refused to sign the necessary papers authorizing the payment of aid to his family. This soldier applied to me and I went to the chairman of the Patriotic Fund Committee and told him that I wanted him to either sign that paper or give me a written statement of his reasons why he would not sign. He said the reason he would not sign was because there were three grown up sons. These sons had been overseas from 1916 until peace was declared when they came home and were demobilized. They are seeking to re-establish themselves and I think you will all agree with me that these men have a right to their own earnings to re-establish themselves after giving three years to the service of their country. The chairman of the Patriotic Fund Committee did sign this paper but he said "I will see that they do not get anything." I do not know what steps he took but I imagine he wrote to the authorities here not to pay the money. These boys are endeavouring to make the payments on their house. Here is this woman, worse than a widow, with three small children, one of them an invalid, getting $5.50 a month and nothing from the Patriotic Fund. I appeal to the members of this House if they think that is the way Canada should discharge her obligations to her soldiers. The man who is killed is out of his misery but this poor man is suffering untold agony and cannot at the best live very long.

Hon. N. W. ROWELL (President of the Council): Two questions have been brought up this afternoon entirely distinct—one of the law and the other of the administration of the law. The Board of Pension Commissioners are in no way responsible for the law. That was made by this House. It is their duty to administer the law as this Parliament made it. I was glad to hear the remarks of the hon. members for Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon,) the hon. member for Winnipeg Centre (Mr. Andrews) and the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) in appreciation of the work of the Board of Pension Commissioners. No doubt they are fallible as all other men are but they are all men who have served overseas. They are all men who, I am sure, have the deepest sympathy with the returned men and their dependents and I am sure I am but speaking the truth when I say that they are exceedingly anxious to administer the law as they understand it in the way which will do justice to those who are entitled to have the benefit of the pension regulations. The Pension Commissioners are a body entirely independent of the Government but I feel that it is due to them in their absence to say this much in reference to their work. As to the law, the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) is correct in his statement of the position. The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) is possibly not aware that last year we changed the law on the point he mentioned. Prior to the amendment of the law last year the earnings of a widow were deducted when the question of her pension came to be decided but the law was changed last year so that the earnings of a widow are no longer taken into account.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I mentioned the specific case that I had taken up myself three or four times where a widow was earning $700 or $800 a year working in a bank. Her case would not be considered so long as she was working in the bank.

Mr. ROWELL: Either my hon. friend is misinformed as to the situation or the Board of Pension Commisioners are misinformed. Up to September 1 last year that was the law and the Board of Commissioners were bound to administer it but that has not been the law since the 1st of September and the Board of Pension Commissioners have been administering the law on the other basis since, because an actual case which they had before them came under my observation—

Mr. COCKSHUTT: The case to which I refer may have been righted within the last two or three months.

Mr. ROWELL: It has been righted since the 1st of September because it was on that date that the law passed last session came into force. Therefore the point that my hon. friend raises with reference to a widow's earnings is no longer a matter requiring our consideration. Take the other question, the one brought to the attention of the House by the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power), supported by the hon. member for London (Mr. Cronyn) and other members of the House, and which, I am sure, is one that commands the sympathy of every one in the House. We are all deeply interested in the welfare of the widows who have lost their sons and we are all anxious that no injustice shall be done to them. I think however that I should state to the House the position in

which this matter stood last session, particularly in view of the observations of my hon. friend from London. The members of the House will recall that for two sessions—that is in the session of 1918 and the spring session of 1919—we had a committee composed of members from both sides which went very fully into the question of our pension law. The committee reported its findings to the House and the Government in each case accepted its conclusions—as to what the pension regulations should be in the first case, and as to what the pension law should be in the second.

This particular matter was considered at length by the committee. The hon. member from Quebec (Mr. Power) and the hon. member from London (Mr. Cronyn) pressed their view upon the committee with great force. A substantial number of the members of the committee sympathized with the view presented, but when it came to a vote the majority was against that view for reasons which perhaps it is not at all necessary to enter into now. It is true that the hon. member for London raised the question on the floor of the House and submitted an amendment differing somewhat from the motion which my hon. friend (Mr. Power) had submitted. The latter, if accepted, would place a widow who might have a fortune of one, two or three hundred thousand dollars in the position to receive a pension just the same as the widow who is left with practically no means of support. The amendment proposed by the hon. member for London was not the same. It recognized a limited income, and in the case of a limited income provided that it should not be taken into account in fixing the pension. I did state to the House when the hon. member proposed his amendment that I would ascertain the facts from the Board of Pension Commissioners as to how much it would cost the country if the amendment were accepted, and if the Government could see its way clear to accept the amendment I might suggest that it be introduced into the Senate. I was under the impression that I had informed the member for London of the result of that investigation. The result was this: We found that accepting the hon. gentleman's amendment would involve an additional charge upon the revenues of the country of between two and three millions—I think about three millions a year. Possibly adopting the amendment proposed by my hon. friend (Mr. Power) now might involve the charge that the member for Winnipeg has mentioned—five millions. The view of the Government last session was that as the Pension Committee had considered the matter in all its bearings at great length, and had reached the conclusions which had been reported to the House, and as the House had accepted that report in Committee of the Whole, the wisest course for the Government was to act on the Pensions Committee's report, is it had always done, and leave this matter over for consideration when the Pension Committee was formed this year.

I want to say to the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Power) it is the intention of the Government that there should be a Committee on Pensions this year, just as there has been at prior sessions of the House, and already a Government notice of motion is on the Order Paper for the appointment of such a committee. That is necessary because my hon. friend will recall that under the law as passed last year the bonus only continues until the first of September next, and the committee must review the question as to whether that bonus is to be continued, or modified, or made permanent. A number of other important questions relating to the matter will also be required to be considered. Therefore I suggest to my hon. friend that this motion—on a matter of great importance and commanding the sympathy of members of the House—should be referred to the Committee on Pensions when appointed, for consideration and a report to the House by that committee in connection with other matters that will come up.

Mr. POWER: I will not occupy very long in replying to the minister—

Mr. SPEAKER: I should point out to the House that if the hon. gentleman exercises his right to reply, the debate on this resolution will be closed. Therefore if any other hon. member desires to speak on the question he now has an opportunity.

Mr. POWER: It was far from my intention, in presenting this resolution, to reflect in any manner whatsoever on the Board of Pension Commissioners. I know the three commissioners personally and I have always received the kindest treatment and courtesy at their hand. A reading of the resolution itself should make it clear that my object is to amend the law in order to place beyond dispute who is, and who is not entitled to have a pension under Article 34. I have in mind two cases recited to me by the former hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) last year. For example, supposing a boarding-house keeper were earning $40 a month from her boarding-house and suddenly

wished to change that boarding-house into an apartment-house, her earnings would then become income and she would lose her pension. I want this kind of thing stopped once and for all so that the widowed mother of a soldier will get a pension even if she has $300,000 just as the wife of a soldier sometimes has $300,000. If she does not want to apply for the pension she need not do so; but I want every widowed mother to be entitled to the pension, and that is the object I had in proposing this resolution. However, I accept the suggestion of the minister and therefore wish to withdraw the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman's resolution is to be withdrawn on the understanding, I assume, that it is to be referred to the Pension Committee. Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. member have leave to withdraw his resolution?

The House gave permission.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. McMASTER (for Mr. Fielding):

For a return showing for each of the fiscal years 1891, 1896, 1901, 1906, 1911, 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917, 1918, 1919 and estimated 1920 (a) Total revenue of the Dominion; (b) Expenditure chargeable to Consolidated Fund; (c) Expenditure chargeable to capital; (d) Total expenditure; (e) Estimated population; (f) Total revenue per head of population; (g) Expenditure per head chargeable to Consolidated Fund; and (h) Total expenditure per head.

PARLIAMENTARY RESTAURANT.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House:—

That a Special Committee composed of the Honourable Messieurs Boyer, Casgrain, Fowler, Thorne and White (Inkerman), has been appointed for the purpose of considering and reporting upon a scheme for the placing of the new Parliamentary Restaurant, when completed, both as to equipment and administration, on a parity with a first class club or hotel or dining room, and inviting this House to appoint a like Special Committee to act jointly with the Special Committee of the Senate.

NAVAL SERVICE BADGE.

Mr. WILLIAM DUFF (Lunenburg) moved:—

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, correspondence and documents, which have passed between the Minister of Naval Affairs, or any of his officials, or any Department of Government, and the Committee on Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, the Officers of the Great War Veterans' Association either the Naval or Military branch, and any and all persons, regarding the service badge which has been distributed or is ready for distribution to any and all Canadians who served either in the Canadian or Imperial Naval services, either in Canadian or Overseas waters.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this afternoon we listened to a very interesting discussion with regard to pensions for widowed mothers of returned soldiers; in fact, since I have had the honour of being a member of this House I have on several occasions had the pleasure of listening to a number of interesting discussions affecting our returned men. For a short time to-night I want to direct the attention of hon. members to our sailors who also fought for their King and country; and although what I am about to discuss will not involve any heavy expenditure, yet I feel, as do a number of our people, that the matter is a very important one.

May I be permitted to say, Sir, that the reason I am asking for these documents is that I received a letter from the Secretary of the Naval Branch of the Great War Veterans' Association of Canada requesting me to take this matter up and obtain the opinion of Parliament regarding the manner in which our sailors have been treated in reference to the service badge issued to those who served either in the Imperial Forces overseas or in the Home Forces in Canadian waters. These sailors are not satisfied with the badge issued to them by the Naval Department of Canada. They feel, Sir, that they should be treated exactly as our soldiers have been treated in this respect.

The letter to which I have just referred is dated March 2, and is as follows:

The members of this Branch feel very keenly the refusal of the Naval Department to carry out recommendation 14 of the Parliamentary Committee's report. On account of the interest you are taking in naval matters I am instructed to write to you . . . .

Would it not be possible to have this grievance discussed in the House, especially as a number of naval veterans are being antagonized by the action of the Naval Department.

Now, Mr. Speaker, they say that instead of issuing to the sailors the little bronze badge which we so much admire on the lapels of the coats of our soldiers who fought so gallantly overseas, the Naval Department issued a great big white disc resembling one of the old Mexican dollars, and my information is that these boys are ashamed to wear this badge on their coats.

I may be permitted, Sir, to quote another letter which I have received from a young naval rating who lives in Ashcroft, British Columbia. It is as follows:

I am very pleased indeed to see that you are taking up the matter of the service badge issued to those who served in the Navy during the war. As one of the Naval men who went overseas I wish to state that the badge we have been given is a shame and disgrace and I would not be seen wearing it to a dog fight. As you are probably aware it has much the appearance of some of the military cap badges and in fact is taken for one quite generally. No one ever would dream that it is the service badge issued to its sailors by a grateful country. I trust you will be able to see justice is done the Naval men in this matter.

You will remember, Sir, that last year a committee was appointed by this House to investigate certain soldier grievances. That committee met a number of times under the chairmanship of the Hon. Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) and at one of those meetings the Great War Veterans' Association made a suggestion with regard to a badge for the naval ratings, which was adopted by the committee whose report was subsequently submitted to the House, and, if I understand correctly, adopted.

The recommendation to which I refer is contained in the fourteenth clause of the report, and it is in this form:

That members of the Naval Service who have served overseas in either Imperial or Canadian naval services or who have served in any seagoing ship in the Canadian naval service, outside of the three-mile territorial limit, shall be awarded the Class "A" badge with "naval" or suitable words in place of "C.E.F."

Now, Mr. Speaker, in case there is anybody here who does not understand what the Class A badge is, I may say that it is the little bronze badge we see our soldiers wearing on the lapels of their coats. The recommendation was that our naval ratings should be awarded a similar badge, but that instead of the letters "C.E.F." the word "naval" should be engraved thereon.

It is quite evident that this matter is engaging the attention of some of our important newspapers. Under date of March 1, the Toronto Star has an editorial which, with your permission, Sir, I will place on Hansard:

CANADA'S LITTLE BROWN WAR BADGE.

The desire of those Canadians who were in the naval service during the war to be awarded a badge which will be recognizable in this country as denoting that the wearer took part in the war is a perfectly natural one.

The little bronze button worn by the man who fought at the front is a badge of honour, and ever will be. Its significance is known to all who see it. Total strangers who wear it, meeting anywhere, establish a bond of understanding at a glance.

The badge which has been issued to the men who saw naval service in the war—and to some who didn't—is a decorative design in silver, too conspicuous for ordinary wear by a modest person. If a man did wear it probably not one person in a hundred in Toronto would know what it meant, and nine out of ten who tried to make a guess as to its meaning would probably regard it as a badge of some sort of non-combatant service. No doubt the tenth person would mistake it for a battalion badge of some sort. The fact is there are not enough naval war service men in the country to introduce this distinctive badge and give it vogue and acceptance.

In the fourth and final report of the Parliamentary Committee on the Re-establishment the 14th suggestion was as follows:

This suggestion I read a moment ago; I shall not repeat it.

It is the carrying out of this recommendation that the returned naval men ask for. In asking this they have the support of the G.W.V.A. organizations here and elsewhere and the editorial support of their organ, The Veteran.

The little bronze badge is the one that counts in Canada—it is the one that every one knows the meaning of and always will, and its meaning is that the wearer risked himself in the war and survived such dangers as confronted him in his duties. Already the use of this badge has been extended, and very properly so, to an overseas service not connected with the C.E.F.—those Canadians in the Royal Air Force who flew at the front receiving the badge whether they had formerly been in the military forces or not.

The ilttle bronze badge is the active service war badge of Canada—it is worn by those who saw active service on land and in the air, and should appropriately be extended to those who served on the sea.

I think you will agree, Mr. Speaker, that the Toronto Star sums the situation up much better than I could. I see no reason why the Naval Department should depart from the recommendation made by the Parliamentary Committee on Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment and issue this distinctive badge to which the naval men object.

Of the Canadians who served in the Imperial navy during the war, there were about 300 officers and 2,700 men. While these men did not, perhaps, see active service which our soldiers saw in the trenches, they had to face the danger of the submarines, mines, storms, fogs and winds, during the course of their work in the North sea. Any one who knows anything about seafaring life know what conditions these men had to face as day after day and night after night they stood on the decks of small fifty or one-hundred ton boats, keeping watch over the sea and looking after the interests of British people

everywhere. It seems to me that these men are deserving of the distinctive war badge as are the soldiers.

A number of our Canadian boys took part on the dash on Ostend and in the raid on Zeebrugge. We all remember reading with pride of the raid on Zeebrugge, when the English vessels entered the harbour and closed up the gap so that the German submarines could not get out of their bases. Surely any Canadians who took part in that raid are deserving of the very best that Canada can give them, and when they ask for a war badge similar to that which is given to our gallant soldiers, I see no reason why their request should not be granted.

The Naval Department give some reasons why they have not issued this distinctive metal badge. They say:

1. "A.A." badge—

That is, the white metal badge.

—fulfils its purpose.

2. Objections from the military authorities and the military individually.

3. Naval veterans are satisfied with the white metal badge.

4. That naval service should not be ranked on a par with military service in the trenches

I am quoting from a letter which was written to me by the Secretary of the Great War Veterans' Association. Perhaps the Minister of the Naval Service (Mr. Ballantyne) will tell us, after I have finished my remarks, whether or not these reasons have been correctly stated.

As to the first objection, I understand that the naval ratings are not satisfied with the white metal badge they would prefer these little bronze badges. The naval ratings say that the white metal badge is not recognized by the public; that it is not suitable to be worn and that "service rendered," the words which appear on the badge, are not adequate or fair.

As to the second objection, that the military authorities and individual soldiers object to the use by the naval ratings of the metal badge, that cannot be correct, because, as I pointed out a few moments ago, at a meeting of the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Committee, before which appeared Mr. McNeil, Secretary of the Great War Veterans' Association, and other members of that organization, it was suggested that the same badge be issued to sailors as was being issued to soldiers.

The third reason given is that the naval veterans are satisfied with the white metal badge. Now, Sir, I take exception to that statement; the naval veterans are not satisfied with the white metal badge. I have on my desk here a number of letters and telegrams which I have received from all over the country since I put this motion on the Order Paper, thanking me for bringing this matter before Parliament and expressing the dissatisfaction of the naval ratings with the white metal badge.

The fourth objection was that the naval service should not be ranked on a par with military service in the trenches. Well, even if that were correct, no naval official should have made the statement. I hope that the minister will be able to say that no such statement was made by the Naval Department, because it seems to me that if our Canadian sailors had been given the chance that they would have been given if we had had Canadian ships on the Canadian coasts, they would have shown their mettle and have done just as good service as was done by the boys in the trenches.

I noticed in the Ottawa Journal a few days ago an announcement which I assume was issued by the Naval Department. It is headed "1914-15 Bronze Star," and it says:

> The Department of the Naval Service announces that the issue of the 1914-15 Bronze Star for service in the Royal Canadian Navy has commenced. The conditions for the award of this decoration are service at sea between August 4, 1914, and December 31, 1915.

I assume from the fact that this badge or star is being issued for service betweeen August, 1914, and December, 1915, that the Naval Department intend to issue a number of badges of different kinds. It would be far better to issue only one badge. The men do not want these distinctive badges; no reason can be offered for issuing them. I trust that my remarks will be approved by the members of the House and that there will be a general protest to the minister in this matter and a request that only one badge be issued, the same as that which is worn by the soldiers. The cost will surely not be very great. We did not, I am sorry to say, have very many sailors, either in the Imperial or in the Canadian Naval Service; consequently the matter of cost cannot be urged as the reason for the non-issuance of these badges. Even at this late date the department can call in all the white metal badges that have been issued to sailors who served in the naval forces either in Canada or overseas and issue the little bronze badge which is so much admired by everybody. I trust that the minister will listen to the prayer not only of myself, but also of the boys who so gallantly served in our naval forces, and grant their request.

Hon. C. C. BALLANTYNE (Minister of the Naval Service): Mr. Speaker, I am

grateful to the member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) for putting this motion on the Order Paper and also for his warm words of commendation of those who served their country so ably and so gravely in the Royal Canadian Naval Service and in the Imperial Navy.

The House may be interested to know that the total number of Canadians who served overseas with the Imperial naval forces was 1,544, and that there were killed in action 26, lost at sea 3; that 11 died of disease and 5 were wounded. All hon. members will look with pride on this showing made by Canadians who served so well in the Imperial Navy during the war. In addition to that, 5,000 men served in the Royal Canadian Naval Service on the Atlantic and on the Pacific. The men who served in the senior branch of the service, either in the Imperial Navy or the Canadian Navy, are naturally proud that they have had an opportunity of serving in that branch.

Those who served Overseas shared, of course, in the glorious traditions of the British navy. Those who served in Canada in our own navy must in a lesser degree also have felt proud of being part of the great Imperial navy, which has not only preserved the British Empire to us but has done so much for the peace of the world. I am therefore glad to rise in my place in this House to-night and say on behalf of the 1,144 Canadians who served in the Imperial navy, and on behalf of the very large majority of the 5,000 men who served in our home naval forces, that while they look with pride on their brother Canadians in the Canadian Army corps who served so bravely on the fields of France and who deserve all the honour and recognition that has come to them, yet they have equal pride in their own force and want a medal that will distinguish the naval service from their brothers-in-arms of the Canadian Army corps. We have therefore issued three classes of badges to the Naval Service of Canada. I cannot agree with my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) that a man would not be proud to wear one of these badges. I have a cut of the badges in my hand. They are of silver, and are very beautifully designed. In order to meet the views of the large number of sailors of all ratings who have served in the Imperial navy and in the Canadian navy for badges that would be distinct from the badges granted to the other branch of the service, after very careful consideration on the part of the Naval Service, by myself as responsible minister, and by the Government, the following three classes of badges have been approved by the Government and the Naval Service, and have been issued:

(1) Naval Class AA. This corresponds to the Militia Class A. This AA badge is issued to those who have served at sea or Overseas and who have been honourably discharged for reasons other than invalided.

(2) Naval Class A. This corresponds to Militia Class B. The badge is very beautifully designed, and bears the words "For King and Empire. Services rendered." This badge is similar to the one issued by the Imperial naval authorities.

(3) Naval Class B. This corresponds to Militia Class C. It is issued to those who have served on shore or in harbour in Canada and have been honourably discharged. It bears the words "For Honourable Services."

I am sure hon. members will agree that we did well to issue badges to honour these brave men who served Canada so well in guarding our own shores.

The hon. member for Lunenburg has suggested that the naval badge might not be known or recognized. I agree. But if my hon. friend had served in the front line trenches I am sure he would be proud to wear the Class A badge issued by the military authorities, and naturally the sailors are proud of the badges that are issued to them. If I had served in the navy, that fine branch of the service, I would not want to wear the badge of the gallant soldiers, much as we admire them; I would want an entirely distinct badge, and would be very proud indeed of the distinction of wearing the Naval Badge AA. If I had been invalided out of the service, nothing would make me feel more proud than to wear the badge of the invalided men, and if I had only been permitted to serve on shore I would with equal pride want to wear the Naval Badge B.

It is true that there are a few men in the Naval Service who are desirous of wearing the Military Badge A. They would be content to have the small letters C.E.F. eliminated from the military badge, and equally small letters inserted to make up the word "Naval;" but a naval man walking along the street or going into an office with that badge would at once be taken for an ex-soldier who had served in the front line trenches. Those Canadians who served at sea in the Imperial service and ran all the risks of mines and submarines and the other risks of naval warfare, can feel an equal pride in wearing Class AA badge. It was felt that the man who had served on shore should not receive a badge

of the same class as the man who had served Overseas, and we have therefore followed the practice of the Department of Militia and Defence. That department issues three badges, A, B and C. Badge A is for soldiers who have served in the front line; Badge B for those who have been invalided out of the service; and Badge C for those who have served at home. Some did not have the privilege of fighting in the front line trenches, but nevertheless they offered their services and did the very best they could. That is true of our men on both the Atlantic and the Pacific coasts. I am sure my hon. friend appreciates that there were certain dangers even in the patrol service on the Atlantic coast. When the German U-boats came to that coast in the summer of 1918, they strewed the waters with mines, any one of which these patrol boats might have struck, and at any moment a U-boat might come to the surface; so the men who served in our home forces were exposed to certain risks, particularly on the Pacific coast at the outbreak of the war, and in the later stages of the war on the Atlantic coast.

The hon. member for Lunenburg has referred to a recommendation of the special committee which was appointed last spring to consider Bill No. 10, regarding soldiers' civil re-establishment.

Suggestion 14, to which the hon. member referred, was as follows:

> That the members of the Naval Service who have served overseas in either the Imperial or Canadian Naval Services, or who have served in any sea-going ship in the Canadian Naval Service, outside of the three-mile territorial limit, shall be awarded a Class "A" badge with "Naval" or suitable words in place of "C.E.F."

This was the suggestion that was made to the special parliamentary committee, and the following is their recommendation, which the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) omitted to give us, possibly not having it in his possession:

> It is recommended that the suggestion should receive the immediate attention of the Government with a view to removing a cause of complaint which, in the opinion of the committee, appears to be well-founded. The same may be also true of the R.A.F. If so, the matter should receive the attention of the Government.

There is nothing in this paragraph in the nature of any definite suggestion to the Government; it merely brings the matter to their attention. The Government gave due consideration to the recommendations of the parliamentary committee, and having done so decided to issue the badges which I have fully described to the House.

The hon. member for Lunenburg referred to the Royal Air Force badge being the same as the soldiers' badge, and I think it is but fit and proper that the two should be the same. The Royal Air Force is part of the army. It is not under the Admiralty, but under the control and direction of the Commander-in-Chief of the British Army, Sir Douglas Haig; and when the badges were being given to men of the Royal Air Force they would naturally be the same as those given to the soldiers in the army.

With regard to the medals that have been mentioned, I may say that the Admiralty will give medals, which I shall describe in a moment, to all ratings in the British Navy, and I think that our Canadian men have a right to be given the same medals. These medals are: 1914-15 Star: Service at sea between August 4, 1914, and December 31, 1915; British War Medal (General Service Medal), for those who have been 28 days mobilized in the service; Victory Medal, for those who have served at sea between August 4, 1914, and November 11, 1918. I shall make it my duty, and indeed it will be a pleasure to me, to see that these medals are given to all Canadian naval ratings, both those that were in the Imperial service and those that served at home.

Mr. DUFF: Are the badges mentioned by the hon. minister to be given to men in the British navy or to Canadians?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: To men in the British navy. I shall not take up any more time on the subject, but I desire to say that if we granted a badge similar in design to that issued to the Canadian soldiers it would not satisfy the majority of the thousands of our men who served either overseas or in our Canadian naval service. It would also antagonize the Great War Veterans, and I do not think the Militia Council would approve of it. On the whole, I think that any fair-minded man who has served in either the naval or the military forces will recognize the need of having distinctive badges for the two services; and I hope, in view of the brief explanation which I have given to the House this evening, that the hon. member may see his way clear to withdraw his motion.

Mr. H. M. MOWAT (Parkdale): I am interested in this matter because of representations made by large numbers of the naval veterans in Toronto—hundreds of them—that they feel keenly their treatment, which they regard as being unfair. The minister has said about everything that

could be said in defence of his part in this matter, and has said it extremely well, as he always does. But at the same time he seems to me to fall short of explaining something that needs explanation, namely, that the report of the committee—the largest and most important that has sat in this House for years, a committee that sat day in and day out, week after week—came to a conclusion different from the opinions which have just been expressed. The point I wish to call to the attention of the House is that it is not the minister who took this position, but two of his officials. The report of the committee was adopted by this House on the 7th of November last year, but we find that on the 31st of October, a week before, one of the officials of the Naval Service Department took it on himself to say that we should not have that badge which was recommended by the parliamentary committee. of course, that was going pretty far.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: If the hon. member will permit me, I should like to correct his statement that my officials decided the question. The whole matter was decided by myself as the head of the department, and if there is any blame to be attributed to any one I am the responsible person.

Mr. MOWAT: That is very generous of my hon. friend, but it is incumbent upon me to point to the date of the letter of Admiral Kingsmill regarding the matter, and I venture to say that the minister will admit the truth of my contention.

Mr. BURNHAM: Do I understand the hon. member to say that the report to which he has referred was adopted? If I remember rightly it was only received.

Mr. MOWAT: I understood that the report of the committee on the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment was adopted and passed on the 7th of November. Whether that is so or not, however, it was received and virtually adopted by a large majority of the House. The letter to which I refer is dated October 31st, and I may read from it:

> There appears to be no reason why the badges issued for naval service should not be recognized in the same way as those issued for military service except that, as there are comparatively few naval men in Canada, the public have not become familiar with the naval badges or the service which they denote, though a description of the badges and regulations governing their issue have been published in the press; and there is no doubt that in some cases discharged naval men have suffered injustice through the public not understanding the significance of the badges awarded to them.

The letter does not refer in any way to the fact, which was afterwards discovered, that there were some objections from the Department of Militia.

But that comes a couple of months later in a letter from the Deputy Minister of Naval Service. What happened was this: The admiral and the deputy minister came to the conclusion that they will make a badge, and they design a silver badge which the men do not like. But it would seem to be lese majeste to suggest that the badge designed by these two officials was not the thing for the soldiers and sailors, and the minister apparently thinks it would be a good thing to have some advice from the Department of Militia and Defence. He says:

> It was considered necessary that the opinion of the Militia Department be obtained before taking any action.

Although we had declared in this House that this particular badge with the word "Naval" should be issued to the sailors. He says further:

> There appears to be no reason why these badges should not receive due recognition.
> The Naval Department, therefore does not feel justified in issuing a badge similar to the Class "A" Militia Badge, when by so doing it is clear that great dissatisfaction would be caused.

There is no evidence of dissatisfaction. As a matter of fact, the secretary of the Great War Veterans' Association, Mr. MacNeil, was present at the committee; he is a soldier, he represents the soldiers; there were all sorts of officials present; and it was stated that the sailors asked for this particular badge. Any objection which came from the Deputy Minister of Naval Affairs or from the Militia Department afterwards must have come with very poor grace after the matter had been decided by the committee. How was this badge issued by the committee and how did they come to the conclusion that it would be better to make no distinction, or very little distinction, between the badges to be worn by the soldiers and the sailors? They are both fighting the battle of the country; they are both looking for jobs when they come back. When the men get back and line up before an employer in order to get a job, it is a great advantage to a returned man to have a service badge. But if he wears a silver badge which nobody knows anything about, and which, although it may be very dear to the heart of the officials of the Naval Service, is not relished at all by the sailors themselves, and which may look like a badge of the Ancient Order of Pelicans, or something of that kind, he is not likely to be selected by

the employer. That was said by a gentleman who appeared before the committee, a gentleman who entered the service as a sailor and afterwards rose to the rank of a petty officer. Here is what he says:

Q. What is the point there?—A. Canadian sailors, I think, are the Canadians that have served overseas on active service that are not being granted the recognized active service button. This places all classes of sailors at a disadvantage.

Q. In the public estimation?—A. In the public estimation, a returned sailor going in to see an employer asking for a position, there is probably a line-up of men asking for employment and the employer does not stop to ask questions, his eye instinctively travels to the left lapel of the man's coat to see if the button is there and if the man is a strong, vigorous, active young man fit for service the employer simply asks no questions, but suggests that he go somewhere else to look for a position.

That is the evidence of the secretary of the Naval Branch, who was promoted during the war. I have also the evidence of an officer of the force and which shows that our sailors went all over the world. I refer to Captain A. C. Turner, whose evidence will be found at page 927: He says:

If I may take my own case as an example, I first of all went to England and was kept there a few months. Then I was sent to Gallipoli and the Dardanelles. From there I was sent back to the Channel and I had comand of my own ship in the attacks on Zeebrugge and Ostend. From there I went to the north of Scotland. For that service I have nothing to show. Until six months after the armistice there was no button that we could wear to show that we had been overseas. Lately the Naval Service Department issued a large white metal badge which however entirely failed in its purpose. First of all, it is not known to the public, and therefore is of no value. The only button of any value, so far as the public is concerned is that for service at the front. Secondly, that button in its wording is absolutely inadequate. It simply says, "For service rendered." It does not indicate the service. That is our request about the badge and our members feel very strongly about it. It puts them in an unfair position both in business and in private life. They fail to see why a line should be drawn between them and the men who went overseas as soldiers. Most of these three hundred Canadian Naval officers did exceptionally good work in various parts of the world. They went because they knew more about naval matters than about infantry or gunner work or military matters. They thought they could serve their country best in that way, and yet until about two months ago they had been given no badge of any description.

Q. Did you say you were at Zeebrugge?—A. Yes, I had the honour of being in command of a motor launch at Zeebrugge and I was later at the successful action against Ostend.

Q. You were under fire?—A. We were under fire for two hours and forty minutes at Zeebrugge and for two hours at Ostend. You have probably heard Captain Carpenter speak of that action. All who were in it were right in shore. Up to six or eight weeks ago there was not a button or a badge of any description that I could secure or that any Canadian Naval officers could secure to show that we had seen service. Now we have got a badge that is equal to the Class B badge. It is too large to be worn on the lapel of the coat, and it is absolutely unknown to the general public.

Q. Did you make application to the Admiralty or to the Canadian authorities for a badge?—A. We did, and that is the result.

Q. What sort of badge is it that you desire?—A. We desire one for service at the front; perhaps instead of the words "C.E.F." some suitable word such as "Naval" or "Naval Service."

That evidence so impressed the committee, sitting there deliberating and hearing the whole thing, that they came to the conclusion that is found in the report. I do not think that the report should be whittled down to the fine point to which it has been whittled by the minister because I am quite sure that it was meant by this House to give these sailors what they asked for. It is recommended that:

The suggestion should receive the immediate attention of the Government with a view to removing a cause of complaint which, in the opinion of the committee, appears to be well founded. The same may be also true of the R.A.F.

It appears that the R.A.F. had a Naval Service button known to all as the R.A.F. button. But when it comes down to interfering with this little silver badge that nobody wants but the officials of the Naval Service there is all the difference in the world. They make no difference between a man on the ground and a man in the air but they make a tremendous difference between a man on the ground and a man on the sea. There is nothing to warrant this. While I respectfully beg to commend the minister for the way in which he has defended the department I do not think they have done the just thing by these men. The minister says: I would not want to wear that little badge. The minister has not been overseas but those who have been overseas do want to wear this well known badge. They say it helps them in civil life, and I do not think that the minister or anybody else should now say: It is my duty to decide what they want, or what they think they want. It is rather the duty of the minister to give them what they do want. I think it would be a very small thing to scrap this silver badge, issue a war badge, and give that badge to all returned soldiers and sailors.

Mr. D. L. REDMAN (Calgary East): Mr. Speaker while there may be something to be said in support of the view advanced by

the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat) the fact remains that we have two arms of the service; the senior arm—the navy, and the other arm—the army. The Naval Department have issued two badges for the navy. The army have also issued their badges. There seems to be nothing improper in that, no differentiation against the Naval Service. In fact, as I said before, they are the senior arm of the service, and should have the badge which belongs to that arm. Given that, everything is being done for them that could be done and possibly in that respect they have an advantage over the army. To any one who has thought enough of the navy to enter it, as compared with entering the army—surely the love of such men for that particular branch of our forces will still continue, and they ought to desire a distinctive badge for that service. It does not seem to me that any practical difficulty could be encountered in the wearing of that badge. Any man wearing it ought to be pleased to explain to any Canadian who had not sufficient knowledge of our affairs to recognize the badge, that it was a badge of the Canadian Navy. The members of that service are connected with the great British Navy which after all, in the British Empire, always has been, and possibly always will be, more important than our army. The traditions and associations of the British Navy are theirs, and they surely will be glad to have a badge which is peculiarly connected with those traditions and associations. Then we must look to the future in a country like Canada. With our vast coast line on three oceans Canada must have naval protection in some form or other. In the future we must have a navy along our coasts, and if that be the case there is no better way of educating our people to the fact that we have a navy, that we have men who fight for us in that navy, than that those men shall wear a distinctive naval badge.

Reference has been made to the report of the committee and it recommended that some button should be given. The committee did go so far as to say that the complaints in regard to the matter appeared to be well founded and that the question should be considered by the minister. That inquiry, however, was only a side line in the investigation, the main subject was that of the extent of the gratuity or direct help that should be given to our soldiers. The hon. member (Mr. Mowat) has mentioned the case of the Royal Air Force and the minister explained that that was a part of the army. We might also say that the Royal Naval Air Force is a part of the navy, and doubtless in the future will be classified under it.

I do not think any one in Canada will feel dissatisfied in that the men of the Naval Service hold a naval decoration rather than an army decoration. I would not go so far as to say that the men who have served in the army would have no objection to the naval men wearing this badge. I think that all these men have the highest regard for naval men, but the soldiers' idea of discipline and orderliness would tend to make them think that as a general principle it will be more in accord with army and navy practice that each branch of the service should have their own peculiar and distinct decoration.

Mr. A. R. McMASTER (Brome): I would not enter into this debate had I not had the experience the other day of seeing one of these badges and therefore can well understand the disinclination of the naval men to wearing it. If you have ever, Mr. Speaker, seen the Highlander in full regalia you surely would have noticed the badge or broach on his left shoulder fastening his shawl. Now the badge in question is almost as large as the brooch you see on members of the Highland Brigade. It may be that the minister, who no doubt looks well in the regalia of a Scottish regiment, was duly impressed with the idea of the traditional Highland costume.

The trouble with the minister in this matter is that he does not understand the mentality of the sailor, although he is at the head of the navy, and for a long time was a harbour commissioner of the harbour of Montreal. The sailor, Mr. Speaker, is a brave and a modest man; his bravery is only equalled by his modesty. This medal or badge is one which on an ordinary lapel will extend over each side for at least one-eighth of an inch and is of bright, shiny metal. I do not think it is silver, because silver is so valuable these days, that the Minister of Finance would scarcely allow the Department of Naval Service to issue such a badge in real silver. It is more likely a mixture of tin and zinc, a—bright shiny, white metal. The fact of the matter is that we should give our sailors, who are just as much entitled to credit for their bravery as our soldiers, no more and no less than the latter. We should give them a badge that they would be pleased to wear and not a badge that is so conspicuous that it offends a man's sense of modesty to wear it. I speak with perfect seriousness in this matter. We should give our sailors a badge which is as attractive as that of the army but

sufficiently different to be distinguishable from it. It should be of such a size and so inconspicuous that a modest man would be pleased to wear it. Hundreds of thousands of young men all over the country are wearing army service buttons, but I see very few men wearing the brooch—for it is a sort of a brooch—which the Department of Naval Service has issued. I believe the reason for that is that men do not like to make themselves unduly conspicuous.

I would urge upon the House the wisdom of the motion made by the hon. member (Mr. Duff). I do not often find myself in complete agreement with the words of the member for Parkdale, but the fact that I do find myself in complete agreement with what he said to-night will, I trust, add weight to his words.

Mr. E. W. NESBITT (North Oxford): I would like to endorse what my hon. friend for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat) has said. So far as the conclusions of the committee were concerned the whole of their report was a recommendation to the House, and that part of the report dealing with this particular matter was just as much a recommendation as the other matters treated in the report. The reason why the committee came to the conclusion it did was because it was waited on by various members of the Naval Brigade; and when the young fellow who commanded a motor boat at Zeebrugge —probably one of the most daring feats ever carried out by the British navy—when he applied personally to have the badge changed and to have a badge similar to the organizations that have been mentioned, I had no hesitation in supporting the suggestion to change the badge, and that these young men should be given the type they wanted. As the hon. member for Parkdale asked, what difference does it make to us? These young men only want what they certainly have earned, and as the cost will not be very great the committee could not see any reason why the request should not be granted.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Would the hon. member want the badge given to all those that served in the Canadian navy, at home as well as abroad—the identical soldiers' badge, with the exception of the small word "Naval" instead of the badge of the "C.E.F."?

Mr. NESBITT: I have no choice in the matter. It did not make any difference to me what the badge was, I simply concurred in the demand of these men.

Mr. FIELDING: The minister asked that the resolution be withdrawn. I would like to draw his attention to the fact that the motion does not express any opinion; it merely calls for papers to which I presume there can be no objection.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I quite agree with the hon. member (Mr. Fielding). I noticed what he refers to, but I thought it might be agreeable to the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff). If, however, it is not, I have no objection to conform to the motion as it reads on the Order Paper.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to take any part in this discussion until I heard the speech of the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster). After listening to him I concluded that he was trying to camouflage himself to the world as a Highlander!

Mr. McMASTER: I come of decent Lowland folk and never did anything of the kind.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE: The name "McMaster" has graced the personnel of many a Highland regiment. But, like Peter of old, his language has betrayed him to-night, and he shocked my modesty very much by asking: What sort of a shawl this is that a Highlander wears? Let me tell my hon. friend from Brome that that is the shawl which was worn by the 42nd Highlanders at the Battle of Waterloo; that the same shawl was worn by the Highlanders at the Relief of Lucknow; and that the same shawl was worn by Highlanders in the many battles all over the world where they have distinguished themselves and brought honour and glory to their King and country.

The pin or brooch which my hon. friend knows so little about is the clasp with which the Highlander fastens his plaid across his broad shoulders,—and if the badge which has been issued to these sailors bears any resemblance to the Highlander's brooch, I have no sympathy with any man refusing to wear it.

I did not hear the speech of my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) which I regret very much, and I heard only part of the speech of the Minister of Naval Service (Mr. Ballantyne), but I thought it was worth while, for the education and edification of my hon. friend from Brome, that I should give him some information about the shawl and the brooch and the reason for the pride with which Highlanders wear their plaid and every other part of their

uniform from the bonnet to the buckle on their shoes.

I can quite understand, Mr. Speaker, that there should be some distinction between the badges awarded to the several classes of our Canadian forces. There is nothing too honourable to be worn by our soldiers who were at the front or who tried to get there; and there is equal distinction coming to any man who honourably served his country in the Naval Service where real service was performed. But I am not in sympathy with giving any decoration to men who during the war served in what was called the Canadian Navy, because I submit, Mr. Speaker, that so far as I know —and I know a good deal about them— they did not do very much that entitled them to any honour. I do not think they were serving with the idea of being awarded medals. At any rate, they had no opportunity of distinguishing themselves because they had not any fighting ships, and certainly it would not be fair to put a man who served in our Canadian Navy upon the same footing as the man who served in the British Navy during the war. If badges are to be issued for naval men I hope a distinction will be made and that it will be given to our men who served in the British Navy rather than to those who were engaged around our own coast in absolute security and who were able to return to harbour every night and sleep soundly in their beds. Possibly if I had heard the whole speech of the hon. minister I would have no doubt as to the different classes of badges that are to be issued. But I would join my voice with those who say that these naval men should be given the kind of badge they require so long as it does not interfere with the distinctive badge issued to the soldiers.

Mr. J. H. BURNHAM: Mr. Speaker, on 7th of November, 1919, the report that I referred to was adopted by this House. On that date, I see, a division was taken and the main motion that the report of the committee be received was agreed to. So the member for Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) is wrong. Of course, as this is not a private fight anybody can get into it, but I have not taken sides in the matter because I do not understand the question. The point, however, is, that since this report was agreed to by the House it certainly shuts out all criticism of it; it would be an entirely different thing were it only received,—especially in view of the fact that the member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) has come down so heavily and

[Mr. McKenzie.]

almightily on the whole situation as to say that it was not adopted but only received.

Mr. NESBITT: That is a pure technicality. It does not matter.

Mr. DUFF: Mr. Speaker, I—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before the hon. member (Mr. Duff) exercises his right to reply it is my duty to inform the House that any hon. member who desires to take part in this debate must do so now.

Mr. DUFF: Mr. Speaker, I will not take up much time replying to the arguments put forward by the hon. Minister of Naval Service (Mr. Ballantyne). It seems to me that after what has been said by hon. members who support me in this matter there is only one thing for the minister to do—to recall the badges already issued and to issue the badge which the sailors require.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, you noticed that during the minister's remarks he did not tell us whether the sailors asked for those particular badges which he has been issuing. I would like to know who did ask for them. Was it the sailors, or, as the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat) suggests, did the request come from the officials of the department?

We know that the minister is large-hearted. Last year, Sir, when I made a speech with reference to the Canadian navy, he was so big-hearted that he wanted to take on his shoulders not only the sins of the officials of his department while he was minister, but their sins while under his predecessor. To-night he is doing the very same thing, he is shouldering the sins of his officials who were responsible for these monstrosities.

The minister did me the honour of sending me a few minutes ago specimens of the three different badges which he has issued. The first one, as I have already said, is a monstrosity. It is certainly no honour to the scarf-pin which the hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. D. D. McKenzie) and I wear when we don our kilts. Further, Sir, I say it is an insult on the part of the member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) to refer to this monstrosity as something like the scarf-pin which Scotchmen wear.

This first badge, Sir, consists of two fouled anchors. That will enable the House to form an estimate of the artistic capabilities of the designer. You know, when a vessel gets her anchor fouled she goes adrift. Well, I suppose

that is what is going to happen to these sailors. God knows that they had opportunity enough of going adrift while they were at sea; the minister evidently intends now to send them adrift with a heavy disc on their left lapels. Above these two fouled anchors there is a scroll; then a great, big crown. Sir, the thing is not fit to wear; I would not have my dog wear it, let alone give it to a man who has served in the naval forces.

Now, I was not a sailor during the war, nor was I a soldier, but the member for Calgary (Mr. Redman) said, as I understood him, that the army was the senior arm of the service.

An hon. MEMBER: He said, the navy.

Mr. DUFF: Then I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon; I thought he said that the army was the senior arm. I contend that the British navy is the senior arm of our forces. I say, then, that if the Great War Veterans' Association is satisfied that the same badge be issued to sailors as is issued to soldiers, all members of Parliament, the minister included, should agree that the one badge be issued.

Somebody has evidently told the minister that the Great War Veterans' Association objected to the use by sailors of this metal badge. The secretary of the Great War Veterans' Association, Mr. McNeil, assures me that the executive of the Dominion Command of that association is unanimously in favour of the recommendation to which I refer. Whether it was adopted, makes no difference; the fact is that the committee brought down this recommendation to the House; a recommendation which was endorsed by the military branch of the Great War Veterans' Association, as well as the Ontario Command. If the soldiers are willing that their comrades in the navy wear a badge the same as that worn by them, with the substitution of "Navy" for "C.E.F.," then the minister should scrap the different badges which he is issuing and issue a bronze badge similar to that which the soldiers are wearing.

The minister said that he was following the example of the British navy. Well, the British navy is a very old institution, and I can understand why they find it necessary to have distinctive badges or medals. But the Canadian navy comprises a very small part of the forces which we sent overseas; consequently it is not necessary for us to have three or four distinctive badges. As I have said, my only idea in bringing this matter up is to comply with the request of the Great War Veterans' Association and also of a number of sailors from whom I have received letters and telegrams. Under the circumstances the minister should, I think, reconsider this matter, and issue the same badge for sailors as is issued for soldiers.

Motion agreed to.

RESIGNATIONS FROM THE CABINET.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Acting Prime Minister): I should like to reply to a question that was put to me on Friday by the leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie King) as to the resignation of the ministers who have resigned since the last session of Parliament. Up to that time I believe that explanations were made with regard to resignations which had taken place previously. I do not think I can make any better explanation than to lay on the Table the correspondence between the Prime Minister and the Acting Prime Minister and the two ministers who resigned. I may add, however, that in neither case was the resignation on account of any difference, either personal or with reference to policy.

Mr. BUREAU: May I ask the Acting Prime Minister whether this correspondence will be set out in detail in Hansard. If some other arrangement is not made he will have to read it in order that it may appear on Hansard.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If it is the desire that the correspondence should appear on Hansard, I have no objection.

Mr. BUREAU: We can consent to its being put on Hansard, and dispense with the reading of it.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If there is no objection, then, Mr. Speaker, we will have it on Hansard.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This can only be done of course, with the unanimous consent of the House. If no hon. member takes exception, the correspondence may be printed in Hansard.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

The correspondence thus authorized to be published in Hansard is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.
MINISTER'S OFFICE,

OTTAWA, September 22, 1919.

My dear Sir ROBERT BORDEN,—In the reorganization of the Cabinet, which you now have under consideration, I trust you will not

overlook the request I made to you some little time ago, to permit me to retire from my present position in the Government.

As I stated to you then, I accepted the portfolio of Minister of Militia and Defence (Canada) with a keen desire to play my part in assisting you in every way possible to bring the war to a successful conclusion, and to support the Canadian Corps at the front with reinforcements. On the termination of the war, and before you left for the Peace Conference, at your request, I agreed to stay on for a time to carry out, so far as this department was concerned, the big problem of demobilization. As this task is just about completed, and as this department will now be reorganized on a peace basis, I feel that my contract has terminated and that the administration of the department should now be handed over to some one else.

While the war was on I did not hesitate to sacrifice everything I had to give my service to my country. I have been absent from my home and my business for nearly five years, and have been compelled to neglect my practice and my private affairs, but I feel repaid, inasmuch as I have had the privilege of doing something to support you, in a small way, in the enormous responsibilities that have been cast upon your shoulders since the 4th of August, 1914. During this long period, in the various offices I have been privileged to occupy in the public service, I have endeavoured to the best of my ability to conscientiously carry out my duties faithfully and to give you my very best support.

I feel that the time has come when I must, in fairness to my family, take a short rest and give personal attention to my private affairs that have been sadly neglected for so long. I would, therefore, ask you to accept my resignation as Minister of Militia and Defence at the earliest possible date.

I wish to express to you my very deep appreciation of the confidence you have reposed in me, and of the very loyal and whole-hearted support you have given to me while I have been a member of your Cabinet, and I trust that confidence will continue for all time.

I have the honour to be, my dear Sir Robert

Your obedient servant,

S. C. MEWBURN.

The Right Honourable
Sir ROBERT BORDEN, P.C., G.C.M.G.,
Prime Minister of Canada,
Ottawa, Ont.

OTTAWA, Ont., December 29, 1919.

My dear Sir ROBERT BORDEN,—With reference to my letter to you of the 22nd September, my subsequent interview with you, and having regard to the events which have developed during the past few days, owing to your very regrettable illness, I find from every standpoint I am compelled to ask you to accept my resignation as Minister of Militia and Defence, and I urgently request that same take effect not later than January 15 next.

I sincerely trust that you will ere long be restored to your old-time health and strength.

Believe me, my dear Sir Robert,

Yours faithfully,

S. C. MEWBURN.

The Right Honourable
Sir ROBERT L. BORDEN, P.C., G.C.M.G.,
Prime Minister, Ottawa, Ont.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker.]

OTTAWA, Ont., December 29, 1919.

Dear General MEWBURN,—It is with the greatest regret that I have received your letter announcing the necessity of your retirement early in January. In September last you agreed, at my earnest request, to remain until the end of the year, in view of my unavoidable absence for some weeks from Ottawa; and I am grateful that you remained at your post during that period.

Throughout the war you have given splendid and conspicuous service to Canada and to the Empire in different capacities. Especially during the period in which you have presided over the Department of Militia and Defence your service has been notable. I am most grateful that in October, 1917, you accepted my invitation to become a member of the Union Government, upon which has been laid so heavy a burden of responsibility. During the period that has since elapsed you have given most valuable assistance in the discharge of that responsibility.

I trust that every blessing may attend you and your family in the New Year upon which we are soon to enter.

Faithfully yours,

R. L. BORDEN.

Major-General
The Hon. S. C. MEWBURN, M.P.,
Minister of Militia and Defence,
Ottawa.

OTTAWA, February 23, 1920.

My dear Sir GEORGE,—I beg herewith to tender my resignation as a member of the Government of Canada, and respectfully request an immediate acceptance of the same.

Yours faithfully,

A. K. MACLEAN.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER,
Acting Prime Minister,
Ottawa, Ont.

OTTAWA, Ont., February 24, 1920.

Dear Mr. MACLEAN,—I received your letter of resignation as a member of the Government of Canada and in accordance with your request give you an immediate notice of its acceptance.

I regret exceedingly that you have found it necessary to sever a connection which for the past two years and more has been so pleasant to all your colleagues and so fruitful of service by yourself.

Personally, I shall miss your counsel and your helpful co-operation.

Yours faithfully,

GEORGE E. FOSTER.

Honourable A. K. MACLEAN, M.P.,
Ottawa, Ont.

CANADA'S REPRESENTATIVE AT WASHINGTON.

On the Orders of the Day.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Leader of the Opposition): I am informed that there is an Associated Press cable from London to-day to the effect that the status of the proposed representative of Canada at Washington has been definitely fixed by the British and Canadian Governments. I should like to ask the Acting Prime Min-

ister if that report is correct and whether he has any information to give to the House with regard to it.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: All that I can say is that the correspondence is still proceeding and that when it has ended an announcement will be made in the House.

A NATIONAL EIGHT-HOUR WORKING DAY.

Resuming the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of Mr. Burnham:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that to the extent of the jurisdiction of this Parliament a national eight-hour working day should be established immediately, subject only to the right of express private contract.

Mr. I. E. ARGUE (Swift Current): Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak on this resolution from the point of view of the farmer. If this resolution carries and the eight-hour day becomes law in Canada, I do not see how we shall be able to carry it out on the farm. There is a great deal of lost time on the farm on account of inclement weather. To-day we are paying higher salaries than were ever paid in Canada for farm labour; in my own district we are paying from $75 to $100 a month. During the greater part of the summer, during seeding and the summer fallow, we must work our teams at least nine hours a day in order to get our work done. If we do that we are in the position of having to pay a man time and a half for overtime or of hiring a stableman to take care of the teams when they come from the farm and to get them ready to go out to work the next morning. Then, during harvest time when the grain is ripe and hundreds of acres are standing ready to cut, we must work ten or twelve hours a day to get the cutting done. I do not know how many hours they work in Ontario during threshing time, but I know that our machines start at daylight and work until dark, and sometimes after.

When our teams are hauling grain to the elevators it is often eight or nine o'clock before they get back to the farm. If the eight-hour day goes into effect in Canada it will simply mean that living, instead of becoming cheaper, will become dearer in this country. It will mean an increase of fifty per cent in the price of farm products. We have no objection to an eight-hour day in shops and factories. They can work eight or ten hours a day if they wish, but I do not see why we should pass legislation in this House to restrict the working hours of possibly the only people in Canada who seem to be willing to work—the farmers. I shall be compelled to vote against the motion.

Hon. NEWTON W. ROWELL (President of the Privy Council: Mr. Speaker, the question which is raised by this motion was one that engaged the attention of the Washington Conference, and as what was done at that conference may have some bearing upon this matter I think it is only right to put the House in possession of the facts. As the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) is here, he can speak to the House on the constitutional aspect of the case.

Hon. members will recall that under the labour clauses of the Treaty of Peace, it is declared that among the conditions of labour which are producing "unrest so great that the peace and harmony of the world are imperilled" are the hours of labour, and among the measures which it is recommended should be adopted is one "regulating the hours of work, including the establishment of a maximum working day and week." Among the principles laid down in the treaty as of urgent importance is: "The adoption of an eight-hour day or a forty-eight-hour week as the standard to be aimed at where it has not been already attained." And in the agenda for the Washington Conference as set out in the Treaty the first article is "the application of the principle of the eight-hour day and the forty-eight-hour week."

I have referred to these matters in order to indicate to the House the exact nature of the question that came before the Washington Conference for consideration. The question before the Conference was not whether it was desirable or undesirable to pass legislation regulating the hours of labour. That principle was affirmed in the Treaty of Peace; and in all the provinces of the Dominion legislation has been passed regulating the hours of labour in certain classes of industry and among particular classes of workers, particularly women and children. So that principle is recognized in the legislation of Canada and, I think, of all civilized countries. Nor was it the question of whether, in regulating the hours of labour an eight-hour day or a forty-eight hour week would be wise or unwise. That general principle was also laid down in the Treaty. The question which the Washington Conference was called upon to consider was whether there should be an eight-hour day or a forty-eight-hour week or some modification or combination of the two, and whether the

time had arrived to secure general application of that principle to all industrial nations. Hon. members of the House will recognize that one of the principles underlying the labour clauses of the Peace Treaty is that uniform action should be secured on these matters among the industrial nations, that the failure of one or more industrial nations to take action on any of these matters embarrassed, and, in a measure prevented other nations from taking advanced ground. Therefore the issue before the Conference was to ascertain if an agreement could be secured among the representatives of the nations members of the Conference whereby these nations would move forward together in a matter of this kind. What action did the Washington Conference take on this matter and how is such action to be made effective? I will tell the House briefly for the information of hon. gentlemen. Article 19 of the labour clauses provides:

When the Conference has decided on the adoption of proposals with regard to an item in the agenda, it will rest with the Conference to determine whether these proposals should take the form; (*a*) of a recommendation to be submitted to the members for consideration with a view to effect being given to it by national legislation or otherwise, or (*b*) of a draft international convention for ratification by the members.

Hon. members will see that it was open to the Conference to adopt either of these two courses, either to set forth its conclusions in the form recommended which would go forward to the different nations with the view to unite giving effect thereto by national, or the Conference might decide that its decision should take the form of an international treaty or convention to be signed and ratified by the nations parties to the Conference if they approved,

This same article also provides the vote necessary to make the decision effective:

A majority of two-thirds of the votes cast by the delegates present shall be necessary on the final vote for the adoption of the recommendation or draft convention, as the case may be, by the Conference.

In the case of this particular convention the necessary two-third majority was secured. Now what follows when a convention is adopted? That is also provided in Article 19:

A copy of the recommendation or draft convention shall be authenticated by the signature of the president of the Conference and of the Director, and shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the League of Nations. The Secretary-General will communicate a certified copy of the recommendation or draft convention to each of the members.

[Mr. Rowell.]

Now by reason of the fact that the Washington Conference was held prior to the League of Nations being constituted, because the ratification of the Treaty did not become effective till the 10th of January, the Conference was not formally closed, but was adjourned until after the Treaty of Peace had gone into effect by reason of its ratification, and the Conference was formally closed by declaration of the governing body at the meeting held in Paris after the Treaty had gone into effect. Before action is taken a certified copy of this convention must be sent to the secretary of the League of Nations, and a certified copy must be sent by him to each member. The Government has not yet received the certified copy of this or of any of the conventions adopted by the International Labour Conference at Washington.

Therefore the Government is not in receipt of any official communication up to the present time upon which it can take official action. This clause also sets out the obligation which shall rest upon each member.

Each of the members undertakes that it will, within the period of one year at most from the closing of the session of the Conference, or, if it is impossible owing to exceptional circumstances to do so within the period of one year, then at the earliest practicable moment, and in no case later than eighteen months from the closing of the session of the Conference, bring the recommendation or draft convention before the authority or authorities within whose competence the matter lies for the enactment of legislation or other action.

The members of the House will see that that raises an important question, particularly in a country like Canada, with a federal constitution, as to whether the legislative authority before which this matter should be brought for appropriate action would be the legislatures of the provinces or the federal parliament. It goes on:

In the case of a draft convention, the member will, if it obtains the consent of the authority or authorities within whose competence the matter lies, communicate the formal ratification of the convention to the Secretary-General and will take such action as may be necessary to make effective the provisions of such convention.

Then there is a further express provision dealing with a federal state:

In the case of a federal state, the power of which to enter into conventions on labour matters is subject to limitations, it shall be in the discretion of that government to treat a draft convention to which such limitations apply as a recommendation only, and the provisions of this article with respect to recommendations shall apply in such case.

As the Minister of Justice is here I shall not undertake to discuss the constitutional aspect of the question either in relation to the federal parliament, or the rights and powers of the provincial legislatures.

Mr. MORPHY: I cannot hear what the minister is saying, but I should like to know whether it is his opinion that this Parliament has no jurisdiction in the matter at all.

Mr. ROWELL: What I said was that, as the Minister of Justice was here, and as he has been giving the whole matter serious consideration, I would not undertake to pass upon that aspect of it. The Minister of Justice will be able to state the position as he sees it.

Mr. MORPHY: Will the Minister of Justice make a statement on that particular question before this debate is over?

Mr. ROWELL: Yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I desire to ask a question of the minister (Mr. Rowell) in order that we may fully understand the procedure. In the event of this draft convention being submitted to a parliament that has jurisdiction and such parliament deciding not to take the action suggested in the convention, what would be the consequence of its position?

Mr. ROWELL: I cannot undertake at this moment to answer the question raised by my hon. friend. He will see that it involves a very important question, under our constitution, which would require very careful consideration. My hon. friend no doubt understands that the obligation of a government to submit a convention is exactly the same whether or not that government agrees with the principle of the convention. It may be open to very serious argument that a government, under our system, in submitting such a recommendation, should submit it so as to permit a free and open vote of the members of the House. That is one view of the matter. The other view would be that the government must take the responsibility of submitting the convention to the House as a government. But it would be a rather anomalous and embarrassing situation if the government were bound to submit to parliament a convention against which it had voted at the conference and with the principle of which it did not agree, and to put it forward as a government measure, virtually saying that parliament must adopt it. I mention this merely to indicate that here again is a very important question which will require the most careful consideration before a precedent is established which might to some extent bind subsequent governments. The matter is not free from very serious difficulty in the consideration of its constitutional aspect.

Mr. BURNHAM: May I ask when steps will be taken to settle the question of jurisdiction?

Mr. ROWELL: That whole question is now under the consideration of the Department of Justice. This afternoon I promised my hon. friend (Mr. Burnham) at his request that I would make a statement to the House in regard to the terms of the Washington Convention, so that hon. members might be informed on the subject; and in view of this, and the fact that the Minister of Justice will make a statement in reference to the question of jurisdiction, I would ask my hon. friend to withdraw the motion, because he has accomplished his purpose in bringing the subject to the attention of the House.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: In order that we may clearly understand the powers of governments in this matter, will my hon. friend explain to the House how any government will be made to carry out any convention that is agreed upon? As I understand the minister, there is an international convention drafted, and it is submitted to the governments of the different countries that are members of the League of Nations. Should any one of those nations decide not to carry out the convention, by what means will it be coerced, or is there any means of doing this?

Mr. ROWELL: As I explained the other afternoon in discussing the Bulgarian Treaty, there is no means of compelling a government to carry out any convention. The obligation of the Government is to present the matter to the competent legislative authority, for consideration and action. If that body determine that the convention shall not be accepted, or, in the case of a recommendation, that it shall not be acted upon, then the government has discharged its whole responsibility under the terms of the Treaty. But there is a provision requiring the government to submit the convention to the competent authority, and any government declining to do so might be subject to an economic boycott and the other penalties provided for to insure the enforcement of the provisions of the treaty.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is the point which I desired to bring out. I wanted to know the method by which obligations were to be enforced.

Mr. ROWELL: It depends, in the last analysis, upon the public opinion of any country, as voiced through its competent legislative assembly, whether any convention shall or shall not be accepted in that particular country.

Mr. MORPHY: Suppose this Parliament were found to have no jurisdiction, the jurisdiction being in the provincial legislatures, what would be the position of the Dominion then in relation to the League of Nations?

Mr. ROWELL: In that event, the whole responsibility of the Government of Canada would be to submit the matter to the respective provinces, and it would be for the provinces to decide what action they should take. The whole obligation of this Government would be discharged if it submitted the matter to the provinces.

Mr. MORPHY: Have the provinces any status in connection with the League of Nations and how do they come into juxtaposition?

Mr. ROWELL: The treaty expressly provides for, and contemplates, the case of states with a federal constitution. The matter came up in considering the position of the United States. Brazil also has a federal constitution and provision was made in the treaty for such cases. The reason the treaty says, "Competent legislative authority" is that it was considered that some of these matters might come within the competence of provincial parliaments and not within the competence of the Federal Parliament.

Mr. BUREAU: Do I understand the President of the Privy Council to say that if the Department of Justice, or the highest judicial authority of the land, decides that this matter is within the purview of the provincial legislatures, and one of the provincial governments refuses to submit the agreement to the legislative body, or the legislature refuses to take it into consideration, a boycott will be resorted to? Are the other provinces of the Dominion to refuse to do business with this particular province —to boycott it?

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friend has misunderstood what I said. I said nothing of that kind. What I said was that in cases where jurisdiction rests in the provinces and not in the Dominion, the whole obligation is discharged when the Federal Government passes on the recommendation to the province. There is no boycott, the provinces are not obligated to take action and the Federal Parliament has no authority to compel them to take action. The only case where the obligations of the treaty could be brought into play would be if the Federal Government declined to take any action or declined to submit the convention or recommendation to the competent legislative authority.

Mr. BUREAU: The way out is for the Federal Government to deny its jurisdiction?

Mr. ROWELL: It cannot deny it if it has it. But the Minister of Justice will discuss these matters of jurisdiction, and I think we will save time by leaving them to him to discuss.

Mr. FIELDING: Has my hon. friend in mind the date of the Washington conference?

Mr. ROWELL: November.

Mr. FIELDING: I understand that the official report has not yet been received by the Government of Canada?

Mr. ROWELL: The conference, as I explained, only adjourned; it did not conclude its session. The reason it did not conclude its session was because, owing to the delay in the ratification of the Treaty of Peace, the treaty had not been ratified when the conference concluded its regular business. Therefore the conference formally adjourned, instead of closing its session, and the conference was proclaimed closed some time in the month of January or February —I do not remember the date—by action in Paris, when the executive, or governing body, met. The chairman and secretary of the conference could not transmit any convention to the secretary of the League of Nations prior to the formal closing of the conference, and the secretary-general of the League of Nations could not transmit certified copies to the nations which are members of the League of Nations until he had received them from the chairman of the conference. Therefore, all have not received them. But there has been no great delay in dealing with the matter.

Mr. KING: I would like to ask the hon. minister whether, in his opinion, the circumstance of the United States not having become a member of the League of Nations would have any effect in delaying a con-

clusion upon the question as to whether the Federal Government ought to take action on this convention.

Mr. ROWELL: That would be an important factor to be taken into consideration. Now, just a word or two as to what the convention does provide. In the first place, it differs from the resolution before the House in that the resolution provides for a general eight-hour day irrespective of the classes of occupations. The convention recognizes that there are three or four groups of employees and it divides them into industry, agriculture, commerce, and those who go to sea. The convention only covers industry. It does not cover agriculture, commerce, or seamen. Thus it is narrowed down to employees engaged in industry.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: May I ask the hon. gentleman to explain the difference between industry and agriculture?

Mr. ROWELL: The distinction is drawn in the treaty in this way: The treaty sets out certain classes of employment which shall be called "industrial undertakings." It provides:

> For the purposes of this Convention the term "industrial undertaking" includes particularly:
>
> (*a*) Mines, quarries, and other works for the extraction of minerals from the earth.
>
> (b) Industries in which articles are manufactured, altered, cleaned, repaired, ornamented, finished, adapted for sale, broken up or demolished, or in which materials are transformed; including shipbuilding and the generation, transformation and transmission of electricity or motive power of any kind.

It goes on to define certain other specified undertakings which are classed as industry, including works of construction, building railways, transport of passengers or goods by sea or land. Then it adds—and this meets the point which my hon. friend has raised—

> The competent authority in each country shall define the line of division which separates industry and commerce from agriculture.

It is referred to the competent legislative authorities in each country to draw the line between industry, agriculture and commerce.

Mr. SEXSMITH: Does not the first clause include agriculture? It says: "other means of producing or extracting things from the earth."

Mr. ROWELL: No, agriculture is expressly excluded and is referred to the competent authority in each country to draw the line

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Agriculture is chiefly concerned with transforming materials into something a little different. It is not merely a matter of sowing the seed and reaping the harvest.

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friend evidently did not catch what I said. It is extracting minerals from the earth; not materials from the earth.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Materials transformed.

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friend can see the document and peruse it for himself. It makes it quite clear that it does not apply to agriculture. There is no mistake; it is made clear beyond peradventure. The Convention provides for an eight-hours day and a forty-eight hours week, subject to the exception set forth in the Convention. These exceptions are briefly as follows: (1) Persons holding positions of superintendence or management or employed in a confidential capacity; (2) where the hours of work on one or more days of the week are fewer than eight, the limit of eight hours may be exceeded by not more than one hour per day. Where there is a Saturday half holiday then the other days of the week may exceed eight hours so long as the total working hours in the week do not exceed forty-eight. (3) where persons are employed in shifts the eight-hours day and the forty-eight hours week may be exceeded provided they do not exceed the average of eight hours a day and forty-eight hours a week for a three weeks period.

Mr. BUREAU: In the other case the eight-hour day would be more properly defined as a forty-eight-hour week?

Mr. ROWELL: That is what the Conference decided. It is an eight-hour day and a forty-eight-hour week. In fact that was one of the points of difference in the Conference. The employers wanted the forty-eight-hour week without the eight-hour limitations.

Mr. BUREAU: That would be more sensible.

Mr. ROWELL: —and the employees wished the straight eight-hour day. If this had been granted in all employments where the Saturday half holiday prevails, it would mean a forty-four-hour week. This Convention was agreed upon as a result of a long conference between employers and employees and representatives of the Government as a fair solution of the differences.

Mr. MORPHY: What has the League of Nations to do with this resolution? It stands by itself as I understand it and this Parliament can adopt it or not irrespective of the League of Nations. Are we not discussing what is on the Order Paper, free from any interference, or control, or request by the League of Nations?

Mr. ROWELL: Entirely so. But as there will be before the Government of Canada a proposal dealing with this matter in the form of this Convention when it reaches the Government, I was simply explaining to the House the nature of the Convention so that the House will be seized of the matter and as a good and sufficient reason why this resolution should not be pressed at the present time. Some hon. members, including the hon. gentleman who moved the resolution, asked that the terms of this Convention might be stated for the information of members generally. I have now given the general terms of the Convention and I do not think there is anything to be gained by discussing the details of it at the present time. I will simply mention the further exceptions to the general limitation of hours of work contained in the Convention, because they are important.

Mr. BURNHAM: Are we going to receive an explanation from the Minister of Justice before this sitting closes?

Mr. ROWELL: Yes, the Minister of Justice will give an explanation.

There are exceptions in the case of accidents, actual or threatened also with respect to the processes required in an industry which by nature of the industry must be continuous. Provision is also made for seasonal occupations. So that great elasticity is possible to meet the varying conditions of industry.

Special provision is made for Japan and India and China. Japan makes the greatest advance of any country under the provisions of this Convention. The only law of Japan at the present time limiting hours of work is the one regulating the hours of work for women and I think that is twelve or thirteen hours a day. Japan has no rest day on Sunday but has two holidays in the year. Under this Convention Japan agrees to a limitation in general industries to nine and a half hours a day and in the silk industry to ten hours, and to one rest day a week. In this respect it marks the greatest advance in limiting the hours of labour in any country in the world. That means a great deal for Canada and the United States. In the days that lie before us the competition, the keenest competition, both as to employers and employees, will come from the great labouring classes in the Orient. It will be a great thing for the people of this continent if by means of a Convention like the present we get the hours of labour in Japan cut down from twelve or thirteen without any rest day each week to nine and a half or ten with a rest day each week, with the expectation that within a few years Japan will come into harmony with the general terms of this Conference. If nothing else were accomplished by the Conference at Washington than bringing Japan up to that point of co-operation with the other industrial nations in regulating the hours of labour, it would be well worth while and a great success.

Rt. Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): I am very happy indeed to meet what seems to be the general desire for an expression of opinion on my part upon the question of the constitutional power of this Parliament to deal with the subject matter of this resolution, which, I think is the question that properly arises in connection with it. I quite understand that the natural desire of members for information with regard to the Labour Conference should have led to the very interesting discussion that we have heard on that subject; but I quite agree with the suggestion of the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy) that it is in reality—and I think in giving the explanation which he did give the President of the Council (Mr. Rowell) recognizes the fact—beside this question.

The Motion that we have before us is a Motion to this effect:

> That it is desirable that to the extent of the jurisdiction of this Parliament a national eight-hour working day should be established immediately, subject only to the right of express private contract.

Now, as was pointed out, if my memory serves me correctly, by the leader of the Opposition, this motion or declaration that such an enactment should be adopted would not meet, and does not meet, the desire of those who want to have an eight-hour day made an obligatory day by law, because this resolution especially provides for an exemption from any rule that may be made wherever by private contract it is stipulated there shall be an exemption; and I understood the hon. member (Mr. Burnham) who moved the resolution to have declared that his resolution, if adopted and action taken upon it, would carry us no further than to establish a state of the law

under which there would be a presumption that a day's work was eight hours.

Mr. BURNHAM: That is right.

Mr. DOHERTY: That is all. That presumption would be subject to become inapplicable or to be rebutted by any express stipulation in the contract. I think I am correct in that.

Mr. BURNHAM: Yes, that is right.

Mr. DOHERTY: Now, taking that position, I think there is room for little if any doubt—I think I may say for myself that I have no doubt, because one always looks upon a legal question recognizing the fact of the possibility of the existence of other people's opinions—that such a resolution, or an enactment based upon that resolution if adopted would be an enactment dealing with a subject matter entirely outside of the jurisdiction of this Parliament of Canada. Because, after all, what is it that that enactment would be? It would be a presumption applicable in every contract of lease or hire of work. Now the determination and the interpretation of contracts —the presumption that arises in connection with contracts generally; I will not make exception of any special conditions such as those that appear in Bills that come before Parliament—falls under the designation of "property and civil rights," and to me it seems quite clear that we have no jurisdiction to declare that it shall be a presumption in every contract of lease or hire, where a day is mentioned and no number of hours, that a day means eight hours. I think that is clearly legislation dealing with the interpretation of contracts having to do with property and civil rights within the different provinces, and—giving my opinion, of course, for what it is worth and for nothing more—I am of opinion that we would have no jurisdiction to enact legislation of that kind.

I would like to point out that of course the opinion of the Minister of Justice is of no binding effect upon this Parliament. It stands as worth what his opinion as a lawyer may be worth, and it has the weight of whatever may be his reputation as a competent lawyer. The Minister of Justice is not charged with advising the House of Commons, still less with imposing upon it his views of the law; he is the adviser of Government and of the departments of Government.

I think I might leave the matter there so far as the constitutional question is concerned as arising in connection with this resolution. However, I may point out what would be the powers of this Parliament to legislate with regard to the conditions of contracts of lease and hire if by some treaty validly entered into either Canada or any of its provinces became bound to enact some particular legislation upon the subject. If such a condition arose, then under Article 132 of the British North America Act this Parliament would have power to legislate for the purpose of giving effect to any obligation imposed either upon the Dominion or upon any of the provinces. It is only from the point of view of the application of that article that we may be led—in fact, I think we will be necessarily led—to a consideration of the question: Whether anything may arise out of any treaty or any convention that may be submitted to us by the Labour Conference which would confer jurisdiction upon this Parliament to enact such legislation as might be requisite to comply with or carry out the convention.

Mr. MORPHY: Might I ask the minister a question? Does he say that this Parliament, in view of section 93 of the British North America Act, giving the power to the province to legislate with regard to property and civil rights, would have any right to entertain jurisdiction until the provinces had or had not acted with regard to something which should be done in the treaty with foreign nations under section 132?

Mr. DOHERTY: I think that raises, not a question of the power of this Parliament, but the question of what would be proper in the action of this Government. If legislation were essential to the carrying out of an obligation imposed upon a province by a treaty made by the British Empire, there would be power in this Parliament to enact that legislation. If the legislation were of a kind which, under the rules of the constitution, irrespective of any treaty obligation, would fall within the legislative competence of the provincial legislatures, I myself would think it highly proper for the Dominion Government, before it proceeded to enact the legislation required, to ascertain whether the provinces in the exercise of their ordinary jurisdiction were prepared to act. But as an abstract question of law I do not think that the power of this Parliament to act under those circumstances would depend upon previous application to the provinces; the power seems to be given in express terms without any exception or limitation. In regard to that, as of course in regard to everything else, I am giving merely my own opinion, and upon this very question I shall guard myself by saying

that it is really an offhand opinion, the question only having been brought to my attention this moment.

Mr. BUREAU: We would act through the provincial legislature.

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not want to give any more off-hand opinions than are necessary, but the words go very far to confer a power to do that which is necessary so that the obligation is carried out, and I would be disposed to think we would be entitled to do something more than pass a law to carry out the obligation,—that being entitled to pass that law we would be entitled to enforce it. I have not the slightest doubt that if it were a matter about property and civil rights in the provinces, and Canada or the provinces became bound by a treaty to enact that kind of legislation, when we enacted it the courts would have to enforce that just the same as though it were a provincial law.

Mr. BURNHAM: Does the minister take due notice of the fact that the resolution says, "It is desirable?" Would he mind discussing that word "desirable?"

Mr. DOHERTY: It is a pretty long cry from what is constitutional to what is desirable. I am not suggesting that this Parliament can pass this pious aspiration perhaps that such a law is desirable; but as I understand the resolution it would be in effect a declaration by us that it is desirable to the extent that it is within our constitutional power to enact the legislation; which in my opinion it is not.

Now, do not forget that the hon. gentleman pointed out the other evening that there are parts of this Dominion where we would have constitutional power. In fact, I think someone suggested that the only work done in those parts was by the wolves. However that may be, it does not seem to me that we could declare a national eight-hour day applicable in what remains of the Northwest Territories and the Yukon. The purpose of the resolution, no doubt, is to declare a national eight-hour day, and I think we might leave out of consideration what possibility there might be of declaring such a day to be effective in those territories. Certainly it would not be a national eight-hour day if put into effect in that way. Opinions, of course, differ on the question whether it is desirable that there should be legislation creating this presumption. That, however, has been threshed out from different points of view, and I do not think that I could add anything of value.

Now, I do not purpose to go into the question of the interpretation of the provisions of the Peace Treaty with regard to the manner in which conventions are to be dealt with by the different powers. I may, however, point out that as I read the provisions of the Treaty—I say this subject, perhaps, to further consideration, though I have very little doubt about it—they do not impose upon the nations an obligation to enact into law the particular conventions adopted. The obligation as set forth is that the respective governments or the respective countries will bring before the competent authorities a convention for the enactment of legislation or other action. It goes no further than that. The convention goes on to point out that if that competent authority does not adopt legislation or does not act, there is no further obligation upon the country. If that competent authority does adopt legislation or take other action giving effect to the convention then it becomes the duty of the country concerned to report that ratification to the body in authority. When the conventions arrive at their official condition I do not think that we shall be in any very great difficulty in determining what action is incumbent upon us; certainly to the extent that action is incumbent upon us it will be our duty to take it. As I have pointed out, any action incumbent upon us deals in express terms with our bringing the matter before the competent authority.

Mr. BUREAU: That would be before the legislatures.

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes. I should say that unless there can be found in the terms of the Treaty as applied to the convention the creation of an obligation to enact some specific legislation, we shall not find what in my opinion are the essential conditions to giving jurisdiction to this Parliament to legislate upon the subject. Upon this question of legislative jurisdiction I understand that very strong opinions adverse to that which I have expressed are entertained by those who speak for some, at all events, of the provinces. In that condition of affairs it may become necessary to have this question authoritatively passed upon. It would be an undesirable situation, if it did arise, that we should fail entirely of action simply because all the different authorities considered that they were not competent to deal with the matter.

Mr. BURNHAM: Will this Government now try to find out about the jurisdiction?

Mr. DOHERTY: I might venture to say that we think we know about the jurisdiction. But if there should arise such a situation as I have been pointing out; if each authority should say: We have not the jurisdiction,—then it might become desirable that we should get an authoritative decision as to where the jurisdiction lies. It is not in the power of this Government to impose its view upon the provincial governments, and of course it is not in their power to impose their views upon us. While I am not saying that it will necessarily be done, the House will see that it is readily conceivable that that will become, if not a necessary, at all events a very desirable step to take.

Mr. MORPHY: Having regard to the phraseology of section 132 of the British North America Act, is the minister of the opinion that under this particular Convention there is any obligation resting upon a province as such, irrespective of its being a component part of the Dominion?

Mr. DOHERTY: Whether there is an obligation resting upon a province as such must depend upon what are the obligations in the Treaty. I have difficulty in conceiving that we would make a treaty imposing an obligation upon a province by name. But if by a treaty we undertook an obligation which in the ordinary operation of things could be carried out only by a province, then there would arise an obligation incumbent on that province as the result of the treaty. I do not conceive that the case that is contemplated is the making of a treaty whereby Canada would say: The province of Ontario will do such-and-such a thing. But if Canada undertook to do something which had to be done in the province of Ontario and which, leaving treaty obligations entirely aside, would be a matter to be dealt with by the province, then I think you would have the case that is contemplated in the statute of an obligation incumbent upon a province. I cannot at the moment quite conceive of a situation where you would have a treaty which would in terms undertake that a particular province would do a particular thing. It would be a treaty-making power that would undertake to do it; but in order to make that effective you must have something that is to be done by a province, or at all events through the exercise of powers which ordinarily belong to a province.

Mr. MORPHY: Even though this Parliament would over-rule the exclusive jurisdiction of the province?

Mr. DOHERTY: If the case came under Article 132, Parliament, as I understand it, certainly would be entitled to over-rule the exclusive jurisdiction.

Mr. MORPHY: You would have to amend the British North America Act, would you not?

Mr. DOHERTY: No, because Article 132 says that.

Mr. McMASTER: In the terms of Article 132?

Mr. BUREAU: Is not the province supreme?

Mr. SPEAKER: We are not in committee. The Minister of Justice has the floor.

Mr. DOHERTY: Where there is concurrent power in the legislature of a province and in the Parliament of Canada to legislate upon the same subject, then the legislation by the Parliament of Canada supersedes the provincial legislation. Even if you treat Article 132 as leaving co-existent with Parliament's competency under Article 132 the competency of the provincial legislatures under section 91, then you have the case of concurrent jurisdiction, and I think that lawyers generally would agree that in such a case the legislation of Parliament would over-ride that of the provinces. But the only purpose of this express provision of Article 132 is to give to Parliament a power which it would have under the general provisions of section 91; by its express terms it confers a power with regard to matters constituting obligation on the part of the province. Therefore I do not think there is any difficulty in the way of its operating to confer upon Parliament the power to do things which, under other circumstances, would be within the exclusive power of a provincial legislature.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Am I right in gathering from the minister's remarks that as a matter of jurisdiction this Parliament has no power to enact what is called the eight-hour day?

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not want to say that there is no possible combination of circumstances--

Mr. W. L. MACKENZIE KING: I mean, generally speaking.

Mr. DOHERTY: I understand the enactment of an eight-hour day to mean the enactment of a general law that in all contracts for the lease or hire of labour the day shall be eight hours and no more.

Eliminating all questions of carrying out Treaty obligations, my own opinion would be that Parliament has not the power to enact that legislation.

Mr. JACQUES BUREAU: Unless Parliament made it a criminal offence to work longer.

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes. If Parliament felt justified, I suppose it is within its power to take matters which in their very nature one disassociates entirely from the idea of crime, and by declaring certain things with regard to them to be crimes, to put the matter into our jurisdiction in that way. But I myself would not be disposed to do that.

Mr. JACQUES BUREAU: Very few would.

Mr. JOHN H. BURNHAM (West Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, some days ago it was pointed out in the newspapers that the Drury Government in Ontario did not intend to put the eight-hour day upon their legislative programme, but intended to hand the matter over to a commission to find out what it might find out. It naturally occurred to me that it would also be advisable for us in this House to find out, if we did not know, and at any rate to declare our position with regard to the eight-hour day in order that the province of Ontario and all the other provinces might know what the scope of their jurisdiction was with regard to it. We have tonight received from the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) the explicit declaration that in his opinion—that is, such an opinion as he would give in advising the Government—this Parliament has no jurisdiction to consider a national eight-hour working day. That liberates, in my opinion, the province of Ontario and enables them to go on promptly with the work of enacting an eight-hour working day if they wish.

All this talk about whether or not the farmer would stand for it, has nothing whatever to do with the question. It was all very interesting, although I knew it all before personally. As to the point: Is the eight-hour day desirable?—strange to say, among all the mighty legal minds in this House not one of them has fastened upon the essential word in the introduction of the resolution. A resolution, as I understand it, is to enable the House to give an academic opinion after an academic discussion. But this House refused to consider the question whether an eight-hour day was desirable or not, and that is all I wanted them to consider. If they said it was desirable, then the next step was to be taken. If they said it was not desirable, that would have finished it. But they did not, and would not, consider whether or not it was desirable. They simply attacked, almost every one of them, the principle of the eight-hour day.

The object of the resolution has been fully attained, and as it serves no further purpose than that declared by the Minister of Justice I beg leave to withdraw the resolution, Mr. Speaker.

Motion withdrawn.

On motion of Sir George Foster, the House adjourned at 10.35 p.m.

Tuesday, March 16, 1920.

The House met at Three o'clock.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Evidence and Exhibits in the Race Track Inquiry.—Sir George Foster.

Volume 3, Auditor General's Report for the year ended March 31, 1919.—Sir Henry Drayton.

Annual Report of the Department of Indian Affairs for the year ended March 31, 1919.—Hon. Mr. Meighen.

Copies of Orders in Council passed from August 1, 1919, to February 5, 1920, in accordance with the provisions of the Forest Reserves and Parks Act, Railway Belt Act, Dominion Lands Survey Act, and the Dominion Lands Act—Hon. Mr. Meighen.

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Leader of the Opposition): The Minister of Finance has laid on the Table to-day the third volume of the Auditor General's Report. May I ask when we may expect the full report, particularly that part which has to do with the war expenditure?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (Minister of Finance): I understand from the Printing Bureau that Volumes 1, 2 and 4 will be finished about the end of this week. Volume 4 contains full particulars of the war expenditure.

KINGSTON HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Vercheres): I would draw the attention of the Government to a despatch from Kingston appearing in the Montreal Stand-

ard of March 13, which states that the Canadian Government has given the city of Kingston the assurance that the sum of $2,500,000 will be spent on harbour improvements there. I would ask my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, who is also the distinguished representative of Kingston in this House, if the report is true, and if so, whether these improvements are to be made in fulfilment of an election promise.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (Minister of Finance): The report is absolutely incorrect. That also answers my hon. friend's second question, but in order to make it a little more emphatic, I might say that there was no election promise.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JOHN H. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough): May I be permitted to remind the leader of the Government of the well-known Parliamentary doctrine that the Government is required to obey the orders of the House of Commons. At the last session, and the last but one, a large number of orders were passed for the production of papers, which have not yet been complied with. I am drawing this to the attention of my right hon. friend in order that he may have the proper officers notified and have the papers brought down.

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If my hon. friend will give me a list of the orders passed which have not yet been complied with, I will take the matter up personally.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I will do that.

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE AMENDMENT ACT.

THIRD READING.

On motion of Hon. N. W. Rowell (President of the Privy Council) Bill No. 2, to amend the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act and to transfer to the Commissioner of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police the powers heretofore vested in the Commissioner of Dominion Police was read the third time and passed.

SUPERANNUATION AND RETIREMENT ACT AMENDMENT.—RATE OF INTEREST.

On the motion of Sir Henry Drayton (Minister of Finance) the House went into Committee to consider the following proposed resolution, Mr. Boivin in the Chair:

Resolved, That section twenty-seven of the Civil Service Superannuation and Retirement Act, Chapter seventeen of the Revised Statutes of 1906, be amended to provide that the rate of interest computed on all sums to the credit of the Retirement Fund, whether principal or interest, be increased from four to five per centum per annum, that the Governor in Council shall have power to reduce the said rate of interest, but not below four per cent per annum, and that the proposed amendments shall be deemed to have come into force and effect on and from the first day of January, 1920.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: This resolution speaks pretty well for itself. I would point out that I am withdrawing resolution No. 5 on the Order Paper dealing with the same subject matter as this resolution. The object of the resolution before the Committee is to increase from four to five per cent the rate of interest on the percentage that is taken compulsorily from the salaries of civil servants, and the aggregate of which is paid over to them on their retirement. In view of the higher rate of interest now prevailing it has been thought but just to grant this increased rate.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Shelburne and Queen's): When this Act was passed, the rate of 4 per cent allowed on these savings was considered to be rather a generous one, because the Government were then borrowing at 3 per cent or less. I quite agree that in view of the changed conditions of the money market, 5 per cent is not too high to-day, and I quite approve the action of the minister. It suggests, however, the point to which I drew attention the other day, that we are increasing the rate of interest on nearly everything except savings bank deposits. I mention the matter merely for the reflection of my hon. friend Sir Henry Drayton.

Mr. DUFF: I see that provision is made to raise the rate of interest from four to five per cent, but the Governor General in Council is given power to reduce it, not below four per cent. It seems to me that some explanation is needed in regard to this provision. Why should that power rest in the Governor in Council? I think that if a year hence, or at any other time in the future, circumstances were found to justify the reduction of the rate the minister might come to Parliament and obtain its sanction for that reduction.

Mr. FIELDING: I think it is well, in increasing the rate of interest, to give notice that this is due to the general higher value of money, and that if a change takes place the rate may have to be reduced. But even if the 5 per cent rate were continued it would not be too generous.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE: I am quite aware that in 1898 a change was made in the superannuation law giving an option to a great many civil servants to retain their status under the old Act or to come under the new Act. I should like to know from the minister how many civil servants are now entitled to the benefit of superannuation, and how many are entitled to that under the fund with which we are now dealing. Does it apply to the Civil Service generally? An explanation from the minister would be greatly appreciated by the country, as there is at present some confusion in the matter.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I regret that I have not the definite statistics here, but, as I understand the matter, with the legislation of 1898 the former superannuation system ended. The result is that only those who were employed in the service prior to 1898 are still entitled to the old superannuation fund, which was not and is not a self-supporting fund, and towards which, I think, the country has contributed something like $11,000,000. That is altogether stopped now, except as regards those who had an interest in it at the time that legislation was passed. The present arrangement applies, I understand, to all civil servants who, apart from the change in the law stopping the superannuation, would have been entitled to that superannuation. The great difference between the two funds is that the present retiring allowance is supplied entirely by the employee himself, his salary being arbitrarily reduced by five per cent.

Mr. FIELDING: An option was given to the civil servants to determine whether they would remain under the old Act or take advantage of the benefit—if it was a benefit—of the new Act. I think a few old officials came to the conclusion that they would avail themselves of the option, and I know of one notable instance in which an old public official who had contributed a great deal of money, and to whom in the natural order of things nothing would be due at the time of death, took the option and agreed to come under the retirement fund. He died a few weeks afterwards and his heirs got many thousands from the public treasury.

Resolution reported, read the first and second time, and concurred in.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 17, founded on the resolution.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

]Mr. Fielding.[

CURRENCY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

(GOLD AND SILVER COINAGE).

On the motion of Sir Henry Drayton (Minister of Finance), Bill No. 15, to amend the Currency Act, 1910, was read the second time and the House went into Committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On Section 1—Standard for gold and silver coins—

Mr. BUREAU: Will the minister please inform the House what the old standard was?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The change made here is in connection with silver coinage. The old standard was 925 parts fine, and the reduction is to 800 parts.

Mr. McKENZIE: I take this opportunity of calling the attention of the minister to an article that appeared in the Boston Post a few days ago, regarding our exchange. In the debate on the Address I made some remarks that seem to have been regarded as being inconsistent with the general ideas concerning exchange, and I received a great deal of cheap advertisement throughout the country. The Boston Post published an editorial on my observations in which it said that Canadians could not expect anything else in regard to their money if they continued to grind it out simply in the press instead of digging it out of the ground in the form of gold. If it be the case that our exchange is what it is by reason of the fact that we have too much paper and not enough gold, when are we going to make an honest effort to get back to gold conditions and to a proper ratio between our paper money and our gold reserves so that our dollar will be worth one hundred cents as it was not so many years ago?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: And get the good opinion of the Boston paper.

Mr. McKENZIE: Get the good opinion of those who are selling goods and get a good opinion of our dollar. We know that our dollar is perfectly good and legal tender everywhere. I never heard of a paper dollar issued in Canada for which payment was refused in gold when it came back to the proper quarters. There is some prejudice against our money in the United States which is not justified. If it be true, as this paper says, that we have too much paper and not enough gold, whenever an opportunity presents itself to bring this matter to the notice of the Minister of Finance, I think we should do so. I do not profess to be an authority on these things but it

does not require very much sense to know that when you present your dollar in any of the hotels in Boston it is only worth eighty-five cents. I want to bring back the old conditions when it was worth one hundred cents on the dollar. It is all very well to say that we do not scientifically understand these things. I think I am justified in bringing it to the notice of the Government and to those who are supposed to have scientific knowledge. I want to know whether there is anything in the argument of the Boston Post or not.

Mr. PEDLOW: Mr. Chairman, what is the business before the House? We have absolutely no knowledge of what is going on. We might as well be sitting looking at a moving picture show. I would like the members, when they are addressing the House, to turn in this direction so that we will have some slight knowledge of what is going on.

The CHAIRMAN: We are considering clause 1 of Bill No. 15.

Mr. PEDLOW: Thank you very much. I would like to have a copy of the Bill. We do not know what the Bill refers to.

The CHAIRMAN: The Bill has been distributed and ought to be on the hon. member's file.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am afraid it would take some time to properly answer the question of the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie). Perhaps it will be enough to say that Canada's currency stands well and compares favourably, taking any standard of comparison, with any other currency in the world. It is absolutely an ill-founded statement to say that the declension in one particular matter, brought about by the exigencies of trade and the movements of money both as shown in trade balances which are apparent and those which are not so apparent is owing to the fact that the Canadian dollar is not sound. It is sound and not only compares well, but compares very favourable with any other currency.

On Section 2: Silver coins; schedule amended.

Mr. McMASTER: May I ask the minister to explain what "remedy allowance" and "millesimal fineness" mean?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: They mean that you are getting the fineness down to a very small point. This "remedy" which is spoken of refers to the standard of fineness that every coin ought to have. For example, it is impossible to get every single coin absolutely perfect to the fraction of a grain and this is the standard of remedy which is fixed. The standard may be within that very small margin which is allowed. Our standard of remedy is exceedingly severe and more severe than the standard of remedy which is applied in the United States.

Mr. McMASTER: How is that remedy applied? Are deficient coins called in?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Deficient coinage is rejected. There is a machine which tests each accurately and any coin not coming up to the standard is at once rejected.

Mr. McMASTER: I do not think the minister understood my qusetion. When coins in circulation get below this standard, is there any machinery for calling them in?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: This particular clause of the Bill does not refer to that; it refers to minting. Of course, coins which are below standard are called in.

On Section 3: Silver coins heretofore struck to continue current.

Mr. DAVIS: I would like to ask the minister how this will compare with American coin and whether the change will not make our coins pass for less than they do at the present day.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: In answer to the hon. member's question I would say that a silver coin, ordinarily and properly, is a token coin. So long as the country stands behind the silver token, and stands for the obligation, it does not make any difference whatever as to what the contents of the token are. We have been getting into an abnormal condition, in so far as silver is concerned, owing to the unprecedented rise in the price of silver, a matter that was discussed when the motion was introduced. The price has risen, during the last year, from 80 cents to $1.41 an ounce, so that at one time we were coining silver at a loss. Of course, just as soon as you have your token coin containing enough currency to be worth the increased amount—that is the amount a coin as a token coin is worth —then the coin is more than a token and there is actual value in it apart from the token. But the function of silver coinage is token coinage, and it could have no effect upon the value of our silver currency as a token.

Mr. DAVIS: At the present time I understand our coins are worth about one-twelfth less in actual value of silver than American coins. What I want to get at now is,

what will be their relationship with this change?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The fineness of the American token is 900. Our old token was 25 points above the American token, but although it was 25 points better that did not help it in the American market. I might say, for the information of the hon. member, that the British Parliament, at the present time, is considering reducing the fineness of silver coinage to 500, and that the American authorities are now considering reducing the fineness of their coinage to 800.

Mr. DAVIS: The minister has not answered my question: What would be the proportion now between the actual value of the American silver and ours?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: As eight to nine.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

GOVERNMENT ANNUITIES ACT (1908) AMENDMENT.

On the motion of Sir Henry Drayton, Bill No. 16, to amend the Government Annuities Act, 1908, was read a second time and the House went into committee thereon —Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—sale of annuities to persons resident in Canada:

Mr. CAHILL: Will the minister explain the meaning of the change proposed here?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The purpose of the change is to remove from the officers looking after the sale of Government annuities the obligation of seeing that a man is domiciled in Canada. It renders it more easy for them to do business, more easy for Government annuities to be placed readily at the disposal of people living in Canada. No one entertains any idea looking towards leaving Canada for the purpose of pressing the sale of annuities; this provision simply enables the officials to deal with those Canadian residents who come to do business with the department without first finding out whether they are legally domiciled here.

Section agreed to.

On section 2—limit of amount increased from $1,000 to $5,000:

Mr. CAHILL: Will the minister kindly explain the purpose of this clause?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Under the old clause no annuity could be sold for a greater amount than $1,000. This provision allows annuities to be purchased from the Government for as large an amount as $5,000.

Mr. CAHILL: What was the reason for the Government's desire to increase the amount from $1,000 to $5,000?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Requests have been made from time to time, from residents of Canada, who were anxious to make provision either for themselves or for their children and who found an annuity of $1,000 was not sufficient for that purpose.

Mr. FIELDING: The reason is that he wants the money?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think that is quite right; that is an additional reason.

Mr. McKENZIE: The House would like to know whether the Government sale of annuities has been a good paying business —what the record of the Annuities Branch has been since its inception, up to the present time. The Annuities Branch is not a very old institution in Canada. It commenced its operations, I think, in 1910, and some changes were brought about with respect to it in either 1912 or 1913. I can recall that when the former Postmaster-General, now Judge Pelletier, was in the House, we had lengthy explanations from him with respect to the annuities, and I think it is only fair to ask now if the business has been a paying one. We are paying out annuities from time to time and receiving certain contributions from the people, who are preparing themselves for the receipt of those annuities. Has the business been a paying one?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I have not the exact figures showing how the operations of the department have worked out, but if the hon. gentleman desires I will be very pleased to obtain them for him. The real trouble in the past has been that we have not done very much business. Now, in so far as to whether the sale of annuities has been a paying business or not, the complaint has been made that in the past the Government has been making too much money out of them. A general complaint has been made that we have not been generous enough to the public, having regard to the table on which the annuities were based, rather than that the Government was losing money on them. The real trouble with the situation, I think, is that owing to the limitations that we are now trying to get rid of, there has not been as satisfactory a volume of business in the department as could have been desired. It is hoped that with the removal of these

restrictions a far better volume of business will be transacted, and satisfactory profits made.

Mr. McKENZIE: Would the minister instruct his officials to give us a fair idea of how the business stands as to outgoings and incomings from its inception up to the present time?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: A report is laid on the table each year.

Section agreed to.

On section 3—Age when annuity payable:

Mr. H. B. MORPHY: Mr. Chairman, there is very great difficulty in following the discussion from this end of the Chamber. I have only just learned that clause 3 relates to Bill No. 16 to amend the Government Annuities Act of 1908. I did not hear the reason given by the Finance Minister for the amendment; consequently I am not able to properly answer something that I could not possibly understand. Speaking in this direction (towards hon. members opposite) section 3 appears to be all right, but I have a great deal of objection to it for the reason that I do not know the number of the section to be repealed. It has not been produced before the House, that I am aware,, and—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Louder.

Mr. MORPHY: What I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that section 3, repealing subsection 3 of section 8 is rather difficult to understand when the Act to be repealed is not before the House. I would like to have a full explanation of just what that section means by the Finance Minister addressing the Chairman first in this direction, so that hon. members at this end of the House may hear him, and then in the opposite direction so that other hon. members may hear as well.

It becomes a perfect absurdity and brings the House into disrepute when the public business is proceeding with only one half of the members able to hear what is being discussed. A conversational tone is accepted I believe, in some deliberative assemblies as being a highly ornamental method to disseminate knowledge, but it is not to be recommended for adoption in this Chamber. I notice the pressmen with their hands to their ears in an attempt to understand what is being said—and they are quite close to the ministers. Every member is entitled to the courtesy of those gentlemen who are a little further away using their best efforts to state plainly the matter that is before the House so that public business will be intelligible to every one; but we cannot hope for any improvement while the present conversational tone is maintained.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I have much pleasure in answering the question of the hon. gentleman, and I hope he can hear me now. We are striking out, as the hon. gentleman observes, sub-section 3 of section 8 of the old Act, which reads as follows:

> Except upon the occurrence of invalidity or disablement of an annuitant, no annuity shall be payable or paid to any annuitant, unless he has reached the age of fifty-five years.

The amendment will enable annuities to be sold so that they become effective before the age of fifty-five years is reached.

Mr. CAHILL: Does any age limit apply now?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There will be no age limit at all. The rates of pay, however, provide a very effective age limit, because if a man wants to get an annuity at an unusually early age the charge becomes prohibitive.

Section 3 agreed to.

On section 4—rate of interest increased:

Mr. COPP: What does that mean?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The change here is merely to provide that the rate of interest which is payable to the estate of a man who would have become an annuitant if he had lived long enough shall be at four per cent instead of three. There are really three classes of annuities: (1) Where a guaranteed number of payments is made either to the man if he lives long enough or to his estate if he dies; (2) where all premiums paid on account of the annuity shall fail unless the annuitant lives for the specified period; and (3) the intermediate class where if the annuitant dies his estate does not lose the benefit of the payments which he has made, but is entitled to a return of those payments plus interest, which used to be at three per cent but we now make it four percent .

Section 4 agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

TREATY OF PEACE WITH BULGARIA.

STATUS OF CANADA AS A NATION.

Resuming the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Hon. Mr. Rowell) respecting the Treaty of Peace between the Allied and Associated Powers and Bulgaria:

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, before speaking to the resolution I should like to ask my hon. friend the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Rowell) whether in the resolution itself the word "plenipotentiaries" is correct, or whether the word "plenipotentiary" should be used. I notice the resolution states that the Treaty has been signed "on behalf of His Majesty, acting for Canada, by the plenipotentiaries therein named." But on referring to the Treaty itself I find there is only one plenipotentiary mentioned for the Dominion of Canada, the Hon. Sir George Perley—unless it is to be understood that the other British representatives named are also signing on behalf of the Dominion.

Hon. N. W. ROWELL: It should be "plenipotentiary." In this case only one representative signed on behalf of Canada; in the other case there were two Canadian ministers.

Mr. W. L. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, while listening to my hon. friend, the Secretary of State for External Affairs, in introducing this resolution I could not help feeling that he himself in asking Parliament for the approval of this Treaty was doing so simply as a matter of form. There was really nothing in his argument in the way of a substantial reason why this Parliament should approve of the Treaty so far as the relations between Canada and Bulgaria are concerned. This is a Treaty between the Allied and Associated Powers and Bulgaria, and we as a Canadian Parliament are being asked to give our approval to it. One would assume that, the Canadian Parliament being asked to approve the Treaty, we would find in it somewhere something relating to the Dominion of Canada. One would also have expected that there would be a possibility of an opinion of this Parliament influencing the judgment of those who have to do with the final ratification of the Treaty. But looking at the Treaty, one sees that it was signed by the different powers at Neuilly-sur-Seine on November 27, 1919, and I am very sure my hon. friend will agree that anything that this Parliament may do in the nature of approving or disapproving the Treaty will not affect the dotting of a single "i" or the crossing of a single "t" in a single clause of the Treaty from beginning to end. It is for that reason I say, it seems to me, that the approval of this Parliament is being asked for simply as a matter of form.

But while the hon. member has given us no substantial reasons why this Parliament should approve the Treaty, he has given reasons why it would be unwise for us not to approve the Treaty. In drawing attention to its different clauses, he pointed out that practically everything that we are asked to approve here was approved last year when we had before us the Treaty between the Allied and Associated Powers and Germany. Therefore, not to approve this Treaty at this time would be to have it appear that in the interval something had arisen which had caused this Parliament to take a different attitude towards the Treaties of Peace which are being signed in Europe from that which was taken at the last session. I am not aware that anything of the kind has arisen, and for that reason, I think it would be unwise for Parliament not to take, in the matter of approving the Treaty, the same action as it took in the matter of approving the Treaty between the Allied and Associated Powers and Germany.

But I want to point out just what are the grounds upon which my hon. friend has asked this Parliament to approve the Treaty. The grounds are broadly comprised under two headings. My hon. friend has mentioned one particular in which the Treaty has "special interest" to Canada, and it is the only particular in which he has specified any special interest to Canada as regards this Treaty. My hon. friend says that the provisions relating to debts and financial matters are of special interest to Canada in view of the fact that there are a number of Bulgarian Nationals living in Canada, and that there is a certain amount of enemy property in this country. It sounds very serious that there should be Bulgarian Nationals living in Canada, and that there should be a certain amount of enemy property in this country; but would any one consider for a moment that that was a reason serious enough to present to this Parliament for approving a particular Treaty? Yet, as I said, that was the only mention my hon. friend made in his speech of the particular interest this Treaty has with respect to Canadian affairs. In the same connection he pointed out that the provisions the Treaty contains respecting debts and financial matters are on all fours with similar provisions in the German Treaty which was approved last session.

My hon. friend went on to give another ground which he said made the matter of "most immediate concern" to Canada. It may be summed up in his own words as follows:

To go back to the two groups of clauses in the Treaty which are of most immediate concern to Canada, should like for a few minutes to speak in reference to the League of Nations and to the labour clauses of the Treaty.

In other words, we are being asked to approve this Treaty at the present time because of what it contains in reference to the League of Nations and the labour clauses of the Treaty. This Parliament has already approved the League of Nations' Covenant; it has already approved the labour clauses of the Treaty. Why should the time of Parliament be taken up in approving a second or a third time these particular matters? There has been no difference of view between us as to these clauses. I am not aware, when they were being debated in connection with the German Treaty, that a single exception was taken by any member of the House to the clauses relating to the League of Nations, and, in particular, to the labour clauses. Therefore, the reasons which my hon. friend has urged, are more in the nature of excuses for bringing this particular Treaty before the House, than they are good and substantial reasons for asking the approval of Parliament of this Treaty. I have said that they are excuses. I think, if my hon. friend would tell the House exactly what was in his thoughts, he would admit that his reason for asking the House to approve the Treaty was largely that he might repeat at this session what he said in Parliament at the last session and what he has since been saying on a good many platforms in regard to the League of Nations' Covenant and the labour clauses of the Treaty. I think that is the main reason for the introduction of this measure at this time.

4 p.m.

My hon. friend, however, in addition to the two statements which I have quoted, has said that the adoption of the resolution involves the acceptance of certain principles which he has set forth. It is important that we should consider what my hon. friend has said in that connection. It affords the reason why, it seems to me, it would be inadvisable for this House not to approve the Treaty. These statements of principle might be made as separate substantial motions in this House; they might be made in reference to almost any other Treaty as well as this particular one. But should this House, in view of the statement which my hon. friend has made, refuse to approve the Treaty, then it would be immediately said, or the impression would be conveyed, that in some way or another this House was unwilling to accept the statements of principle which my hon. friend set forth.

Let me take up these statements of principle, one by one, and see whether there is any difference of opinion between members on both sides of the House in reference to them. They are all in the nature either of recognitions of something which is already conceded, or of reaffirmations of something which has already been affirmed. The first is the recognition of democratic control of foreign policy, and that Canada should not, without the consent of its Parliament, be finally committed to important international engagements such as are embodied in this Treaty. I venture to say there is not an hon. member who for one moment will take exception to the desirability of democratic control of foreign affairs. If we are to have an increased measure of foreign policy as a part of the business of this Parliament, it becomes increasingly important that we should have some effective democratic control of it; but the first example my hon. friend has given of democratic control by Parliament of foreign affairs is a somewhat unfortunate one inasmuch as he brings here for our approval a Treaty that was signed several months ago, the contents of which were not made known to a single member of this House until within the last two or three days, and a document which, I am sure my hon. friend himself will say, cannot be altered one way or another by anything which this House may do at the present time. But that is not the only example which my hon. friend has given to the House of his view of democratic control in regard to these matters of foreign policy.

On the first of March my hon. friend the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Rowell) laid upon the Table of the House copies of other treaties:

The Czecho-Slovak Minorities Treaty, a treaty between the Principal Allied and Associated Powers and Czecho-Slavia, signed at Saint Germain-en-Laye, September 10, 1919. Ratification on behalf of Canada authorized by Order in Council of December 1, 1919.

Note those words " ratification on behalf of Canada authorized by Order in Council of December 1, 1919." Mr. Chairman, is ratification of a treaty by Order in Council an evidence of democratic control on the part of the Parliament of Canada? That is exactly the line of action which hon. gentlemen opposite have been taking in so many matters of all-important concern during recent years—and that we have been pro-

testing against. Instead of submitting these matters to Parliament for consideration, they have taken action upon them by Order in Council.

Copy of another treaty was also laid on the Table by my hon. friend on March 1:

The Serb-Croat-Slovent Minorities Treaty, a Treaty between the Principal Allied and Associated Powers and the Serb-Croat-Slovene State, signed at Saint Germain-en-Laye, September 10, 1919. Ratification on behalf of Canada authorized by Order in Council of December 1, 1919.

Here again is more ratification by Order in Council instead of by Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, let me repeat, we on this side of the House are strongly in favour of democratic control of all these matters of foreign policy. I think we would be willing to go so far as to say that we would like to have an expression of opinion of this House to the effect that Canada should not be bound by any treaty or agreement in matters of external relations, of which Parliament has not been fully informed in a way of which all of us could take cognizance. That would be helping along the democratic control of foreign relations, and when we have that principle carried out we shall have a sense of security which at present we do not feel in the matter of our external and inter-imperial relations.

The next reason that my hon. friend has given is that the adoption of the resolution will involve:

A recognition that in any war in which the British Empire is engaged and in which Canada has taken part is a matter of concern to the people of Canada; that the terms of the Treaty of Peace bringing such a war to an end are also a matter of concern to the people of Canada, and that such a Treaty should not be ratified by His Majesty until it has been approved by Canada as of the five nations of the British Commonwealth.

There can be no difference of opinion on that matter. Every one in this country will admit that any war in which the British Empire is engaged and in which Canada has taken part is a matter of the greatest possible concern to Canada. Every one will be fully prepared to admit also that the terms of the treaty of peace bringing such a war to an end are also a matter of concern to the people of Canada, and that such a treaty should not be ratified—I think the word "not" has been left out of Hansard by mistake—until it has been approved by Canada as one of the five nations of the British Commonwealth. I am not sure that my hon. friend would not have been more consistent if he had inserted after the word "treaty" in the phrase "such a treaty" the words "in so far as Canada is concerned."

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

I just interject that point for his consideration.

Those are two recognitions or declarations of policy, or whatever one may choose to call them, upon which I think all hon. members of this House are thoroughly agreed. The remaining three are not recognitions of accepted policy, but are reaffirmations of positions this House has already accepted. First there is

A reaffirmation by Parliament of its approval of the creation and maintenance of a League of Nations for the promotion of international co-operation and the achievements of international peace and security by the methods set forth in the Covenant of the League.

As I mentioned a moment ago, this Parliament has approved of the creation and maintenance of a League of Nations for the promotion of international co-operation and the achievement of international peace and security by the methods set forth in the Covenant of the League. We have approved that over and over again, and why should our approval of it be asked for again in this connection? Is that a reason why this particular treaty with Bulgaria should be brought before the House for its approval at this time?

The fourth reason given by my hon. friend is that the approval of the treaty will mean:

A reaffirmation by Parliament of its approval of the Labour Clauses; and of the creation and maintenance of the International Labour Organization under its provisions.

How often have we to be asked, Mr. Speaker, to state what we have already stated time and time again in this House as to our views upon the Labour Clauses of the Covenant of the League of Nations? It may be that my hon. friend has some doubt as to the position some of his supporters may take towards those Labour Clauses, but let me tell him, speaking for those of us who are members of the Liberal party on this side of the House, that before the House took action one way or the other in regard to the Labour Clauses of the Covenant of the League of Nations, the National Liberal Convention, composed of representatives of the Liberal party from the Atlantic to the Pacific, made as one of the planks of its platform a full acceptance of the Labour Clauses in the spirit in which they were framed as part of the Covenant of the League of Nations. So that there may be no doubt as to the position which we on this side of the House have taken as to the Labour Clauses of the League of Nations, let me read the following from a

resolution which was adopted in August last year by the National Liberal Convention:

> Resolved that the Committee recommends that the National Liberal Convention accept in their entirety as a part of the Liberal platform, in the spirit in which they have been framed and in so far as the special circumstances of the country will permit, the terms of the Labour Convention and general principles associated with the League of Nations and incorporated in the conditions of peace.

Unless hon. gentlemen opposite entertain a different view of the significance of these Labour Clauses, I cannot see why this Parliament should again be asked to approve them under the guise of expressing its approval of a treaty between Bulgaria and the Allied Powers. So far as the League of Nations is concerned, I believe there is only one opinion in this House and in this country. We all recognize that the League of Nations is in a formative stage, that its constitution is more or less nebulous at the present time, but that it has in it promise of great good for humanity and for mankind. We all desire to see the League of Nations made a success, and we cannot by approval after approval in this House make our position better known than it is.

Now I come to the last reason which my hon. friend gave as to why we should approve this Treaty. He says its adoption involves:

> A reaffirmation by Parliament of its approval of the position and status accorded to Canada in the League of Nations and in the International Labour Organization and of its determination to maintain that status.

Well, Mr. Speaker, who has questioned the status which Canada has attained in the League of Nations in any way that calls for a further approval by this Parliament of the status which we already have? Some question has been raised in the House and outside of the House as to whether the status is in any way the new thing which my hon. friend would lead us to believe it is; whether it is not a recognition of something that was achieved long before the Administration, of which he is a member, had anything to do with the matter one way or another. I think we are all agreed, Sir, that whatever status we have we desire to maintain. There is not a man in Canada who would cede one inch of ground on the question of the status which Canada has as a nation, and I do not think there is any difference of view between any of us on that point. Yet my hon. friend seizes this opportunity to bring up this question of Canada's status as a nation. As I have listened to his remarks in this Chamber and read his speeches delivered outside of the House, it has seemed to me that whether he intends to do so or not, he is seeking to convey the impression that we have a new status which we have never had before, and that it has in some mysterious way come about through some action of the Administration with which he is connected. I would be the last one to deny the Administration any credit to which I think it is entitled in regard to the service which it has rendered Canada in helping to maintain and clearly define a status which we have and which has long been admitted. But I think we are allowing full credit to the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) and those associated with him, my right hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Doherty) and my right hon. friend the Secretary of State (Hon. A. L. Sifton) for their service to this Dominion in standing firm on the question of its status, when we give them credit for having done their duty in a manner satisfactory to the people of the country.

Let me say at once that this whole question of Canada's position as a nation, when it comes to debating the matter, turns very largely on the meaning that we attach to the use of words. Hon. gentlemen opposite, on one or two occasions, have sought to make it appear that gentlemen on this side of the House, were, in some way or other, little Canadians who were endeavouring to minimize the status of their country, because they were unwilling to admit that, from certain points of view, strictly legal, or technical if you will, Canada was a nation with sovereign powers. Now, Mr. Speaker, no good purpose can be served by a contention of that kind. What is needed above everything else is clear and precise thinking on questions of this nature. Let me direct my hon. friend's attention to his own language in order to illustrate my meaning. My hon. friend says that in approving this resolution we are endorsing the following principle:

> The recognition that in any war in which the British Empire is engaged and in which Canada has taken part is a matter of concern to the people of Canada; that the terms of the Treaty of Peace bringing such a war to an end are also a matter of concern to the people of Canada and that such a treaty should not be ratified by His Majesty until it has been approved by Canada as of the five nations of the British Commonwealth.

My hon. friend will observe that in the first part of the paragraph he speaks of any war in which the British "Empire" is engaged and in which Canada takes part, while

in the last part of the clause he speaks of the five nations of the British "Commonwealth." In other words, we go into war as part of the British Empire and emerge from it as part of the British Commonwealth. My hon. friend knows as well as any one here that, according to one meaning of the term, you cannot say that an empire is a commonwealth; although, according to another meaning, the two terms are more or less identical. It is exactly the same in regard to the use of the word, "nation." If you wish to emphasize and lay particular stress on a certain legal technical point, then it cannot be said that Canada has all the rights, the privileges, and the attributes of a sovereign nation. But if, instead of looking merely at the letter of the word you look at the spirit of it, I think that everyone will be prepared to concede that, with the self-governing status which we have, we are to all intents and purposes a nation. Now that is the point I would direct to the attention of my hon. friend. There is in Holy Writ a familiar passage which says: "The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life;" and that is as true in reference to the interpretation of constitutional documents as it is in reference to the Scriptures. If you rigidly follow the letter you kill what is real in the relationship between the different nations that comprise the Empire. If, on the other hand, you take the spirit of that relationship, then we distinctly have five nations forming a part of the British Empire or Commonwealth, by whichever name you choose to designate it. I should like to have that point made perfectly clear, and I trust I have done so in a way which will satisfy my hon. friend.

What, then, is the difference which exists between us and my hon. friend, or any of those associated with him, in regard to this question of the status of Canada? So far as I can see, we have no difference on what is fundamental as respects our status. Our difference is that hon. gentlemen opposite, and in particular my hon. friend, would have it appear, as I have already said, that our status is something newly acquired; that in some way or other which is inexplicable to us there has been a change within the last few years, and that we stand in a position now, from the legal and constitutional viewpoint, which we did not have before. We on this side of the House maintain that while there has been a clearer defining of the status of Canada, and while there has been unquestionably, and above all else, in the eyes of the world and from the international point of view, a recognition of the status of Canada through the splendid services of her armies overseas, and by reason of the valiant part they played in the great war, all these circumstances have served to emphasize and strengthen and make permanent a status which we already had and which we intend to maintain. If my hon. friend has any doubt at all on this point, I hope his mind will be disabused of any misgivings before I conclude.

By way of illustration of the point which I have been seeking to make clear, let me draw the attention of the House to the first Government notice of motion which appears on the Order Paper. In the name of my right hon. friend, the Minister of Justice, there appears the following proposed resolution:

> Resolved, that a humble address be presented to His Most Excellent Majesty, the King, in the following words:
>
> To the King's Most Excellent Majesty:
>
> Most Gracious Sovereign:
>
> We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of Canada, in Parliament assembled, humbly approach Your Majesty, praying that you may graciously be pleased to give your consent to submit a measure to the Parliament of the United Kingdom, to amend the British North America Act 1867, in the manner following, or to the following effect—etc., etc.,

Note the words in that resolution. The prayer from this Parliament is not to the King to assent to an amendment of the British North America Act. It is to His Majesty to submit a measure to the Parliament of the United Kingdom to amend the British North America Act. If you take the letter of the Constitution alone will any one for one moment contend that this country is a sovereign nation to the degree of having all the rights and privileges which the British Parliament has when we have to go to the British Parliament to ask for an amendment to our Constitution? If you construe the Constitution according to the letter, you kill the spirit immediately because we know, as my hon. friend pointed out the other day, that if we ask the British Parliament to amend the Constitution according to the constitutional practice, it is almost certain to do so and, since it is almost certain to do so, we have to all intents and purposes the full rights and privileges of a sovereign people in reference to our own Constitution. But I would like to submit to my hon. friends opposite that perhaps it would be more in accord with the status which Canada has as a self-governing dominion or nation within the British Empire if, instead of presenting an address to His Majesty to ask

His Majesty's consent to the Parliament of the United Kingdom amending the British North America Act in the two particulars mentioned, the Government should consider the advisability of an address being presented to His Majesty to have powers given to the Parliament of Canada, subject to the concurrence of the several provinces of the Dominion, to amend the Constitution of Canada in such particulars as may be agreed upon as a result of conference between the provincial and federal authorities and approved by this Parliament and the legislatures of the different provinces.

I have here a copy of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia and of the Dominion of New Zealand. Both Australia and New Zealand have the right to amend their own constitutions in the particulars mentioned therein. Why should this Parliament not have the same powers to amend its own Constitution, subject to the safeguards that are necessary to comply with the spirit of the Act of Confederation, as have these other nations within the British Empire?

As I have said, our difference with hon. members opposite is not at all upon the question of Canada's being a nation but upon the inference which they would convey that national status, or to put it in the phraseology of the minister, equality of status with the other nations of the British Empire, is something newly acquired, something to be credited to the present Administration. What we say is that Canada's status as a nation from the constitutional point of view was established long before the present Administration was formed and in spite of the opposition of some of its own members and their associates in the past. If any one doubts this I will quote my hon. friend an authority which he will not question. Indeed, I am prepared to leave the question of Canada's status as between hon. gentlemen opposite and gentlemen on this side of the House to the testimony of my hon. friend himself.

I have in my hand a copy of a splendid address—one of the many splendid addresses which my hon. friend has delivered. It was not delivered since the war, or since the present Administration of which he is a member was formed, but it was delivered in Montreal on November 11, 1912—nearly eight years ago. The address is entitled:

> A Short History of the Beginning and Growth of Constitutional Government in Canada.

In it my hon. friend has set forth the constitutional development of this country and to whom the credit should be given in that connection. Let me, without quoting too many extracts, just read a few that are significant as showing the position which we on this side of the House are prepared not only to maintain but which we are glad to have the opportunity of advocating and of furthering to the extent of our ability. My hon. friend started in by saying:

> In all discussions of the relations of Canada to Great Britain and the other parts of the Empire, three questions appear to be uppermost in the public mind: Our political relations, our trade arrangements, and the defence of the Empire.
>
> I am glad we have with us this evening a descendant of Papineau, a man, who, in the early history of our country, struggled to secure for the people of this province what William Lyon Mackenzie was struggling to secure for the people of Upper Canada—the right to manage their own affairs; and while we may not agree with the methods either pursued, we must agree that they were fighting against grave abuses and were struggling to redress serious injustice to the mass of the people of the two provinces.
>
> The Rebellion of 1837, and the exceedingly able report of Lord Durham on the political conditions in Canada which followed the Rebellion constitute a convenient starting point for our discussion. Permit me to recall to your minds the records of the two political parties in this country from the Rebellion of 1837 down to the year 1911 on the three questions I have mentioned.

I am not going to quote at any great length, but just let me give one or two sentences.

Mr. McMASTER: Whose speech is that?

Mr. KING: It is the speech of my hon. friend the present Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Rowell): He says:

> The four main events in the development of our political relations during this period were: (1) the struggle for and securing of responsible government; (2) Canadian Confederation, including the purchase of the Northwest Territories; (3) the evolution of Canada from the position of a colony of Great Britain to that of one of the free self-governing nations of the Empire; (4) the creation of a truly Imperial organization under the name of "The Imperial Conference."

I wish to remind hon. members that this is an address which was delivered on the 11th of November, 1912. The Armistice was signed on November 11, 1918. It was in 1912 that my hon. friend was speaking. After mentioning the great fight for responsible government, he says:

> Around this issue the battle waged for years, Baldwin and Lafontaine leading the Liberal forces.

What further does my hon. friend say? He says:

The Conservative party in Great Britain clung just as tenaciously to government by Downing Street as did the Conservatives in this country.

Then he goes on:

The only party that believed in responsible government as being essential to the progress and prosperity of Canada, and that the granting of this right of self-government would not only not weaken but strengthen our loyalty to the Crown and the Mother Country, was the Liberal party in Canada.

My hon. friend makes the position clearer when he declares:

The result of the Conservative policy was the Family Compact, the Rebellion of 1837, and the long and bitter struggle which retarded the progress and development of Canada, and divided the people of Canada into two hostile camps. The result of the Liberal policy was the securing for Canada—

Listen to this:

—and ultimately not only for Canada but the other colonies of the Empire—of the right to manage their own affairs, and with that right the peace and progress of the country and a great increase in affection for and the desire to maintain British connections.

Then my hon. friend says:

This great discovery of colonial self-government, which, according to Sir Herbert Samuel, is one of the two great contributions in the sphere of Government which the British people have given to the world, was made, was wrought out and secured by the Liberal party in Canada.

My hon. friend goes on to say:

Their labour has made the Empire as it exists to-day possible.

I shall pass over what my hon. friend has had to say about the question of Confederation and the part played by the two parties in this country in that connection, and what he has said about the acquirement of the Northwest territory. He concluded, however, that part of his address by saying:

Here again it was the policy of the Liberal leader and the Liberal party which forced this great question to the front, and was so largely instrumental in securing these territories for Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, lest it might appear that we were getting away from this all important question of the status of Canada, and Canada's status as a nation within the British Empire, I am pleased to see that my hon. friend has devoted a considerable part of his address to that one particular subject. "The changed status of Canada," he calls it. Now let me read what he says in that connection:

When Sir Wilfrid Laurier went to England to attend the Diamond Jubilee of Queen Victoria—

That was in 1897, 23 years ago—

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

In one of his very first public utterances he took the position that Canada was no longer a colony but a nation. He said: "The authority of the Queen does not rest on military force, but from the Pacific to the Atlantic rests on the cheerful allegiance of five million people who feel themselves a nation. The feeling dominating Canada is one of pride in her local autonomy and legislative liberty connected with Imperial unity."

That is the end of the quotation from Sir Wilfrid Laurier's speech and my hon. friend goes on:

Throughout his stay in Great Britain Sir Wilfrid consistently maintained the position that Canada had reached the status of a nation. When he returned to the city of Montreal, and the citizens extended such a memorable welcome to him he again emphasized that position. He said: He had longed to live to see the day when Canada would no longer be a colony, but would be a free nation within the Empire, and he was glad to be able to say he had lived to see that day.

Mr. Speaker, whatever doubt there may be on the other side of the House, as to Canada's status, there can be no doubt as to the position which we of the Liberal party of Canada have had in regard thereto. My hon. friend has stated it accurately, he has stated it truly, and as he has stated it here every one of us is prepared to see that it is maintained along those lines. But what was the position—and here I should like to point out there are times and seasons for all things—of hon. gentlemen opposite? To-day they are saying a great deal about Canada being a nation. They are able to do so, why? Because the struggle which the Liberal party maintained for a quarter of a century in this country has at last, through the great service of our men overseas, come before the world in its true and bold form. Sir Wilfrid Laurier said: "Let us have the attributes of a nation and when the time of stress comes Canada will respond and do her duty by the Empire." Was not his prophesy fully fulfilled? Was it not because we had the status of a nation, because we believed we had the status of a nation, that Canada played the part which she played in this great war? I think one of the most significant things in the history not only of Canada but of the world is the fact that when this war came on, so far as I am aware, the British Government asked nothing of this Dominion; that everything that was done was done voluntarily and freely by the people of Canada through their Government. How did that come about? It came about as a consequence of Canada recognizing that she had the status of a nation, that she had said: "Recognize our status as

a nation and we will do our part." Had she been held in a colonial position is it possible to believe that she would have responded as she did at that time?

But, as I have said, it is one thing to proclaim Canada a nation to-day; it was another thing to proclaim Canada a nation twenty-five years ago in the heart of the British Empire across the seas, and that is what Sir Wilfrid Laurier did. He did not wait, he spoke, he blazed the way. There at the Queen's Jubilee when all the nations were looking on he took that position and from that time he fought steadily to see that it was maintained in every particular. I might quote not only the address my hon. friend has referred to, but also a speech which Sir Wilfrid Laurier made at the constitutional club in London, England, on July 7, 1902. I have in my hand a report which appeared in the London Times on the day following and what is the expression used there? Every member of the House will recall the expression and the occasion of its use. Sir Wilfrid Laurier said:

> You may search the annals of history so far as the human eye can pierce into them, and you shall not find a parallel to the spectacle of which you are to-day the witness. The Empire of Rome in the heyday of her splendid power never reached that level of moral attitude. And the reason is obvious. The Empire of Rome was composed of slave states; the British Empire is a galaxy of free nations.

That is where we get for the first time the expression of the British Empire as a group of free nations. Sir Wilfrid Laurier used the striking, the poetic phrase "a galaxy of free nations." Hon. gentlemen opposite to-day use the expression "A community of free nations," or "A cluster of free nations," or " A family of free nations." Call it by any name you like the essence of the whole relationship is in the phrase Sir Wilfrid Laurier used, " A galaxy of free nations," and from that moment up to the present time we have sought to maintain that position—that is, all of us who have fought for Liberal tradition and sought to maintain it.

Now, what was the attitude of the Conservative press towards Sir Wilfrid Laurier when he took that stand? What was the attitude of some of those who belong to the party opposite? My hon. friend the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Rowell) has told the country. He says in this address:

> What was the attitude of the Conservative press in regard to this? They charged Sir Wilfrid with being a separatist.

He goes on to quote from the Mail and Empire and he mentions that other Conservative journals and leaders of the Conservative party took the same position and indulged in the same criticism. He adds:

> They failed to perceive that which Sir Wilfrid Laurier and those who shared his views saw, that there can be no permanent basis of union and no permanent plan for co-operation between the peoples of the Empire with a dominant race living in one country to which those living in a self-governing Dominion would be more or less subject; that the future of the Empire as well as its strength, and stability depended upon a frank recognition of equality in the status of the people in the self-governing Dominions with those of the Mother Country.

Note those words. I imagine my hon. friend might be tempted to say that while we had sought to maintain a certain status, we had not equality of status as we have it to-day. But here are his own words: either he spoke what was true then, or he did not speak what was true then. I think my hon. friend will say that he believes he was speaking the truth then as he believes he is speaking the truth to-day and at that time (1912) he said: Sir Wilfrid Laurier took the position that the strength of the British Empire and its stability depended upon a frank recognition of equality in the status of the people in the self-governing Dominions with those of the Mother Country. My hon. friend says further:

> This assertion of our national status was necessary for the people of Canada to develop our own national self-consciousness and our own self-respect. It was necessary for the people of Great Britain in order that they might realize that they were dealing not with subjects but with fellow citizens. That this is our position, and that we are now a nation, is not only recognized by the statesmen of Canada but by the statesmen of the Mother Country.

The other day my hon. friend asked permission of the House to place on record certain excerpts from speeches delivered by the Right Hon. Arthur Balfour, the Right Hon. Lord Milner and by General Smuts. He told the House that the reason he wished to place these particular extracts on Hansard was to make it perfectly plain that not only was the status of Canada recognized here among Canadians, but that it was also recognized by the great leaders of thought and opinion overseas. Well, my hon. friend adopted exactly the same method in 1912, and he placed on record then in the course of his address before the Montreal Reform Club quotations from British statesmen to precisely the same effect. I shall not take the time of the House to read

them, but instead of quoting General Smuts he quoted Sir Frederick Pollock. He also quoted Mr. Balfour and Mr. Asquith. He quoted all these gentlemen, for what purpose? To show that our position as a nation was not only recognized by the statesmen of Canada, but was equally recognized by the statesmen of the Mother Country. He said:

> Nowhere have I seen this changed relationship more clearly stated than in an article on the Imperial Conference written by the editor of the Round Table. Referring to the resolution passed by the Colonial Conference in 1907, establishing the Imperial Conference, this writer says:
>
> "This resolution"—

—that is, a resolution passed in 1907, when, I think, my hon. friend for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) was present—

> —"established the status of the Dominions as national entities, entirely distinct from that which inhabited the British Isles. It recognized that the basis of Imperial organization was the co-operation of five nations, not the centralization of power in the hands of the British Government as an Imperial Parliament. It finally destroyed the older conception of Imperial development, as a gradual re-union of the colonies with the Mother Country through representatives in either of the British Houses of Parliament."

But, Mr. Speaker, there are two or three more clauses that I wish to read. These are, I think, perhaps the most conclusive of any of the utterances of my hon. friend—and I again remind the House that these statements were made in the city of Montreal on November 11, 1912:

> Some of the most important changes in our British constitutional system were not brought about by any Act of Parliament or legislature, but by the demand on the one hand for new or enlarged rights and powers, and the recognition of these rights and powers on the other. This momentous change from a colony of Great Britain to that of one of the free nations of the Empire did not require any Act of Parliament—British or Canadian—for its consummation It simply required a demand on our part for a new status and the acceptance and recognition of that new status on the part of Great Britain
>
> I venture to suggest—

It gives me, Mr. Speaker, particular pleasure to read these words at this time and in this place—

> I venture to suggest that when the history of our constitutional development is written among the great things that Sir Wilfrid Laurier has done none will appear greater than his perception of the fact that the status of Canada must be changed and that this change must be brought about, not by legislative enactment, but by the demand on our part for a new status, persisted in until the people of Canada were convinced of its necessity; persisted in until the statesmen of Great Britain were convinced that it was right. By this great achievement Sir Wilfrid has enlarged the liberties and improved the status of every Canadian citizen, and what he has done for Canada he has done for all the self-governing Dominions.

My hon. friend uttered those words while Sir Wilfrid Laurier was alive. I ask him: Will he not be the first to say that they are equally true now that Sir Wilfrid Laurier is no longer here?

Mr. ROWELL: Does my hon. friend want an answer?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I should be pleased to receive an answer.

Mr. ROWELL: I say undoubtedly they are true. And what is true of Sir Wilfrid Laurier is equally true of Sir Robert Borden in connection with the work of the Peace Conference and the League of Nations.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend's statement just made in such a straightforward and honourable way is interesting not only in regard to the meed of praise which he is prepared to concede to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, but also because of his reference to Sir Robert Borden.

Let me repeat here, Mr. Speaker, that my purpose in quoting my hon. friend is not in any way to belittle the work of Sir Robert Borden or of the hon. gentlemen who were associated with him. I would say frankly that Sir Robert Borden and his colleagues stood firm for the maintenance of Canada's status—they did their duty by Canada in that regard. If they had done less they would have been derelict in their duty and would have been liable to the censure of this Parliament. Having done their duty, and done it well, they are entitled to the thanks of this Parliament and of this country.

But, Sir, let me add this from the words of my hon. friend in regard to what Sir Robert Borden and his colleagues have been able to achieve. They are the very next words that appear in the speech from which I have been quoting:

> The welcome which Mr. Borden and his colleagues received last June was only made possible because of the work Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his colleagues had done for Canada.

I will ask my hon. friend if those words are not equally true?

Mr. ROWELL: If my hon. friend wishes an answer I am quite prepared to give it. I believe those words are equally true. I am prepared to give credit to whom it is due, and I think the other side should be just as ready to give credit to Sir Robert Borden and his colleagues too.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I hope we are. I should like to make it perfectly clear that in this matter we are not seeking for honours; all we wish is to have the position made clear and plainly stated. As between us, if you will, honours may be evenly divided. What I wish to make perfectly plain is what my hon. friend himself has emphasized, namely that the welcome which Sir Robert Borden subsequently received was only made possible because of the work that Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his colleagues had done for Canada.

This is the next paragraph:

To-day—this was 1912—we stand in our relationships and in our negotiations, both in the mind of the people of the mother country and in the mind of the people of the other self-governing dominions, as one of the five free nations that go to make up the Empire. It is again the work of Liberal leaders and the triumph of the Liberal policy which has laid the broad foundation upon which alone the future strength and security of the Empire can rest.

Just one word in regard to the development of an Imperial organization. My hon. friend went on to say:

Some of our Conservative friends are very fond of talking about Imperial organization, they are fond of talking about representation in some Imperial body, they are talking about Canada having some voice in Imperial affairs.

I think this will interest particularly my hon. friend for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding):

While they have been talking and dreaming the Liberal leaders of Canada and the Liberal leaders of Great Britain and of the other Dominions, have been creating a truly Imperial organization for dealing with Imperial affairs.

We have in the Imperial Conference a truly representative body which, up to the present time, has proved itself capable of dealing with all important matters of Imperial concern . . . .

It is important for us to bear in mind some of the characteristics of this Conference. It recognizes the national status of the Dominions, as distinct from the mother country; it is truly representative in its character, being composed of the Prime Ministers of the mother country and self-governing Dominions; it is responsible in that each Prime Minister has back of him a parliamentary majority, and therefore has the power to implement the resolutions to which he gives assent; it recognizes the autonomy of all the governments and no resolution affecting any particular government can become effective unless assented to by it.

And this further word:

But Sir Wilfrid's contribution towards securing for us a safe and effective Imperial organization is not limited to a suggestion as to the form and work of the Imperial Conference. He has also done good work for Canada and the Empire in assisting to defeat proposals for Imperial organization which would have seriously impaired our rights of self-government. In so doing, he was not only fighting for Canada, but he was fighting for the whole British Empire.

That leads me to conclude by referring to the concluding remarks of my hon. friend the other day. After he had spoken at considerable length of the status of Canada, he said something to the effect that the choice to-day was between remaining part of the group of free nations comprising the British Empire and, on the one hand, either reverting to the old Colonial status, or, on the other, going in for complete independence. All of us will agree that it is unthinkable to speak about any return to the old colonial status; but my hon. friend did not put his hand on the real danger when he spoke about the alternative being complete independence. The thing about which we on this side of the House are alarmed is not independence or the maintenance of the status which we have as one of the nations comprising the British Empire. The thing we are concerned about and what we fear is the danger of swinging to the other extreme and developing a form of centralised Imperialism which we think would be thoroughly objectionable so far as the interests of this country are concerned. It is not to any status of Canada as one of the nations within the British Empire that we take exception. We wish to see that position maintained and strengthened; but we do not wish to see, through any insidious or other method, a condition of affairs brought about whereby the full autonomy of this country and of this Parliament will in any way be lessened or impaired by any scheme of Imperialism which will lead to a centralisation of the control of the British Empire, instead of the maintenance of the free self-governing position which we are privileged to enjoy at the present time.

We believe that position can be maintained by holding to the attitude of conference and consultation which was developed under the old Liberal administration; that it is possible for the British Empire to become, as regards the League of Nations, a league within a league, if you like, for the preservation of freedom amongst the different nations of the world. That position will be maintained by the attitude of conference and co-operation; it will not be maintained by a development which will lead to the loss of either of those features through any centralising tend-

5 p.m. ency one way or another. So, to make plain the position that we on this side take in regard to the question of status and what has happened in the last few

years, we would say that the change that has taken place in Canada's status as a result of the war—and there has been in the last few years an emphasis which there had not been for many years previously—has not been any change in the nature of our status, but has been, as regards the British Empire and relations within the British Empire, a clearer defining of a status already existing. As regards the world, there has been an international recognition of that status such as never existed hitherto in the history of the British Empire, and for that international recognition we are first and last, and shall always be most indebted to the services of Canada's armies across the seas. That is where the credit belongs for the international recognition which has come; and as I have already said, as regards the clearer definition of the status, we are prepared and are glad to concede to the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) and his colleagues that they have done their duty well in maintaining that status firmly.

So long as, in the last analysis, all matters pertaining to Canada in her external or inter-Imperial relations are made subject to the approval of this Parliament, so long as no action can be taken of which the Parliament of Canada does not have ample opportunity to approve, we shall feel that to all intents and purposes, we are a nation in the true sense of the word. But let the sovereignty of this Parliament be impaired as respects anything that concerns Canada in either her inter-Imperial or international relations, and we shall feel that the position of Canada as a nation has been menaced to that extent.

Right Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I shall have occasion to say, with regard to what the hon. gentleman (Mr. King) has said, some words that will, unfortunately, not be words of congratulation. I hasten, therefore, at the very outset, to offer him some words of congratulation for which I think his speech calls. I congratulate him for permitting us to listen to a different tale from what we listened to at the last session of this House when we spoke about Canada's status as a nation. I have not time to quarrel with the hon. gentleman about his reservations; I have not time to quarrel with him with regard to the question as to what particular Canadian or Canadians we owe the fact of Canada's status as a nation. I am content to congratulate him and to congratulate this country that he, as the leader of the great Liberal party—and at the last session we expected that the leaders of the great Liberal party would have taken the attitude that he took, but we were disappointed—with, as I say, certain reservations which he thought necessary to make for fear that somebody who never claimed any credit, might get it, has recognized, speaking for his party, that Canada has achieved the status of a nation within the great British Commonwealth—if he will permit me that word, as he does not seem to like it—and a nation standing on a footing of equality with the other nations of the Commonwealth. I congratulate him that he has agreed with us on that. We were amazed when people did not agree with us on that. We are gratified now to find that, on second thought and under a second leader, the Liberal party, as represented in this House, does agree with us.

I shall have occasion to refer to that portion of the hon. gentleman's address in which he belittled the importance of that by thinking it worth while to enter into a discussion as to who got it for us, as though it were not manifest to all of us, and as though any Canadian with heart and head large enough to be worthy to call himself a Canadian, were not prepared to recognize the obvious fact that that status was the result of a growth, a growth to which succeeding statesmen, one after another, contributed. Let me say at once, that I take off my hat without hesitation in respect to the memory of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the great contribution that he made to that growth. All that surprises me is that the hon. gentleman (Mr. King) should have thought it necessary to quarrel with some imaginary person who had set up a claim that in the twinkling of an eye Canada had been made a nation, and made a nation by some one individual yesterday or the day before. If he would have taken the pains to read what was said in this House at the last session, he would have seen that no such contention was ever made. I ask him now, whether by or on behalf of anybody who had the honour to represent Canada at the Conference in Paris, any such claim was made as that we had made Canada a nation. Mr. Speaker, I shall have occasion to refer later to that very long and very laboured part of the hon. gentleman's address.

Let me go back to the beginning and take up some of the things that lamentably call for answer, if it be merely for the purpose of giving information to the hon. gentleman about some things that he does not know. The hon. gentleman said that this Treaty was brought before this House

merely as an excuse for the making of a speech, and he asked why there was any need to bring the Treaty before the House, because in the first place, he said, there was nothing in it that related particularly to the Dominion of Canada, and in the second place, nothing that this Parliament might say about it could have the slightest effect upon the binding nature of that Treaty or alter its provisions by one iota,—by the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t," I think he said. He said that this Parliament could do nothing in the matter because the Treaty was signed some months ago, and signed not only on behalf of the other nations of the British Empire, but on behalf of Canada, and he asked, "What are you going to do about it?"

The hon. gentleman does not know that treaties do not bind until they are ratified. The hon. gentleman who has talked so eloquently about our status as one of the nations of the British Empire apparently does not know that this Treaty was signed by the British Empire. He does not know that when you want the signature of the British Empire you get the signatures of all the nations that constitute the British Empire. The hon. gentleman does not know that, just as he does not know what a most elementary knowledge of international law would have taught him, that treaties do not bind until they are ratified. He does not know that when the British Empire proceeds to ratify a treaty it takes the whole British Empire to do it. Why, the hon. gentleman whom I have congratulated on sharing our views on Canada's national status, has not quite fully grasped what it means. He still imagines, as other hon. gentlemen opposite who spoke on this matter at the last session of the House evidently imagined, that there is a something somewhere which is the British Empire and which makes treaties, and that there is a Canada standing off on the side, and that the British Empire is making and ratifying treaties, or refusing to ratify treaties while Canada stands on the side not interested in the slightest degree.

Mr. FIELDING: Does my hon. friend mean to say that if this Treaty be not approved by the Parliament of Canada it will not be binding on the whole British Empire just the same, having been approved by His Majesty the King?

Mr. DOHERTY: This Treaty has not as yet been ratified by His Majesty the King. His Majesty the King, as the constitutional sovereign of Canada just as much as he is the constitutional sovereign of the United Kingdom, has adopted as his guide of action that he will not ratify a treaty binding upon the entire Empire until he has had the advice of the Governments of each and every one of the self-governing nations that make up the Empire. His Majesty the King does not sign on behalf of the Empire because the United Kingdom tells him to do so.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend has hardly met my question. Is the approval of this Treaty by this Dominion essential to the binding effect of the Treaty?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes. In order that the Treaty shall bind the British Empire it is necessary that it shall be executed with the approval of all the self-governing nations of the British Empire, and Canada is one of them.

Mr. FIELDING: And if this Parliament should for any reason not approve, this Bulgarian Treaty would have no effect?

Mr. DOHERTY: I am not saying it would have no effect, but it would have no effect so far as Canada is concerned. It would not bind the British Empire. It would bind, if you will, such parts of the British Empire as chose to ratify it, but it would not bind the whole British Empire. Have hon. gentlemen read the Treaty?

Mr. FIELDING: No.

Mr. DOHERTY: I am not surprised then.

Mr. FIELDING: There is not an hon. member of this House who has read it.

Mr. DOHERTY: Much is now clear to me.—Hon. gentlemen have not read the Treaty.

Mr. FIELDING: Does my hon. friend say he has read it?

Mr. DOHERTY: I have read it and reread it, and I did not get very far into it until I found out that one of the parties to the Treaty is the British Empire.

Mr. W. L. MACKENZIE KING: Did my hon. friend find any mention of Canada in the Treaty?

Mr. DOHERTY: Certainly I did. In the very opening paragraphs of the Treaty His Majesty the King of Great Britain and Ireland and of the British Dominions overseas and as Emperor of India,—acting in those capacities for the entire Empire—when he came to tell for whom and through whom he acted thought it worth while to mention Canada.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My right hon. friend has not answered the question I asked. He says he read the Treaty through and I have asked him to be kind enough to inform the House whether on any page of that Treaty there is any mention whatever of Canada, not in the signatures but in the text of the Treaty.

Mr. DOHERTY: Does my hon. friend wish to know whether there was some special thing that was provided for Canada?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No; that is not the question.

Mr. DOHERTY: There was no mention of Canada because we were not looking for anything special. But, Mr. Speaker, it is significant that this question should be asked by the hon. gentleman who boasts of his pride in Canada's status as a nation standing on a footing of equality. What is the tacit suggestion of his question? It is virtually this: Unless we wanted some particular thing for Canada, this great nation, of which he is so proud, should not have had anything to do with the Treaty. My hon. friend said he did not read the Treaty. Let me point out to him—

Mr. FIELDING: Will the minister pardon me? It was I who said that I had not read the Treaty. I tried to do so, but I may confess that I did not read every line, for I found it too arduous a task.

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not care to go further than to point out who are parties to the Treaty and how they are constituted. The party for whom His Majesty is acting is the British Empire, but His Majesty knows what it is that constitutes the Empire and he therefore informed those with whom he was contracting that when he contracted for the British Empire he did so on behalf of the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, India, etc. He made it clear that he contracted for Canada, Australia and the other Dominions through their plenipotentiaries, and what constituted the signature of the British Empire was the combination of all those signatures. That is why I say that if you strike off one of those signatures, or if ratification fails on the part of one of those nations, you cannot have the signature nor the ratification of the entire British Empire. About that there seems to be no room for question. It is for them who made the contract to ratify it. If the contract could not be made without the participation of all the constituent nations of the Empire, how, I ask, is it to be ratified without similar participation on the part of those nations? This is one of those things which to me seem so obvious that I can only wonder that people do not perceive it.

Mr. McKENZIE: I dare say the minister remembers that Lord Milner, speaking for the Crown authorities of Great Britain, submitted an opinion to the Canadian Government in regard to the signing of the German Treaty in which he told us that our ratification of that Treaty was not necessary?

Mr. DOHERTY: Lord Milner expressed the opinion that because our ministers had signed the Treaty, ratification was not necessary. Let me point out, however, that Lord Milner does not decide questions of that kind for Canada. There are ministers in Canada who speak for Canada on such questions, and Lord Milner received his answer in which it was pointed out that, although ministers of the British Government had signed the Treaty and it was thought necessary that government should submit it to Parliament for ratification, so we, as a nation standing on a footing of equality, claimed that the same procedure was necessary here. On this representation Lord Milner very graciously admitted that our position was right.

Now, the Treaty is here because Canada was an essential party to the making of it and therefore is necessarily an essential party to its ratification; and if the Treaty has come before this Parliament it is not because I am prepared to say that it might not have been constitutionally possible for the advice to His Majesty the King to have gone from the Governor in Council without a special authorization from Parliament. But the hon. gentleman himself (Mr. Mackenzie King) spoke eloquently of his devotion to the sound, democratic principle that treaties of this kind that were to bind Canada should not be ratified—if I mistake not, I think he said they should not be entered into—without the approval of the Parliament of Canada. And because we accepted that principle and brought the Treaty here the hon. gentleman rises in his place and says: "Why on earth did you bring it here?" Having condemned us for submitting the Treaty to Parliament, he then hunts up some Orders in Council under which we ratified the Czecho-Slovakian Treaty and another minority Treaty, and exclaims with indignation: "Here is another example of that awful procedure which we have been condemning for years past—doing these

things by Order in Council." The hon. gentleman's arguments really place one in a quandary. If we bring the Treaty to Parliament he says "Why do you bring it? Why, the whole influence of the Canadian Parliament could not take a dot off an "i" or cross a "t" in the Treaty." On the other hand, if we do not bring it before Parliament but ratify it by Order in Council he assumes an equally strong position. "Why, gentlemen," he says;—well, Sir, words are positively inadequate to express his denunciation of the Government for passing the Order in Council. How will my hon. friend have the matter done? He agrees that Canada is a nation with its obligations and rights and duties, but there does not seem to be any way in which we can satisfy him as to the method of discharging those duties. We brought that Treaty before Parliament in order that hon. members might have an opportunity to express their views on it, and I may say that we did not do so in pursuance of any new idea. We took the position from the outset that any treaty of this kind ought to be submitted to Parliament before its ratification. We held that it should be submitted to the parliaments of all the constituent nations of the Empire, and this Treaty is here because we took that view and were prepared to maintain the democratic principle which the hon. gentleman has so eloquently defined in the course of his speech. It is true that we did advise the ratification of the Czecho-Slovakian and the other minority Treaty without bringing them to Parliament, and the hon. gentleman will remember that last session some objection was raised with regard to the Austrian Treaty. We were asked the same question, "Why was it brought here?" We had announced that if the Austrian Treaty had arrived after Parliament was adjourned we would have felt authorized to advise its adoption without submitting it to Parliament by reason of the fact that Parliament, by the adoption of the German Treaty, had in effect authorized the adoption of the Austrian Treaty, which was in all its essential lines, and in everything that could affect us, identical with the former. I think that we might have stretched a point in this case, and, proceeding upon the authorization that came in respect to the German Treaty, we might have taken upon ourselves to advise ratification without bringing the Treaty here. But if it were possible to bring it here, we thought it right to bring it here because we do attach importance to maintaining the principle that treaties of this nature should be ratified only after their submission to Parliament. In that way we meet the situation that the hon. gentleman contends for and that we have provided for, namely, that no treaty of this importance shall ever be binding upon Canada unless, before it becomes binding, it has obtained the approval of the Parliament of Canada.

This treaty with Bulgaria, signed as it was some months ago, is not binding on Canada yet. It is the action of the King, or the ultimate action of the King, taken on the advice of the Canadian Government, which advice will be given only when this Parliament acts, that will make that treaty binding upon Canada.

The hon. gentleman has pointed out, as I have said before, that there is nothing in this Treaty of special interest to Canada and therefore he adds: Why should Canada have anything to do with it? Canada has something to do with it because the Empire has something to do with it and because without Canada there is no Empire.

Mr. BELAND: Taking, for example the German Treaty, suppose that four or five nations of the British Empire had given their assent to the ratification and one had refused that assent, what, in the opinion of the minister, would have been the action of His Majesty?

Mr. DOHERTY: It is perhaps rash for me to answer a question based upon the hypothesis which the hon. gentleman puts. I cannot tell what His Majesty would have done. That is something that I would not like to take upon myself to say but I do venture this expression of opinion—I might say conviction—that whatever His Majesty did in the absence of the assent of one of the self-governing nations of the Empire, would not constitutionally be binding upon the entire Empire and more particularly would not be binding upon that nation of the Empire which had withheld its assent. What would be the effect upon the existence of the Empire of a divergence of that kind is another question. What would be the necessary consequence of such a situation arising is something the discussion of which I would not like to enter upon at the present moment. My impression is that the consequence might be very grave indeed. But this after all is only a consequence of the fact that the great thing that holds this Empire together is that we have so far found it possible to get together on the great, vital and important questions, and for my part I have abundant confidence that for years, and years,

and years—I might venture to say centuries —we shall continue in that happy position. It is not necessary for me to undertake to prophesy what will happen after the nations of the British Empire disappear. All I am concerned with is to point out that in order to get the evidence of their agreement you must have the action of all of them.

The hon. gentleman, in dilating upon the entire absence of reason for bringing this Treaty here, intimated that at the last session of Parliament there had been no diffence of opinion about the League of Nations. He seemed to have entirely forgotten that the hon. gentleman who sits next to him (Mr. Fielding) had proposed to amend the League of Nations and to put in a reservation to one of its provisions.

Mr. McMASTER: Is it not true that the reservation proposed by my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) last year was almost identical with the interpretation of clause 10 given by the Minister of Justice himself?

Mr. DOHERTY: I am not criticising the amendment which was proposed. I am only pointing out that the hon. gentleman says that there was no difference of opinion upon it when as a matter of fact there was, in the opinion of the hon. gentleman, a sufficient substantial difference of opinion that he thought it necessary to divide the House upon it. Now they tell us that they took up the time of the House with a division about something that did not differ materially from what the Minister of Justice thought.

Mr. KING: Just for the sake of accuracy in the matter, as I recollect the amendment of my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) it was to the effect that in so far as military service was concerned, nothing Parliament was doing in approving the Treaty would countenance Canada's taking part in future wars excepting with the approval of the Parliament of Canada. That was the substance of the amendment and that is practically what we are contending for to-day.

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not think the hon. gentleman has quite accurately analysed the effect of the amendment proposed but I do not believe we would gain anything by threshing out what the amendment was or whether it should have been adopted or not. I only mentioned it to show that there was something or other that arose in connection with the League of Nations which necessitated dividing this House and that did not seem to be quite consistent with the statement that there had been no difference of opinion in connection with the provisions of the League of Nations. The hon. gentleman also dealt with some observations of the President of the Privy Council in which he had reiterated our views in regard to the League of Nations, the Labour clauses, and other provisions. It may be that it was not absolutely necessary to do that but after all it was very eloquently and effectively done and I think this House will quite forgive the President of the Privy Council for having impressed these things not only upon the House and the public of Canada but upon a public that is wider than the public of Canada. The same thing might be said in this connection in reference to matters in regard to which the position of Canada was reaffirmed in the speech of the hon. gentleman.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. King) also dilated upon the possible distinction between what we meant when we said that Canada was a nation and something else that might be considered essential to Canada's being a nation. I do not grasp what the distinction is that the hon. gentleman is seeking to make. I do not realize that there may be respects in which Canada is not an absolutely sovereign state, but I confess I know of no national attribute of which Canada is not possessed. It does not prevent Canada's being a nation that she should be joined and associated with other nations, acting in co-operation with them in the partnership that we call either the British Empire or the British Commonwealth, as you will. As to the meaning to be attached to either of these words, I think if you applied the technical meaning to the word "Empire," the old-fashioned meaning which implied dominating over other powers, it would be incorrect to talk about the British Empire. The domination feature has long since disappeared, and certainly so far as the nations that compose that Empire are concerned, to state that we are all now on a footing of equality, would describe our relation to each other, and the term "Empire" is not perhaps the one to apply to a combination of nations so constituted. From my own part I think that "Commonwealth" is a most excellent word, but I would not quarrel with the words employed, anyway.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am afraid that my right hon. friend has misunderstood what I said. I was not taking exception to the word "Commonwealth"—in fact, I prefer the use of the word "Commonwealth" to the use of the word "Empire." What I was endeavouring to point

out was that the question of determining the status of Canada as a nation depends entirely upon the meaning to be attached to the term made use of. According to the way in which the word " Empire " is used, it may mean an excellent thing, or it may mean the very opposite. The same with regard to the word " Nation."

Mr. DOHERTY: I think there is a distinction to be made between a sovereign state and a nation. The latter may be a nation and not a full sovereign state. I do not propose to enter into the question of whether or not Canada is entitled to, or claims to be a full sovereign state. The hon. gentleman has discussed the question of Canada's status, and here I want to be careful; I am not claiming anything for anybody; I am only stating a fact. At the conference of 1917 we had the catagorical announcement by the United Kingdom, and assented to of course by all the Dominions, that the status of Canada, and of the Dominions within the Empire, was the status of nations standing on a footing of equality. We got this much further, and I should not say that, because the one thing I want to avoid is the evoking of discussion on the ground of what we are claiming for ourselves. We are happy to rejoice over what Canada has got, and let the glory go to anybody who thinks it is worth while to hunt out and claim that glory for himself. So long as Canada has the great substantial benefit accruing from that status our hearts are rejoiced and are proud for Canada's sake. What did happen that was made manifest to the world was this: We had been clearly and unmistakably acknowledged to be in the family circle in the resolution of 1917. There remained for us, if I may use the expression, to be taken out and introduced into the society of nations as a nation among the other nations. The old Mother Nation took us up and presented us to the other nations and said: These are the nations of my family; we will not stop to talk about definitions, I am bringing them into the society of nations; that is the society they are coming into. That is what happened. And that I contend is of very great value, not as making us a nation, but as giving evidence that the world recognizes.

The hon. gentleman referred to a couple of resolutions which were upon the Order Paper as indicating in some way a lack of completeness in respect of national status on our part. Now nobody has ever disputed that legally the legislative power is supreme in the Parliament of the United Kingdom and it follows that the British North America Act—though in reality and in substance a compact between the provinces is in form an act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom. Such being the case when that Act has to be modified we have to go through the form of addressing ourselves to that Parliament of the United Kingdom. But to suggest that that throws any doubt upon our constitutional status as a nation within this Empire I think only implies a confusion between what may be the requirements of law and what, side by side with those requirements of law, may be the constitutional rights of the nations or peoples within the Empire. We have the two things, we have the law and the constitution, and they do not always agree—sometimes they are in absolute contradiction.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That was exactly my position.

Mr. DOHERTY: The hon. gentleman went on to say, apropos of this condition, that what we ought to have, instead of what we are asking in these resolutions, is a power in this Parliament, subject to the concurrence of the provinces, to amend our own constitution. In that I am most heartily at one with the hon. gentleman. I am not quite certain how the idea came to him but it does happen to be a fact that before the hon. gentleman made the suggestion, before this matter arose in the House at all, I had taken up that very question with the attorneys general of the several provinces and in discussing these resolutions on the Order Paper with some gentlemen upon the opposite side of the House, I so informed them. I do not know whether that was the way the idea came back to the hon. gentleman or not; but if it should not be so it only shows how great minds naturally converge upon the same idea.

Mr. BELAND: The leader of the Opposition spoke to me about it last year.

Mr. DOHERTY: I am glad that the hon. gentleman (Mr. King) has given due reflection to the subject but the fact is as I have stated. I rather inferred, therefore, that the way I have explained is the way it came about. At all events I am glad to be confirmed now in my own view. I am all the more glad to find that I was confirmed in advance by the leader of the Opposition. We will have the opportunity, I hope, to co-operate in bringing about the desired result and we will not stop to quar-

rel about who is entitled to the credit of having thought about it first.

I was going to say one or two words with regard to the question as to what party did most to make Canada a nation. It is discouraging, it makes one wonder whether we have reached a national size after all when we cannot venture to congratulate each other and advance in our national status without at once falling into a bickering dispute as to who did the most to bring it about. I might go back to the past and claim for the men of the Conservative party—for the men of the Liberal-Conservative party at all events—

An Hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. DOHERTY: —the party of Cartier and Macdonald, who did so much to build up this Confederation,—I might claim that they at the outset, accomplished perhaps as much as my friend's distinguished ancestor, (William Lyon Mackenzie) and Louis Joseph Papineau, by their readiness to stand up for the national status of Canada in those days.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: They did not take the same chances.

Mr. DOHERTY: Sir George Cartier took his share in the movement, and his name to-day stands high in the regard of all Canadians.

The hon. gentleman cited from the speech of the President of the Privy Council that one of the great steps in the building up of this nation was Confederation. I had an idea that John A. Macdonald had something to do with Confederation.

Mr. McMASTER: He opposed it to the very last; George Brown brought about Confederation

Mr. DOHERTY: I had the idea that Macdonald and Cartier and many of their followers were Conservatives. And yet the hon. gentleman cites from a speech that recognizes, and rightly recognizes, what an immense step in the building up of our national edifice was Confederation, and then he says, "The Liberal party did it all."

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I beg my hon. friend's pardon—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member can only interrupt the Minister of Justice for the purpose of asking a question.

Mr. DOHERTY: If I have fallen into an error I shall be glad to be set right.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I merely rise to correct a mis-statement. My hon. friend asserted that I had said that the Liberal party did it all. If certain names were not mentioned in what I quoted, it is not my fault; I was simply quoting from the speech of the President of the Privy Council.

Mr. DOHERTY: At all events, my hon. friend impressed upon this House that the President of the Privy Council had at some time taken that attitude. Well, the President of the Privy Council is a very eloquent advocate of the causes in which he believes, and I do not want to criticize what he may have said in earlier days. We all can recognize in him, at all events, the capacity for appreciating the light as it becomes brighter and more widespread,—

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. DOHERTY: —and I have not any doubt that to-day he will find a place for the men I have mentioned among those who contributed to the building up of this nation.

I might cite speeches of Sir Robert Borden and of certain of his colleagues in the course of the Naval Debate of 1910, and I might also cite his speeches made at the very centre of the Empire in 1912 in which he stated in no uncertain tones that Canada would not be the adjunct of any nation whatsoever, nay, not even an adjunct of the British Empire.

Gentlemen, let us be fair all round. Let us recognize that there is a Canada in which we all have a share; let us recognize that part of our great inheritance as Canadians is the distinguished men that Canada has given us in the past,—and some of whom remain with us to the present day; let us recognize that those men are the pride and the glory of the Canada that in its entirety is the country of each one of us, and let us try to recall what they have done rather than say, "It was I; it was not you." Let us say: "That is what Canadians in the past did, and it is by deeds of that kind that this Canadian nation has been built up." And allow me to add a word—in which I am only joining with the hon. gentleman, —let us never forget that in rendering comparatively easy the fruition of that work the coping stone that confirmed the status we all rejoice in was laid by the soldiers who proved, as by no other means it could be proved, that Canadians had in them the stuff that made them worthy to have their country recognized as a nation, so that Canada could take her place in bearing the burdens of the world, and that having so taken her place, without counting the cost or the sacrifice, she was entitled to the open, ample and ungrudging recognition of

the world that she stood as a nation among nations, entitled to be heard not only concerning matters that interested her immediately, but to be heard in council when the Great Nations gathered together to devise what was best for the world and best for mankind. Let us see if from now on we cannot start out with one subject upon which we can be in agreement.

As I have said, I would willingly admit that all of the credit belongs to the predecessors in title of the Liberals who sit opposite to me. If it is necessary I will say that, happily, all the credit to-day belongs to the gentlemen who sit upon the other side of the House. But after I have said that I shall still rejoice for that fact which stands out beyond peradventure, that when the nations gathered together there was a place for the Canadian nation. And I am sure that on both sides of this House we can, after all, appreciate the fact of how little importance it is whether at one time men who called themselves Liberals and at another time men who called themselves Conservatives were doing the work.

In regard to the question of our national status, we might well take a leaf out of the book of the Mother Country, where they recognize that the relations of the country with the outside world, in other words, its foreign policy, is not a matter for party politics, but is carried on by government after government on well defined consistent lines, each successive administration profiting by the wisdom of its predecessor, and anxious to hand on in its turn some additional principle that may be availed of by its successor. Surely on this common ground of "Canada a Nation" we can stand together and rejoice together in the work of all those great Canadians who have helped to build up Canada, to all of whom without discrimination we are so grateful, and of all of whom without discrimination we are so proud.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon. HENRI SEVERIN BELAND (Beauce): Mr. Speaker, the resolution submitted for our approval is in all respects identical with the one that was presented for our consideration at the last session of Parliament, which session was called especially that we might give our assent to the Treaty with Germany. In the course of his remarks the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) made to this side of the House what one might call a supplication that we should be unanimous with regard to this resolution. I do not rise for the purpose of offering factious opposition to the resolution; but it appears somewhat strange that Canada should be requested on this occasion to assent to a Treaty between the Allied and Associated Powers and Bulgaria, and that seemingly with the object of permitting His Majesty the King of England to ratify it. The man in the street, little conversant as he is with the affairs of the Balkan Peninsula, will undoubtedly be somewhat startled when he is made aware of the necessity for this Parliament to give its assent to such a Treaty, and the question will inevitably be asked whether it is true that such a radical and fundamental change in the political or international status of Canada has taken place. Last year the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) and the President of the Council (Mr. Rowell), and again this year the President of the Council, in periods pregnant with eloquence, repeatedly assured us of a powerful evolution, almost a revolution, in our political status which has brought Canada to the fore as a full-fledged nation in the councils of the world. No man in Canada is prouder than myself to see my country attain the status to which it is entitled by its economic development, by its almost inexhaustible natural resources in land, forest, fisheries, minerals and water-powers; by its ever-increasing manufacturing industries; by its geographical situation as between two great oceans; by its sturdy, thrifty, vigorous and labour-loving population, and last, but not least, by the heroic deeds of Canada's sons on the battlefields of Europe. These efforts of our soldiers were directed towards preventing the world from falling a victim to militaristic domination; but I fail to see in what extraordinary degree Canada is gaining nationally or internationally. The words "Canada's status," "Canada a nation," have been resounding in our ears from the treasury benches, during last session and also during this session; but since the days when Sir Wilfrid Laurier returned from the Imperial Conferences of 1897, 1902, 1907, 1909, with what I would call complete autonomy in matters commercial, in matters of immigration and in matters naval and military, a sentiment of national pride has pervaded the mind and soul of every man in Canada. That Canada is a nation is no new discovery. Canada was recognized as an autonomous nation many years before the war; but whilst up to the war Canada had inter-

national obligations commensurate with her national status, to-day the indications are that the equilibrium is destroyed by the predominance of international obligations over the political international advantages.

Let not my words, however, be construed as meaning that I offer any opposition to the creation or establishment of a League of Nations. There is, I think, a unanimous sentiment in this country in favour of the establishment of such a League which will doubtless prove to be an effective instrument for the maintenance of peace in the world. But Canada is not an independent nation; Canada is not a sovereign nation; and one has only to travel a few miles on the European continent or even in Great Britain to become fully aware of that fact. If I desired to prolong my remarks, I could quote many instances when, during my last trip to Europe, I was confronted with situations that made it perfectly plain and clear to me that Canada was not a sovereign nation and was not enjoying the same status as the United Kingdom, although the contrary has been affirmed and reaffirmed time and again in this House.

Moreover, a suggestion was made this afternoon by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) that we must be at one with the other nations of the Empire; to differ with the other four nations of the Empire would be fraught with the gravest consequences. Here is a Treaty to which we are asked to assent, though our plenipotentiaries were breathing the pure air of Canada when its provisions were discussed, and drafted, and signed. It is true our good friend the High Commissioner for Canada in London has affixed his signature to this Treaty; but who will doubt for one moment that Sir George Perley crossed the Channel only for a few hours; that on a cool, bracing, beautiful morning of last autumn he took an automobile ride to this delightful little town called Neuilly-sur-Seine, that he signed the Treaty, undoubtedly without reading it, and that a few hours afterwards he re-entered the capital of France only to rush across the Channel again to his absorbing duties in London, and the next morning or perhaps the same day the news was flashed across the ocean that Canada had signed the Treaty of Peace? And Canada has signed the Treaty. We may take it for granted that at the time this perfunctory act was discharged by Sir George Perley, not one of our ministers, surely not the members of this Parliament and the people of this country knew or had the remotest idea of some of the provisions of this Treaty. Would you think, Sir, for instance, that the President of the Council, or my right hon. friend (Sir George Foster), who leads the House, knew anything about a certain point 1295 situated about 18 kilometres west of Kuchuk-Derbend, as a part of the boundary between Greece and Serbia? Or anything about the apex of a salient formed by the frontier of the Treaty of Sofia, 1915, about 10 kilometres east south-east of Jisr Mustafa Pasha? It is a matter of history, however, that Sir George Perley has signed this Treaty without a smile.

The contention has been made in this House that Canada has attained a new status, a position that she did not enjoy and of which she could not boast before the war. We all recall the pathetic picture which was drawn of the struggle made by the representatives of Canada at the door of the Peace Conference. To use a phrase that was used in this House once by the late Mr. Israel Tarte, our representatives "fought like blazes" to gain admittance into the room. I do not want to minimize the honour or the advantage accruing to Canada by participation in the Peace Conference, but I say that no struggle should have been necessary on the part of our representatives to enter the Peace Conference. Canada had supplied 500,000 men, 60,000 of whom had fallen for the cause of the allied countries, and when the representatives of the allied countries got together in conference to settle the terms of peace I submit that no objection whatever should have been offered to the presence of the Canadian representatives.

Of the League of Nations, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to say anything because I do not want to prolong my remarks, except to attempt to correct what I consider is a wrong impression conveyed, not intentionally I am sure, by some hon. ministers regarding the voting power of Canada. In Article 4 of the Covenant it is provided that a nation that is interested in a dispute under consideration and which is not a member of the council may be invited to send a representative to sit in the council. It has been claimed by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) and also by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) that sitting in the council in that way, as an invited guest, as it were, Canada would have the power to register a vote. But a perusal of subsequent clauses of the Covenant shows clearly that whenever Canada, or indeed any nation that is a member of the League, is interested in a dispute she is precluded from voting.

That the League of Nations will render immense services to mankind we cannot doubt. We need only recall the effects that the enactment of the Industrial Disputes Act has had in Canada, and if we may compare a big thing with a small thing we may expect that the League of Nations will at least render to the nations of the earth the service that has been rendered to this country by the Industrial Disputes Act.

Now, what is the new status of Canada within the Empire? No one so far has been able to draw from the Government the particulars of the new situation, if there is a new situation. It is true we have been told that Canada is one of five equal nations in the Empire, but when in the course of a debate last year my hon. friend the President of the Privy Council was invited by my hon. friend from Chambly and Vercheres (Mr. Archambault) to name the nations that constitute the British Empire he replied that the British nation was composed of five nations equal in status, namely, the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa. The claim has been made repeatedly that they are all on an absolutely equal footing in matters Imperial, and, I take it, also in matters international. Now let us see whether the claim is well founded. In order to ascertain whether the contention is just we must proceed by way of illustration. Surely the Parliament of Canada has no more extensive powers than the Parliament of the United Kingdom. That, I think, will be accepted as gospel by my friends on the other side. Last year we had some very interesting declarations from the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden), whom I am sorry not to see in this House at the present moment. He made the declaration that if Canada refused to assent to the German Treaty, His Majesty the King would not ratify it. Have I represented faithfully the declaration of the Prime Minister? If my hon. friends do not object, then I shall go on;—this is becoming more and more interesting as we proceed. For, if the British Empire is composed of five equal nations all enjoying an equal share of autonomy and power and discretion, it is only natural to presume that in some instances one of those nations will differ from the others. We might have a case, for instance, where the United Kingdom differed from the four other nations. Now, in order to enable the House to reach a clear comprehension of what is described as "Canada's new political and international status," I would request the Government to inform the House what course would be adopted by the Sovereign in case the Parliament of the United Kingdom refused to approve this Treaty with Bulgaria after the four other nations of the Empire had given their assent to it. Would ratification take place? Would His Majesty the King yield to the wishes of the Parliament of the United Kingdom and refuse to ratify? Or would he yield to the will of the parliaments of these four other nations of the Empire and sign the Treaty? Whichever course he took, the consequences would be formidable for the United Kingdom. If the United Kingdom as one of five equal nations of the Empire refused to assent to a treaty accepted by the other four nations, there would be only one course open to the United Kingdom, and that would be to drop out of the British Empire. In other words, if one of the five nations refuses to assent to a treaty, then ipso facto a severance of that nation from the Empire takes place. I submit that this proposition, so preposterous, so impossible, so absurd and ridiculous as it appears, has its confirmation from no less an authority than the Prime Minister himself. During the consideration last year of the German Treaty, the right hon. gentleman, in presenting the resolution to the House, was subjected to a number of questions from hon. gentlemen on this side, and I shall read a passage from Hansard in which he makes a definite statement in reply to the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding). At page 22 of Volume 1, 1919, (Special Session) this question is put to the Prime Minister:

> What difference does it make to us, the Empire, or the world, if we never ratify the Treaty at all?

In answer the Prime Minister said:

> It makes this difference. Canada would stand out of and apart from the rest of the Empire ratifying the Treaty. It would virtually, I think, commit Canada to such absolutely independent action that she could not be regarded in the future as acting in co-operation with the other nations of the Empire.

So that in the event of the United Kingdom refusing to give her assent to a treaty to which the four other nations had assented, the United Kingdom would have to drop out of the British Empire! This, surely, would be a very grave occurrence. Whatever, therefore, may be the Canadian national interest in regard to the provisions of any given treaty, if we dared to disagree we would ipso facto be wiped out of the Britannic Commonwealth—that is,

if the explanation and interpretations given by the members of the Government are to be relied upon. The Minister of Justice, has sat, I am sure, on very many occasions on a court of revision in the province of Quebec, and I feel satisfied that in filling that office, in the able manner in which he has always performed his duties, some instances have arisen in which he differed from the two other judges. Yet he was not thrown out of the court; he remained in the court and the judgment was rendered.

Mr. DOHERTY: Does my hon. friend not realize the difference between the two things? In the court you have a provision of law which enables the majority to render judgment. In the present instance you have five nations constituting one Empire, and if the assent of that Empire is needed there is no provision by which the majority or any one of them can overrule any of the constituent nations. There is a manifest distinction between the two cases, I think.

Mr. BELAND: I see the distinction perfectly, but I should like to know how it comes that there is no such provision in this matter. There should be a provision by which, if one of the nations differed, it should not be read out of the British Empire because of that difference; and if this provision is lacking I say that the whole responsibility rests upon the shoulders of my hon. friend. Until the Constitutional Conference which is to be held in London has taken place, no man amongst ordinary mortals can definitely state whether Canada has advanced or receded in recent times. This state of the proceedings is very nebulous indeed. It has been affirmed that Canada has undergone an organic change of political status. We have been told that three courses were open to us: First, to fall back into the colonial state; second, to develop as a free nation within the Empire; and third, to declare our independence. The President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) makes the emphatic protestation that he refuses to recede to the colonial state. So do we. The hon. minister rejects with indignation any suggestion of the severance of British connection. So do we. The middle course, that is, the development of Canadian autonomy within the Empire, he embraces passionately. So do we. I will add, however, that this has been the policy of the Liberal party since the year 1896; but there may be a different appreciation of what constitutes progress in the direction of enlarging national status. And I say, with the leader of the Opposition, that if the development contemplated is to surrender to an Imperial Cabinet the autonomy we now enjoy in naval and military questions, and in questions concerning participation in wars and expenditures in connection therewith—and there are signs of this surrender on the horizon—then I say we are retrogressing and not advancing. I would warn the Government, if they will accept my warning, that in shaping the new political edifice which is in the vision of some imperialistic genius of England we should not start at the roof, the imperial cabinet. The edifice would undoubtedly be an imperial parliament, which would be founded on the desire of all parliaments within the Empire to be consulted. If those parliaments were consulted, judging by what I hear all over this country, you would not find any response to your call if you wanted to concentrate and centralize in London the administration of this Dominion. I can only repeat what was so ably said the other day, and at the conclusion of the last session, by my hon. friend, the member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe). He adequately represented the opinion of the Canadian people when he requested that this Parliament and this country be consulted before any scheme of Imperial Federation be launched, or indeed before any step is taken to alter the present status of Canada.

As far as I am concerned, I wish Godspeed to the nations of the Balkan peninsula. As to Bulgaria, I hope she may be happy; the Peace Conference has paid a great deal of attention to the welfare of the different races that may inhabit that country. The Treaty which is submitted to us contains a whole section—section 4—in the political clauses, devoted to the protection of minorities. This is certainly the section of the Treaty that appeals to me the most. Reading this section, and the political clauses of the Treaty generally, we are apt to wonder how in the world it is possible that we Canadians should have entered a conflict raging some three thousand miles away from us for the vindication of certain principles, when the very principles for which we have struggled, fought and vanquished, for which we have lost 60,000 of the flower and youth of this country, may not be upheld in certain important sections of Canada itself. The reflection comes to the mind of the casual observer that the minorities of the vanquished nations have profited more than the minorities of the victorious nations. For, if we turn to the Treaty, and in particular

to the clauses I have referred to, we find that it contains an enunciation of the principles which are deeply rooted in and inseparable from the heart and soul of every free man. I refer to the privileges guaranteed to linguistic and religious minorities. Nothing is more closely related to the love of God than religious creed, and nothing is more intimately associated with maternal love than the language learned at the knee of the dear parent. That these sacred and fundamental principles should have a place in the Treaty of Peace is an indication to me, Mr. Speaker, that they must have been ignored or disregarded and that the necessity of their public and solemn recognition is imperative.

In this respect the Treaty of Peace appeals to me more than in any other respect. It is a proclamation to the world at large that these principles should be upheld by all countries, and that this is undoubtedly the wish of the five Great Powers. Let me quote a few sentences by way of illustration. When you come to page 24 of the Treaty you are right in the heart of the clauses that deal with the protection of minorities. Here is article 53. I shall read a paragraph:

> All Bulgarian nationals shall be equal before the law and shall enjoy the same civil and political rights without distinction as to race, language or religion.

Let us go one step further—Article 54:

> Bulgarian nationals who belong to racial, religious or linguistic minorities shall enjoy the same treatment and security in law and in fact as the other Bulgarian nationals.

Article 55:

> Bulgaria will provide in the public educational system in towns and districts in which a considerable proportion of Bulgarian nationals of other than Bulgarian speech are resident, adequate facilities——

Adequate facilities.

> ——for ensuring that in the primary schools the instruction shall be given to the children of such Bulgarian nationals through the medium of their own language.

And the last paragraph:

> In towns and districts where there is a considerable proportion of Bulgarian nationals belonging to racial, religious or linguistic minorities, these minorities shall be assured an equitable share in the enjoyment and application of sums which may be provided out of public funds under the State, municipal or other budgets, for educational, religious or charitable purposes.

The nine articles of section 4 are in themselves a code of tolerance.

Resuming my seat, let me say that we concur in the resolution which is submitted to us. We have only to reaffirm the position taken last year as to the supremacy and sovereignty of the Canadian Parliament in the matter of participating in war as involved in Article 10. We are in accord with the Treaty because it embodies those principles of tolerance and justice which should be spread throughout the length and breadth of this country, for they constitute the foundation of a united Canada.

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE E. FOSTER (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I had no idea of speaking on this phase of the discussion which has been carried on in reference to the approval of the Bulgarian Treaty, and I disclaim any idea of making a speech at the present time. I would not have been on my feet had it not been for one remark made by the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King), and reiterated by my hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Béland). I have been, if the House will allow me to say so, pleased with the spirit of the discussion which has taken place upon this Treaty.

In fact I might go a little further and say that I have been pleased with the tone of discussions in this House since the opening of the present session of Parliament; and I indulge the hope, as I most certainly cherish the desire, that we who begin our parliamentary work of this session in these new, artistic and ample surroundings, will express the spirit of this great edifice in its harmony of purpose, in its spiritualization of stone and wood into ideas and sentiments, and that it will have a restraining influence on all of us to be more kindly in our treatment of each other as partisans taking different angles of view, and will temper somewhat, and I hope greatly, what is apt in the best of us to degenerate sometimes into a mischievous, if not a malicious, baiting and hurting of one another.

For instance there is my hon. friend from Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau). I meet him in the corridor, and I sit with him in the club once in a while. We converse together, and he thinks I am a very fair type of humanity. And, without any stretch of imagination or any great compulsion put upon me, I am making up my mind that, taken altogether, he is a pretty good sort of a fellow. We find that our ideas run pretty nearly parallel to each other, and as we sit and talk he would not try to make me feel that he thought I was a thief, a dishonest man, corrupt, over-extravagant, and everything of that kind. Now, when we leave our social converse, where we meet man to man, and separate ourselves

on two sides of the House, the spirit of the aggregate gets into us, the spirit of the party, and when we get on our feet we look at each other through somewhat different glasses from those through which we see one another socially. But we are just as good men sitting opposite each other here as we were sitting side by side socially outside; and in the heart of each of us, no matter what he may be impelled to say in the heat and strife of party politics, we think the same of each other individually here as we did outside. Out of the Chamber we go back again to our social converse and we relapse into about the same relative attitude one to another.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Say that in French.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Well, what I hope is that as we grow older and more experienced we will try and keep that softened and human spirit even in our strongest and bitterest debates and so make them less strong in that sense and less bitter. How often I think of things that I have said a long time ago, when I was more vigorous than I am now, and wish maybe that I had not said quite all I did say; and sometimes I feel that the same thought has come to others who have said things about me. Well, we grow wiser as we grow older, but we cannot try any too much along the line of keeping with us that human kindliness even in our party debates and our partisan discussions.

Now that is not in the way of a lecture; it is just in the way of a word by a man who has been a long time in politics, party and otherwise and who, looking over the past and the present and a little towards the future, feels that we might have done more if we had been less partisan and had thrown all the best of us into the treasury of the common good for the benefit of the country.

A great deal is said about our national status. I am not sure but that we have talked nearly enough about it for a while. It seems to me as if now we had pretty well "sturdied" ourselves, if there is such a word. We know where we are and there is not any difference between us as it seems. Suppose we take it for granted that we have an improved status—and let it go at that for a little while.

Having come to a point of virtual agreement, that is a good point for us to start from. And, having a common opinion with reference to what we are and just how great and how strong we are, let us put that greatness and strength into the push forward for the development and betterment of our common country. We all know this is necessary. We have different points of view and these different points of view will grade our expressions, grade our feelings; but at heart we love our country equally, and we are equally anxious that our country shall get the best that is in us for its betterment and development.

I have found that some of the things that I have got most praise for—and I have never got a great deal of praise for anything I have done, from hon. gentlemen opposite anyway—were things that fell into my lap, things that I could not help but be for when they came to fruition. But the fruit was not my fruit; it was the development of years and years before, which, under proper cultivation long continued, proper sunlight, and proper atmosphere, just at that particular time came to the period of its fruition, and the man who happened to be at the head of affairs, who happened to have taken that line and who therefore foresaw that development—and which had come out as a sort of fulfilment of the prophesy of his own—got the credit of it when the most part of that credit did not belong to him at all. Happily for him fruition came in his time. So, when we talk about Laurier founding a nation, or if we talk of others having founded and made the status of a nation within a certain time, let us be modest about it; for this nationhood that is given to us is the growth of centuries and has had its gradual evolution. We never would have had the nation and the status we have to-day if we had not first had Confederation. That was the forming point, the foundation; our after-greatness aggregated and developed upon that foundation. We never would have had Confederation if we had not had the earnest, honest, straightforward laborious struggle and work of the explorers, the voyageurs, the colonizers and the developers of earlier days.

Confederation came as a fruit of the effort and development that preceded it, and in that work all had a share as in Confederation all had a share. And so what has developed since Confederation has been an evolution from within outward—and happy are we on each side of the House that we have been connected with that evolution and have worked in conformity with its spirit, and consequently, aided by it, have also aided in the result by our own efforts. I say this as, for myself, I have often found it a good thing to think that we all owe so much to the spirit that is about

us, which develops without our efforts, with which we are consonant and with which we sympathize, and with which, to a certain extent, we work, but without which we ourselves would have been powerless to bring about the results.

Now, I had no thought of speaking in this line at all, but I want to say a word or two about a remark made by my hon. friend who has just taken his seat. He reiterated what we stood for on this side, and he reaffirmed his belief in those things. He agrees with us; we all agree with him with reference to that. But the leader of the Opposition made a remark which I would rather not have heard made, although he may think it proper to make it,—and maybe it is; I am not criticising it harshly. He said, "I fear,"—and when he said what he feared I wished in my heart that he had sat down before he voiced his fear, because he rather spoiled the effect of his speech. He said: I agree with what has been done in the matter of our status, its evolution, its strengthening, its gradual extension, its present position; but I fear Imperial centralization. If my hon. friends on the other side have—I will not call it a simulated fear—if they have an honest fear in that respect, it is their duty to voice it and to guard against that fear being realized. But what strikes me is that their fear is groundless in so far as Canada is concerned. Canada is the mistress of her own fortunes. It is not what an isolated man in England may have as a vision of some form of centralization that is going to affect Canada that ought to give us cause for alarm. We should have that sturdy reliance upon our own set purpose and our strength to carry it out, to treat such a thing as an idle fear, because it can have no place in Canada itself. As I said before, we are the masters of our own fortunes.

What are the grounds for that fear? I have been searching for them after having heard them reiterated now and again in the country and sometimes in this House. I have failed to see them. If I did see them anywhere, I was utterly unable to see them in Canada itself. Therefore I am unmoved by them. Again let me say, we are masters of our own fortunes, and I do not know any one in this country who is in for a game of Imperial centralization which will sap to the slightest degree the autonomy and the rights and privileges that Canada to-day exercises, and means to exercise.

If there are no well-founded grounds for that fear, are we doing much of a service to our country and to the Empire to raise it into prominence, to give it, as far as we can, a body, and a threatening body, and send it out to our people raising prejudices and suspicions with reference to our relations with the Mother Country and with the other parts of the Empire? I do not think that is the best service for us to perform. But every man must be guided by his own light, and if any one thinks that there is enough in it to justify him in arousing the country against that fear—which I think is imaginary—then his responsibility is with himself,——

Mr. LAPOINTE: There is no harm done.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: —and I would not be unduly harsh in criticising what he says along that line. But for myself, I do not think it is needed, and if it is not needed I do not think it wise to throw that in among the many contentious things that we already have to cope with. Surely we have enough of realities to fight without putting up these eventualities or figments of the imagination.

I think I have had pretty nearly as wide an acquaintance with the public men of Great Britain as most hon. members here. My hon. and valued friend (Mr. Fielding) who sits opposite to me may have had a more extensive acquaintance, but I have had a fairly large acquaintance with public men in Great Britain of all political shades of opinion, and for the last twenty to twenty-five years I have had the privilege of being side by side with them in a great many different capacities and of learning their hopes, their desires, their plans with reference to the development of the British Empire. I must say, as a result of my experience, that it is not possible for me to put my hand upon any organized effort amongst the public men of Great Britain looking in the least degree towards a centralization of empire which would harm to the slightest hair's weight the automony and freedom and privileges that the overseas dominions to-day enjoy,—and which they enjoy with the good-will and perfect unanimity of the people of Great Britain.

I am not going to say that there are not cranks and extremists and faddists in Great Britain, just the same as there are in Canada. But here is where we are apt to make a mistake, in that we take the voice of some one who gets the ear of the newspapers or of the public and makes his voice widely heard—we are apt to take that as being an indication of the sentiments of the nation to which he belongs. We must be discriminating in that respect. We can take that lesson to ourselves right here in

Canada; my hon. friends can take it to themselves; my hon. friend who just sat down can take it to himself. You can take it on the language question, on the school question—you can take it on any question about which there are differences of opinion in this country. We do not get rid of the differences by saying nothing about them; at the same time, we do not get rid of them by saying too much about them, or if our statements are ill-advised and rash and reckless. But the trouble is that some extreme man in one section of the country makes a statement which is galling, rasping, unjust,—insulting if you like; and immediately, under present conditions, this is distributed to every part of the country, and it reaches that section where it hurts, where it arouses harsh feeling, and the tendency is to translate that statement as the voice of the province or of the section of the country from which its author hails. That is the chief trouble. If we could put all that class of utterance under our feet for a single decade, the unity and good feeling in this country of ours would be advanced one hundred per cent. But you cannot put it under foot. In a democratic country, how are you going to stop a man's mouth? How are you going to stop a newspaper's ink and printing press work? So long as you have those ideas and men who hold them, you will have those ideas floating about, and the injury, and the insult, and the slur will go from one and be returned by the other. If we cannot stop those individual utterances of extreme people, then, as sensible men, and not as children, we must ignore them, and not, like children, feel that we have been insulted by a whole people when one man says of us a thing that is unjust and harsh. We must be careful not to translate those sayings on the one side or the other into a general expression of the people to whom they are directed or from whom they are directed. That is the point which occurs to me. After all, I am of the opinion that there is a substantial, widespread, deep and profound unity in this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Except at election times.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: At election times —there is where we get foolish, very often get very foolish; and if we see on the outside edge of the crowd half a dozen people whom we think we can influence by a sling, or a jeer, or a slur, or a prejudice stirred up, it is human nature not to let the opportunity pass. The arrow goes; but that is an argument against the man who sends the arrow rather than otherwise. If we would just keep those poisoned-tipped arrows in our quiver—no, because we are human and might give way to temptation—

Mr. McMASTER: Destroy them.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: —if we would put them where they could not be used, we would have better politics, better social union and better sectional union in this country. I am digressing somewhat from my point as to this Imperial centralization, and I go back to it again, and I give it as my opinion, for what that may be worth, that neither in Canada, nor in the British Empire, nor in the outlying Dominions, is there anything to be feared from undue centralization, because that can never be made a fact in this British Empire. We have proceeded from the first on the line of conference, better knowledge of each other, co-operation; and the result has been splendid when you measure it up over a course of twenty-five years. I can go back thirty or thirty-five years, and I was, from my youth up, an Imperialist in that I wanted the British dominions and races and countries to work together, feel together, have the same heart, the same throbbing pulses, and the same hopes, ambitions and ideals, and to work out, on the plane of their love of justice and of freedom and their constitutional power of organization, one of the best machineries for the development and civilization of the world. Always I have had that in view. I have travelled in all those overseas dominions and I have met their men, and I have yet to find, in Australia, or South Africa, or New Zealand, or India, men who are working for an Imperial centralization. Everywhere they feel as we feel here; but there is one thing that I stand for—and I believe my hon. friends on the other side stand for it also—and that is this, that this British Empire has within its borders resources, mentality, morale, spirit of enterprise, power of organization, and ideals which, if they are combined in co-operative effort, will build up this great Empire as a unity and thereby make a force amongst the internationals of the world—a force for freedom, peace, justice, and true democracy. There is the line along which, I think, we ought to abate no effort, to leave nothing undone by conference, by co-operation. Go fifty years back and see how we have advanced by conference, by co-operation. Look forward fifty years, and if we proceed on the same lines wisely, our liberties will be broadened rather than curtailed, our politicians will

have visions wider than our politicians have to-day. Our internal development, the spirit of our people, the cultivation of that which is honest and right and the putting up before us and the world of the ideals for which our Empire has stood from the first, will be a great guiding point, a star by which others will steer in their courses across the troubled seas of world development. Whilst we grow stronger ourselves, that strength will infuse itself into the world around us and be an uplifter and a developer for all other countries as well as our own. A strong nation is for the good of the world as a whole. A strong nation founded on the principles of this nation of ours is an untold good and blessing to the world. Do not let us be carried away by these imaginery ideas of somebody wanting to chuck us all into one Imperial group and take away all our liberties. That is absurd, nobody is thinking about it who has power to carry it into operation. Anyway, we are strong enough to let anybody who wants to think that way, think that way. As I said before, we have our fortunes in our own hands.

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Verchères): Mr. Speaker, I must first congratulate the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) on the splendid utterances he has just made and his magnificent plea in favour of unity and harmony in Canada. Let us hope that his remarks will bear fruit and that they will be printed as a heading in all the literature that will be distributed by his party at the next general election.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Might I make a challenge, a defi, to my hon. friend? If we will print that at the head of our literature, will my hon. friend and his party print it at the head of all theirs?

Mr. BUREAU: Provided the body conforms with the heading.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Sure, it has always been there.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: It has always been the practice of the Liberal party to print such statements at the head of our literature. It would be very easy for me to bring before the House some pieces of literature that were distributed by hon. gentlemen opposite at the last election which had none of the earmarks of what my right hon. friend has spoken of to-night.

We are asked by this resolution to ratify the Treaty of Peace with Bulgaria, just as we have already ratified the Treaties of Peace with Germany, Austria-Hungary, Poland and other countries. Personally I do not believe it is necessary for us to ratify this Treaty at all. If England ratifies and the King signs this Treaty it makes no difference whether we ratify and sign it or not. The war with Bulgaria will not start over again. I feel, however, that it is not necessary for us to refuse to accede to the uncouth request of the Government, and I rose to-night not for the purpose of discussing the resolution at large, but to emphasize a point made by my hon. friend from Beauce (Mr. Béland). I simply wish to draw the attention of the House to a few clauses which in my opinion are of unusual interest, and from which I think some hon. members can draw a very useful lesson. If I understand aright the meaning of this resolution, by approving this Treaty Canada approves of all the principles embodied in it, and I should like to read to the House Section IV of the Treaty. It is entitled Protection of Minorities, and reads as follows:

Article 49.—Bulgaria undertakes that the stipulations contained in this Section shall be recognized as fundamental laws, and that no law, regulation or official action shall conflict or interfere with these stipulations, nor shall any law, regulation or official action prevail over them.

Article 50.—Bulgaria undertakes to assure full and complete protection of life and liberty to all inhabitants of Bulgaria without distinction of birth, nationality, language, race or religion.

All inhabitants of Bulgaria shall be entitled to the free exercise, whether public or private of any creed, religion or belief, whose practices are not inconsistent with public order or public morals.

Article 53.—All Bulgarian nationals shall be equal before the law and shall enjoy the same civil and political rights without distinction as to race, language or religion.

Difference of religion, creed or confession shall not prejudice any Bulgarian national in matters relating to the enjoyment of civil or political rights, as for instance admission to public enjoyments, functions and honours, or the exercise of professions and industries.

Article 54.—Bulgarian nationals who belong to racial, religious or linguistic minorities shall enjoy the same treatment and security in law and in fact as the other Bulgarian nationals. In particular they shall have an equal right to establish, manage and control at their own expense charitable, religious and social institutions, schools and other educational establishments, with the right to use their own language and to exercise their religion freely therein.

Article 55.—Bulgaria will provide in the public educational system in towns and districts in which a considerable proportion of Bulgarian nationals of other than Bulgarian speech are resident adequate facilities for ensuring that in the primary schools the instruction shall be given to the children of such Bulgarian nation-

als through the medium of their own language. This provision shall not prevent the Bulgarian Government from making the teaching of the Bulgarian language obligatory in the said schools.

In towns and districts where there is a considerable proportion of Bulgarian nationals belonging to racial, religious or linguistic minorities, these minorities shall be assured an equitable share in the enjoyment and application of sums which may be provided out of public funds under the State, municipal or other budgets, for educational, religious or charitable purposes.

I have no comments to make on these clauses, Mr. Speaker, except to say that similar clauses were embodied in the other treaties which have already been ratified by this House; that they were approved by this House, and that they are highly commendable. I hope that hon. members will carefully preserve this Treaty and long remember the principles embodied in Section IV, because the remembrance of those principles, and their application in Canada in the future, might prove a permanent and paramount basis for unity, peace and harmony.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford): I have taken a good deal of interest in the Treaty of Peace ever since it was promulgated, and I have been moved to make a few remarks this evening upon the question now before the House. The hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King), it appears to me, made a rather unfortunate speech this evening in connection with this great question. If I understood the tenor of his remarks correctly his object was to glorify the position that the Liberals had taken in bringing Canada to the status of a nation rather than to find out our position as at present constituted, and the responsibilities that come to us by reason of being one of the forces in the League of Nations. The hon. gentleman made this remark, that there are times and seasons for all things. I would submit that it is not the time or the season when an international matter is under discussion to introduce local political affairs, and therefore I entirely dissent from the hon. gentleman's attitude this afternoon in debating this question. These international questions are too serious for hon. members to use the occasion to make political capital for one party or the other. The Treaty of Peace is surely a big enough subject to engage our best thought and attention, and I for one am not sure that we have yet done justice to it. Although this is the third or fourth time we have discussed the Treaty, a full exposition of the responsibilities we are undertaking has not been given. I agree with the Acting Prime Minister (Sir George Foster) that we have made altogether too much of the status of Canada in the Empire, and altogether too little of the responsibilities that are going to come upon us as the result of saying that we are a nation. Those responsibilities, as I understand it, are of a very serious nature, and if we do not realize that now we shall realize it in the very near future.

Those who have read the news to-day will have noticed that the American Senate has come to a decision with regard to Article 10 of the Treaty of Peace as contained in the Covenant of the League of Nations. The Senate has set out its objections to that article, which is the one providing for the carrying out of the undertakings of the League when moral suasion and economic pressure have failed. It calls for the contribution of men, ships, air forces, and all the munitions of war, to back up the opinions of the League as a finality. The author of the League of Nations, President Wilson, has said that Article 10 is the heart of the Treaty, and I think he is right in that respect. It is the heart of the Treaty inasmuch as it provides for the carrying out of its obligations when all forms of persuasion have failed. Economic pressure, diplomatic representation, moral suasion and every argument that can be urged are all exhausted before the final act of using the "big stick;" and when the big stick is to be used, as I understand the situation, every nation that has signed the Treaty has assumed the obligation to furnish men, money, ships, or air forces as its fair share towards the discharge of the obligation which the League as a whole has undertaken. The substitute has been found for Article 10, as I observe from the Evening Journal of to-day. I am somewhat surprised that neither of the leaders of the House has tackled what is really the pith of the whole Treaty, and that is the obligation which each party to it undertakes. We quarrel about the status of our country, and debate as to who is responsible for enhancing it, who deserves the glory and who does not. But we fail to realize that, having declared ourselves men, we must play the part of men, and that we shall be called upon to bear the white man's burden which, so far as Canada is concerned, consists in providing the sinews of war when all other peaceful means have failed to secure the carrying out of the will of the League of Nations. I am not one of those who believe that wars have ended. I believe that

the machinery of the League of Nations will be in operation in a short time; in fact, it should be in operation now. And only yesterday the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) in reply to the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) said, I think, that although war was going on in Turkey and some troops were being landed there, Canada was not in this particular instance paying any part of the shot. Well, perhaps she is not; but she may have to do so later on if she lives up to her obligations which I understand she is assuming under the League of Nations, by which I believe she becomes responsible financially, or for the supply of men, money or ships, to hold up her end among the rest of the nations constituting the League. And no amount of explanation, or declamation that our status is being very much improved, making us now one among the big nations of the world, is going to relieve us of that obligation we have undertaken by entering the League of Nations. I desire to read to the House the decision of the United States Senate on Article 10. It is headed, "Substitute for Article 10 accepted." After giving an account of the discussion, and the majority by which the measure was passed—it was adopted by a vote of 56 to 26—the article proceeds:

> The reservation, adopted after many efforts to modify it had been rolled under by the solidly united Republican majority, follows in general form the one adopted last November. It is as follows:
>
> "The United States assumes no obligation to preserve the territorial integrity or political independence of any other country by the employment of its military or naval forces, its resources, or any form of economic discrimination, or to interfere in any way in controversies between nations, including all controversies relating to territorial integrity or political independence, whether members of the League or not, under the provisions of Article Ten, or to employ the military or naval forces of the United States, under any Article of the Treaty for any purpose, unless in any particular case the Congress, which under the constitution, has the sole power to declare war or authorize the employment of the military or naval forces of the United States, shall, in the exercise of full liberty of action, by act or joint resolution, so provide."

So that the United States, speaking through its Senate, which, according to the constitution, has the say in regard to questions of peace and war, has declared that so far as Article 10 is concerned it does not propose to observe the obligation except after the Senate has dealt with it and declared by voice and resolution that the United States is in the war. We have subscribed to this amendment on which our friends, after debating for ten months, have failed to come to a conclusion further than to declare themselves practically ruled out of the operation of clause 10, which President Wilson, the author, has described as the heart of the whole Treaty. That being the case, I do not think that this House can afford to shut its eyes to the obligations which we are undertaking with regard to these treaties that are being passed by us one by one. I contend that we are undertaking very serious obligations which we shall be called upon to fulfil when the time arrives to put them into operation. I am not sure that a great triumph has been secured in the stand that has been taken. I cannot see it that way; and as for the statement of my hon. friend opposite (Mr. Béland) that we are centralizing forces with a view to Imperialism, while I take no second place to any one in this House as an Imperialist, so far as I have been able to voice my sentiments in that respect, I do not regard the matter in that way either. I take an entirely opposite view of it. I may be wrong, but I think that our delegates who attended the councils of the League of Nations should not have gone as representatives of Great Britain, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa or Canada, but as representatives of the British Empire. That is the position they should have taken, the position we have always held in the past—that we were a member of the British Empire and not a separate unit standing on our own footing. I have by me the prize essay of Heber L. Hart, K.C., LL.D., who won the Hundred Guinea prize in London on the subject of the League of Nations in its relation to the British Empire. His words are better than my own, and I shall therefore quote them:

> If it had not been intended that the integrity of the British Union should be impaired, the statesmen of the dominions would have been given a place in the councils of the League only in the capacity of representatives of the Empire as a whole.

That is exactly the idea I was trying to bring out a few moments ago.

> Disputes between different parts of the British Commonwealth should have been left for adjustment to its own representative conference and excluded from the jurisdiction of the League.

In other words, if we had any differences in the Empire, instead of airing them in public and before all the nations of the world, we would have a conference between Great Britain and her associated Dominions, debate the point there, settle the policy and go into the conference as a unit. In my judgment that is a stronger position, a better position than we are likely to

attain, and I think it will lead to a great deal less trouble in the long run for the British Empire to be represented there as a unit than for us to be divided into five different countries speaking through five different classes of representatives from each of these divisions. If we are a nation, as has been boasted, and if we have "cut the painter" entirely—although I do not believe we have—we are just in the position of the young man who is starting out in life and who, when he gets to be twenty-one years of age walks up to his father and says: "Dad, I have been with you for twenty-one years, and now I propose to be a man on my own account; I propose to go out and see the world; I propose to row my own boat and to paddle my own canoe through the world; so, good-bye, Dad, old chap." Perhaps I give him my blessing and I start this young man out in this way. The young man goes out into the world and gets into trouble; he gets into debt; he gets into difficulty. This young man who is willing to be upon his own resources as long as the sun shines, but he expects good old Dad to pull him out when he gets into trouble and when he has contracted debts that he is unable to pay. That is practically the position we are ready to assume in Canada. We say that we are a nation, that we are a nation among the nations of the world, that of the forty-two nations that signed the Treaty, we are just as good as any. Are we prepared to pay the shot the same as they are? When we asked for seven thousand or eight thousand troops for all Canada, "Militarism" is shouted at us; when we ask for a few small boats to keep our coasts, it is said that we aspire to be a great naval power; when we ask for an air force it is said that we are going to squander money on war armaments. We will hear of that, and a great deal more than we have ever done before, if we are going to uphold our position that we assume in this League of Nations. It is going to be an immense responsibility, and I ask hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House to look it squarely in the face. I have appealed, on two different occasions and not merely to-day, in the discussion of this Treaty, and I again appeal to the leaders on this and the other side of the House to tell us what our responsibilities are, and what we are going to do when trouble comes. It is all very well to say that the sun is shining now and that it is always going to shine. I believe it is the part of good policy to look ahead. I do not expect that there will always be sunshine, that there will always be peace in the world or that we will have just the conditions that we would like to have. If that is the case, Mr. Speaker, we ought to look the whole situation over and we ought to have a statement from one of the leaders of the House as to what our position will be when the call comes. On what basis is it going to be settled? Is it on the basis of population, or is it on the basis of the area to be defended? On what basis is Canada, one of the five sister nations of the British Empire, to pay her share, or fight her share, with the rest of the world? That is what we will have to do. The United States Senate has balked for eighteen months over it, although we seem to be ready to take it down at one gulp and make no inquiry whatever as to what our responsibilities are in regard to it. I trust before the debate closes that we will have an authoritative statement from some quarter telling us how these troops are going to be raised, how the levy is to be made, how it is going to be paid for, and who settles the responsibility for it.

Heretofore when the British Empire has been at war we have been at liberty practically to do what we wished to help the Mother Country and in most of her wars we have wished to do nothing. In the last war, I am glad to say, Canada has taken her full share and perhaps more than her full share amongst the nations but is she prepared to take part in quarrels that she thinks do not concern her very much because some of these quarrels may be in the Balkan states, Arabia, Mesopotamia, Palestine and those countries and we may not feel like laying down the tools of peace and devoting ourselves again to armaments. If we are not prepared to do that, somebody has to do our share for us and if somebody does our share for us we have to pay for the share that is being done. That is the way I see it, that is the way it reads in Article 10, and the American people not only read it in the same way but they are not prepared to sacrifice the constitution of the United States in this regard to the extent of handing over to the League of Nations the right to say what they shall do, when they shall do it and how they shall do it. That is what we are doing. We are practically, when signing this Treaty, signing away our independence, not in relation to Britain but signing away our independence to the extent that we became subservient to the directions of the League of Nations. The League of Nations can say to Canada with a population of 8,000,000: You provide 100,000 men, ten ships and fifty or

a hundred units of the air force. That may be the levy and it may not be a very large war at that. What provision is there for finding a force of that kind? That is a part of the Treaty, that is a responsibility that may come to us sooner or later, and if it comes how are we to meet it? I think that instead of glorifying ourselves as being a nation among the nations of the world and pointing to the fact that we have obtained a status that we had never thought of before, we should inquire, if we are going to be a man of the world, how much it will cost; are we able to carry the load; are we prepared to sustain the burden; are we prepared as citizens of Canada to provide the army, the navy and the air force to enable us to take our place amongst the nations of the world whenever they are called for? As I understand it that will be the final necessity of the case when we have entered into this League of Nations because it will apply with binding force to all those who sign the Covenant and in my judgment we will have to pay the piper later. If we do not recognize that now, when the assessment is made by the Council of the League of Nations, which is competent to do it, we will have to do what they ask us to do whether we like it or not, or else we will have to ignominiously drop out altogether. If I interpret the Treaty right, if any member fails to carry out the obligation placed upon it by the Council of the League of Nations, it automatically ceases to be a member of the League. If that is is so it will be up to Canada, when the call comes, to contribute in the way I have suggested and in a measure commensurate with her population, resources and the area that we have and which must be defended.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Shelburne and Queen's): Mr. Speaker, before proceeding to make a few remarks on the important question which engages our attention, I cannot deny myself the privilege of offering to my right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George E. Foster) my congratulations upon the address which he delivered and with which, with very little exception, we on this side of the House entirely agree. I am sure that the appeal he made to the members on both sides of the House as to the spirit in which we should discuss not only this but all questions will be responded to all round. I listened to his address with great pleasure and I am unwilling to let it pass without this remark from myself.

I am exceedingly glad to find my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) drawing attention to the responsibilities of Canada under these treaties and under the League of Nations. He is right when he says that too little attention has been paid to that important question. I think—in fact I know—that many hon. members on both sides have become enamoured of this notion of the higher status that Canada is said to have attained. They are fascinated with the idea of having a place in the League of Nations. We are getting to be a bigger boy than we formerly were and there is a disposition to see something to congratulate somebody upon. I think that when the sober-minded hard-headed people of Canada come to fully understand this question—when they understand the cost of this whole arrangement and the obligations that are being taken upon us—they will have a different impression, and I desire that the people shall understand what this thing is costing us at present. Some of these days we shall have the pleasure, I suppose, of getting at the inside history of this claim of Canada to a separate position. The thing seems to me to be so profoundly foolish that I am unwilling to place the responsibility entirely upon the Canadian Government. I have a notion that this thing originated in the mind of some fussy person from some other section of the Empire, and that the worst than can be said of the Canadian Government is that they were not strong-minded enough to resist the movement. I believe that some of the sober-minded Ministers of the Crown—clear-headed, hard-headed men; they are not all dreamers, they are not all faddists—I cannot help believing that their loyalty to colleagues and courtesy to their party surroundings obliged them to be silent on the question. I am satisfied, as I know these men, that they must entertain a mute protest against this foolish attempt for Canada to mix itself up in the foreign affairs of the world. I think that Canada's part in this matter has been largely a farce,—I hope it is not unkind to say that. A farce, of course, is an amusing thing. I think it was farcical last year when we undertook to represent to the people of Canada that it was necessary that Canada, through its Parliament, should approve of the German Treaty. No constitutional authority of repute would claim that it was necessary that Canada through its Parliament should approve of that Treaty. The Prime Minister himself did not say that. When the question was put squarely to him the most

he could say was: Oh well, if you do not approve of it the Government will have to resign. But it is clear, I think, to the mind of any constitutional authority in Canada that if we had never passed any motion regarding the German Treaty that Treaty would have gone into operation just the same. And if it was a farce to deal with the German Treaty that way last year it is an even greater farce to deal in the same way with this Bulgarian Treaty. My hon. friend (Mr. Béland) gave us a picture of our respected friend, Sir George Perley, rushing down to the coast, crossing the channel, going down to the charming little French village, and hurrying in and affixing his signature to a document which he probably never read. I do not believe there are half a dozen members in this House who have read this Treaty. I do not believe the members of the Government have all read it. The Minister of Justice to-day said he had read it, and I am bound to believe him. He asked me if I had read the Treaty and I was frank enough to say no. I tried to read it, but it is a document of one hundred or more pages. I read the most of it, but I honestly confess I was unable to complete my reading. Still I am convinced that I read five times as much as most hon. gentlemen. Why, the thing is a joke. It is a joke as described by my hon. friend (Mr. Béland) if Sir George Perley went and signed the Treaty in the way described. It would be more of a joke if we could imagine Sir George Perley solemnly sitting down in Council, in judgment, on the condition of affairs to be arranged between Bulgaria and the Balkan States and the civilized world. We cannot imagine a more ludicrous thing than to suppose for a single moment, that Sir George Perley has the qualifications—and I say this without any disrespect for that gentleman; that he has the knowledge and qualifications—to sit down and consider the matter and deliver a judgment in the form of this Blue Book. The whole thing, Mr. Speaker, is ridiculous. And it is a costly bit of folly for the people of Canada. Just what it cost for our ministers to go to Paris I do not know, nor am I interested in inquiring. Whatever we may say regarding the status of Canada we will all agree that when our Ministers of the Crown go abroad they have a status to maintain and we would expect them to do it with dignity; and if the cost in that respect was a large and generous one I at least will find no fault with them. The country will not begrudge any expense of that kind when the money is expended for the purpose of the public business of Canada. Of course, the misfortune is in that case, whatever the expenditure was, it was to no purpose, because there was no public business of Canada before the Conference. Now information was laid before this House, official information I believe, to show that the Canadian ministers over there had exceedingly little to do and that, practically speaking, our participation in that Treaty was very largely a sham. That is perhaps too harsh a word, but at all events they did little or nothing, not because they were not able to do things, but because there was nothing for them to do. You can take the whole Treaty, and take this Treaty, and read them from cover to cover, and you will find nothing in them from beginning to end that has a direct bearing upon the affairs of the people of Canada. Therefore I say there was no need of their dealing with the matter in that way.

I again come to the question of the expense. It was stated the other day that we have paid $65,000 already for our share of the expenses of the League of Nations for the first year. I do not know by what authority or out of what appropriation that money was paid. That of course we will ascertain in due course. But there was another item that we paid in connection with this matter. Not only did the Government bring forward this pretence that it was necessary for Canada to approve of the Treaty through her Parliament, but they went further and said that it was so necessary and so urgent that they had to have a special session of Parliament in Canada for that purpose. Now, I have already declared, and I am not sure but that I am the only member who did so, that it was wanton waste of the public money to call that special session of Parliament, and I do not hesitate to repeat the statement to-night. If you would say "That is a partisan opinion," if you would say "that is a statement that only some partisan Grit would make," I am going to give you the opinion of a supporter of the Government which my Conservative friends will freely accept as having some weight. At the time that special session of Parliament was proposed the Montreal Gazette, a most influential journal of the Conservative party, had an article on the subject in which it said:

> An autumn session of Parliament would be nothing short of profligacy.

That is a very harsh term, but it is not my word, it is the word of the Conservative Montreal Gazette.

No one reason worthy a moment's consideration has been given why a session should be held, while there are a score of reasons on the other side. A million and a half dollars is a tidy sum of money even in these days when men talk familiarly of a hundred millions and do not pale when a billion is mentioned. A session of Parliament lasting only thirty days will cost the country a million and a half, and for this considerable price what can be gained? The ratification of the Peace Treaty three months earlier than in normal course! One might almost infer that an awe-struck world stands in fear and trembling lest the Canadian Parliament reject the Covenant, and so precipitate another war. It is nonsense to pretend that it makes a shadow of difference whether the Parliament of Canada, or the Parliament of any other country, for that matter, approves the Treaty in October or in January.

That is the opinion of the Montreal Gazette. I might put along side it the opinion of a journal that the Minister of Finance will have great confidence in, for I remember, though I have not the paper at hand, that it quoted the Gazette with approval, and that is the Conservative Kingston Standard. So that when I charge upon the Government this waste of the public money amounting to probably a million dollars at least—I asked a question about it the other day but we have not yet the official information, but I fear the cost will be a million dollars—when I charge upon the Government this wanton waste of a million dollars in order to carry out its claim about the necessity of Parliament having to approve of the Treaty, I am simply saying that which sober-minded Conservative people, as represented by the Montreal Gazette and the Kingston Standard, have said. So I think if the people of Canada come to understand the expense that this thing has cost them already—and Heaven knows how much it is going to cost them in the future—this glamour about Canada having a seat at the Peace Conference, will, in all probability, take on another colour.

Now, I must not be misunderstood. If any man says that I am willing to have the affairs of Canada disposed of by people who do not represent Canada he will state that for which there is no foundation. I insist that whenever Canada has a particular business requiring attention that business shall be attended to by the representatives of the Canadian people. That I would make quite clear. But if occasionally there are matters pending of only remote interest to Canada—the kind of interest that a man has out in the South sea islands if he is a Britisher; that a negro has in the West Indies; in fact, the interest which a Britisher has everywhere in the wide world—if there is only that kind of interest, then I say there is no particular reason why Canada should insist upon representation, because it ought to be sufficient for us that the interests of Canada will be safe in the hands of those who represent the British Empire.

So I do claim, Mr. Speaker, that this pretence that it is necessary that Canada, for the protection of her interests, should have representation at the Peace Conference is an entire delusion. There is no need of any hesitation on our part in claiming our right to deal with the affairs of Canada in the way I have described; there is no new status or power required for that purpose. There was a time many years ago when the affairs of the Dominions, or the colonies as they were then called, were disposed of by the British Government and the British Parliament without any reference to us. I suppose those would be what we call "the old colonial days." Unless it be between those times and the present, I do not know where you are going to draw the line as to what are referred to as "the old colonial days."

But those days are a thing of the remote past. For the last forty years at least there has been a recognition on the part of the British Government that wherever the interests of Canada were concerned, Canada must be either directly represented or she must be protected by a reservation in the Treaty that it is not to apply to her until it has received the approval of her Parliament. Our interests in that respect have been fully protected in the past, and it did not need any Conference at Paris or any League of Nations to give us that protection.

Although I may be peculiar in this respect—and I am careful to say that I speak for myself only—I regret to say that I regard the step taken by the Dominions generally in claiming seats at the Paris Conference as a grave mistake. I say it is a mistake to separate Canada from the rest of the Empire in international affairs, and it is a mistake which will work harm in the future. Within the British Empire we should stand for our rights, we should be willing, as my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) said to-day, at any conference with the Imperial authorities to see that wherever it is necessary the interests of Canada are protected. But when you come to deal with foreign affairs I claim that we should deal with them as a unit, as an Empire. And when you say,

"We will treat the United Kingdom as one part, Canada as another part, and Australia as another part," you are making the beginning of a policy of separation, the end of which may not be what you desire. I am firmly persuaded that this assertion of a separate interest on the part of Canada and the other Dominions is the beginning of the evolution of separation, and for that reason, amongst others, I regret we have to deal with it.

I want to say a word with regard to what my hon. friend the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) stated concerning the position of Canada in the League of Nations. The League is composed of a Council and an Assembly. As a matter of fact the Council is the really important body; the Assembly is a larger body which meets only occasionally, the real work being done by the Council. On the Council Canada has no representative, and I do not hesitate to say that she cannot have a representation. It is true there is nothing in the League constitution which says she will not have a representation, and the Prime Minister, for some strange reason, took the trouble to obtain from Mr. Clemenceau, from Mr. Lloyd George and from Mr. Wilson a declaration that the Dominions were not precluded from having a seat on the Council.

But that does not prove anything. The Council is composed of the representatives of five Great Powers: Great Britain, France, Italy, the United States, and Japan. Each of these Great Powers is a member of the Council by right, and then four others are to be chosen by the Assembly. Now, when you consider that there will be perhaps fifty or more nations having seats in the Assembly, many of them seeking to get to the Council, is there any reasonable probability that, Great Britain already having one member, these other nations will give the British Empire a second member in the shape of a seat for Canada.

Mr. BELAND: None whatever.

Mr. FIELDING: It is unreasonable, it is preposterous. We will have no seat on the Council, and it is the Council that is important.

That brings us to the question which has so much disturbed my hon. friend the President of the Privy Council, the Lenroot reservation. According to my hon. friend there is deep indignation throughout this country and a firm determination that we are not going to let Uncle Sam interfere with our rights and privileges in this matter. A great American—I would not say a very great one—gave to his countrymen what he told them was a good motto: Stand by your country, right or wrong. Well, the ethics of that motto I will not discuss, and yet it is practically what we all do. We all stand by our country. When my hon. friend makes a speech in which he tells us the American Senate is trying to interfere with something that belongs to us, we all stand up and say: They shall not do it. But we do not stop to consider what that something is. Now, as a matter of fact there is no such indignation and no such public opinion as my hon. friend says concerning the Lenroot reservation. If my hon. friend would go out into the public streets of any town and ask the first dozen men he met what they thought of the Lenroot reservation, five or six would tell him they never heard of it, one or two would inform him that they had seen it in the headlines of the newspapers, and he would be very lucky indeed if he found one man who knew what it meant; and it is pretty certain that he would not find one of them at all concerned about the reservation. My hon. friend is able to provoke a little public opinion by telling the world that the Americans are trying to do something to interfere with us. Well, we are all going to stand by our country against the United States. If we put forward a claim that is not very reasonable, nevertheless we are not going to let Uncle Sam say that we shall not do it. I suppose in that way my hon. friend can find some public opinion in support of his contention. But the truth is there is no such indignation. No one in Canada cares much for the Lenroot reservation; it is not a matter that disturbs anybody, whatever my hon. friend may think about it. However, he made a speech of the same kind in Montreal not many days ago, and immediately after it was reviewed in the Montreal Gazette of the 17th February. I am going to quote a passage of that review:

> The claim made upon the part of Canada is that the record of the Dominion as a belligerent raises this country to equal status with all those other nations. As a matter of constitutional fact, no such development occurred, and the wisdom of the attempt which has been made to first establish by assertion, and then defend, a position which in point of fact does not exist, is open to question. Canada is not now in any different position constitutionally than before the war. Canadian autonomy is neither more nor less complete than then.
>
> If the status which is being ascribed to the Dominion by some of its representatives had really been attained the Canadian Government would not now be protesting to the Government of Great Britain, as is the case, but would be acting independently. The fact that Canadian

delegates were successful in becoming signatories to the Peace Treaty and obtaining for Canada the right, now disputed, of voting in the League Assembly does not alter the position of Canada as a Dominion under the British Sovereign. Canada cannot be dependent one day and independent another.

Then the article concludes—and this brings on the question of how much public opinion there is on this question:

Moreover, the Canadian people are not worrying one way or the other in regard to their right of representation in the League of Nations. They have shown a strictly detached and dispassionate interest in the matter and have shown no disposition to be what is called "het up"——

That is the Gazette's word, not mine.

——about it.

Here is a bouquet for my hon. friends:

They know that those who mixed up the League Covenant with the Peace Treaty made a miserable mess of both, and they are by no means certain that the League will function with or without their vote. They are inclined to think that the success of the League will be more a question of commonsense than of voting rights and contracts.

Again I say, if there is to be a quarrel between the United States and ourselves, why, we have to stand for this Dominion in regard to the League of Nations, even if it seems an undesirable thing. It is a bad thing for neighbours and friends to quarrel, bad under any circumstances; but when the neighbours quarrel about some silly thing of no earthly importance, then the quarrel becomes very foolish. The President of the Council (Mr. Rowell) may not desire to be so; but whether he is conscious of this or not, his speeches lately have had a tendency to make trouble between the United States and Canada. If we are to have any row between the United States and Canada, I should like it to be about something important; I do not want to have a row with the United States over this petty question of whether or not we shall have a seat in the Assembly of the League of Nations. I do not think that is important enough to fight about; but if our American friends want to insist upon making it an issue between us, I suppose we have all to stand for Canada.

I contend that by the insistence upon these claims for Canada, harm has been done; no good has come to Canada; you give Canada no status in reality that she did not have before; you accomplish nothing for Canada; but you make trouble between Canada and the United States; you make trouble between Canada and Great Britain. I have at hand a quotation which shows that in this action there is, in all probability, a source of trouble for Great Britain. I hold in my hand a statement made by Mr. Henry White, one of the American members of the Peace Conference. Recently, he made at Washington to Senator Hitchcock, a statement which I read from the New York Times:

Henry White, a member of the American peace delegation, who recently returned to the United States, called to-day upon Senator Hitchcock and told him in detail of conditions in Europe. Mr. White emphasized the seriousness of the question raised by the Lenroot reservation on voting strength in the League of Nations Assembly. He told Mr. Hitchcock that in his opinion this reservation, which is number 14 in the Lodge group, is a very grave menace to the solidarity of the league. Mr. White explained how the British self-governing dominions, demanded of Great Britain her support of their claims to the right of independent representation, and how they would protest and oppose any effort by this country to disfranchise them. That is what the Lenroot reservation would do, in Mr. White's opinion.

He indicated that the British Government was not particularly concerned over this reservation on its own account,——

And remember that the writer of the article is reporting his conversation:

——but that the colonies raised such a clamour about it that Premier Lloyd George had been forced to take cognizance of their position, and to support it, as he did in his recent speech in the House of Commons.

Mr. White confirmed previous reports that there is little concern in Europe, particularly in France, concerning other American reservations, but the Lenroot provision is much more formidable as a bar to compromise than the Article X reservation, in his opinion.

So we have the claim of Canada a source of trouble between Canada and the United States, and this clearly shows that it is a source of trouble between Canada and the Mother Country. For these reasons, it is to be regretted that we ever made the claim for a seat in the Assembly which would be no good to us if we had it and which, I think, would not be in any way to the advantage of Canada.

It may be thought that it is only in Canada that dissent is expressed from this claim. I happen, however, to have found in my reading of the public press that the unwisdom—I do not think the word is too strong—of the Dominions making the claim has made an impression elsewhere. I hold in my hand a clipping from Wellington, New Zealand, which reads:

The Wellington Times urges that the Dominions should declare unequivocally against an apparently indefensible position which is not wanted and which those to whom it does injustice object. Such a declaration would splendidly disavow a policy of "grab all."

Another New Zealand paper, The Post, says:

Actually there is little cause of quarrel, since the real power of the League is vested in the Council where Great Britain and America have equal votes, without the Dominions' interference. The Dominions abandoned the substance for the shadow when they accepted votes in the Assembly instead of insisting upon an effective voice in the Council where the real work will be done. The Post urges that the Dominions should reconsider the matter, which is exceptionally delicate and difficult for the Imperial authorities, compelling them to defend a position which is not of their devising, which is formally indefensible and which gives the opponents of the Treaty a powerful handle while, as usual, not the Dominions, but Great Britain must bear the brunt.

Therefore, this claim of Canada has had the effect of creating trouble in many quarters, and trouble to no good end. I regret for those reasons that the minister has attached so much importance to it. I do not think there is anything in the situation which warrants us in getting up a row with the Americans on this question.

The President of the Council (Mr. Rowell) told us that we must do one of two things—shall I say? one of three things: We must recede to the old colonial condition, (although if he were asked to define the day on which that colonial condition ceased and some new condition came into existence, he would have difficulty in doing so); or we must go towards independence; or we must do something else which I have difficulty in defining. With regard to receding to the old colonial condition, nobody proposes anything of the kind. With regard to independence, my hon. friend says—and I am quite sure he is speaking sincerely—that he has no sympathy with the move for independence, and I am in hearty accord with him in that regard. I have said so before, and I hold that view now. But I must tell him that since Canada put forward a claim to a position in the Conference separate and apart from the British Empire, from that day there began to be a discussion in regard to independence in Canada. It is this assertion of a right, separate and apart from Great Britain, that has led men to-day to talk of separation and independence who did not talk about that subject before. I am afraid the matter goes further; I am afraid there is talk of treating Canada as a party separate from the British nation in her authority and power, and I am afraid it leads to wider talk of worse evils even than independence. With regard to the colonial condition of the past, we know that nobody wants it. With regard to independence, I have no sympathy with it; I am heartily against it; but I can at all events understand what it means, and I can go even so far as to admire the man who argues in favour of it as there is legitimate ground for his argument. But I do not know what my hon. friend means when he speaks about our going forward in a line of some constitutional development; I do not know what he wants, and we have the right to ask him what he means. I do not know of any grievances that Canada has. I do not know what we have to complain of. If my hon. friend knows of any grievance that Canada has which needs a remedy he ought to bring it forward in this House. Half a dozen hon. members in this debate have said to the Government that before they go to any Imperial Conference they should receive a mandate from this House. Well, we have had no motion made in that direction by the ministers, and I do not indulge the hope that they will give us the opportunity for giving any mandate in this matter. I do not think they will bring anything forward, for the good reason that they do not know themselves what they want. There is no grievance, nothing that we want to remedy. I do say that when hon. gentlemen talk about some great change which is to be brought about by the coming Imperial Conference I cannot understand what they mean, and I think that before we go any further in this matter we ought to have, perhaps not at this moment in the debate, some declaration from the ministers as to what change they want, and what they are prepared to recommend to the coming Imperial Conference.

Hon. NEWTON W. ROWELL (President of the Privy Council): May I first express my appreciation of the action of the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) in placing upon Hansard to-day so large a portion of an address which I delivered in the city of Montreal a few years ago? I desire to express not only my appreciation of the fact that he has placed that upon Hansard, but my still greater appreciation of his statement that not only he but all his followers heartily agree with the sentiments of that address. We have therefore, Mr. Speaker, the statement of the leader of the Opposition that he spoke not only for himself but for all the men on the other side of the House when he said that the statements I then made, and which I have repeated in the course of this debate, with reference to Canada's status had the unanimous support of the Liberals who are back of him. They certainly have the unanimous support of the Liberals on this side of the House as well as of the Conservatives. I am therefore in the happy position of being able to voice the unanimous sentiment of

the whole House on this important question. My hon. friend in quoting from that address referred to it as an address upon our constitutional development. The address —my hon. friend has a copy in his hand—is an address on "Liberals and the Empire." It was a review of the part the Liberal party had taken in various important events in connection with the Empire. It is true that when it was issued by the Reform Association Publicity Branch, they put upon the face of it that it was a constitutional review, but the title of the address, which indicates its character, was "Liberals and the Empire," and it only professes to trace the share that Liberals had taken in our constitutional development. The address did not attempt to review the part taken by both parties in these great events, but in dealing with the history of Confederation I did refer to the great work of Sir John Macdonald. My hon. friend entirely omitted this reference in his quotations to-day.

It is not my intention to follow my hon. friend through the course of his address. I shall make only one or two further observations with regard to it, and shall then refer to the remarks of my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding). With the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) I must confess that we on this side of the House could not but feel profoundly gratified at the stand taken by the leader of the Opposition to-day. It was a complete reversal of the stand taken by the leaders of the Opposition when the German Treaty came before the House. It is true that my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's in his speech to-night has harped back to the same old position that he took before, differing therein very markedly from the leader of the Opposition; but so far as the leader of the Opposition is concerned, he took entirely different ground from that taken by hon. gentlemen opposite when the German Treaty was debated last September, and if the address I delivered some seven years ago has contributed to the conversion of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition and the members on the other side of the House to a recognition of the status of Canada within the Empire, it has proved one of the most effective addresses I have ever delivered. I am proud of the result. My hon. friend this afternoon instead of taking the position which was taken in the debate last September, that we were not a nation, said, "Oh, yes, we are a nation, but we became a nation many years ago. Sir Wilfrid Laurier made us a nation." Now if he will turn to the address I delivered in this House on the Treaty last September and to the one I delivered here last Thursday, he will see that I drew attention to the fact that Sir Wilfrid Laurier in 1897 had claimed for Canada the status of a nation. I emphasized that in September as I emphasized it on Thursday last——

Mr. BELAND: Not very loudly.

Mr. ROWELL: —to show not only my appreciation of his great work but also how far my hon. friends on the other side had backslidden from the position which Sir Wilfrid Laurier took. I emphasized it in the hope that they might be brought up to date on this question, or at least as far as the position taken by Sir Wilfrid Laurier fifteen or twenty years ago. This is not a question of who is or who is not entitled to credit for our present position, and I shall not discuss it from that standpoint. We are considering a great fact in our country's history, and I think it is important enough to give all parties who have contributed to the result some share of the credit in connection with it. One cannot but contrast the position taken by the leader of the Opposition this afternoon with the position taken by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition paid a tribute this afternoon to the work of the Prime Minister and his colleagues at the Peace Conference. He said they had carried forword the work of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, that they had maintained Canada's position, and maintained it magnificently, and he added that if they had not done so, they would have been derelict in their duty. The hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's rose in his place and said: The whole thing was a farce, the Prime Minister and his colleagues should not have gone over to Paris.

What is the position of my hon. friends opposite on this Treaty? Do they stand for Canada and her rights as a nation, not outside but within the British Empire, or do they take the position of my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's who, while he is opposed to centralization, proposes to leave the handling of our affairs in vital matters to the Government of Great Britain.

Mr. FIELDING: He never said so.

Mr. ROWELL: Then, what did he say? He said that being present at the Conference was a farce, that Canada had no special interest there, and that the Prime Minister and his colleagues had no right to

be there. My hon. friend will not question that I am fairly stating his position.

Mr. FIELDING: I would not say they had no right to be there. I said it was no good to have them there, and was a disadvantage to Canada.

Mr. ROWELL: Then, it was a disadvantage to Canada to have them there, there was nothing of vital interest to Canada there? Well, Mr. Speaker, if the events in Europe were of such importance that Canada raised 600,000 men to help—

Mr. COPP: Oh, let up on that.

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friend says: "Let up on that." Perhaps he does not like to hear about it.

Mr. COPP: If my hon. friend is alluding to me, and will allow me—

Mr. ROWELL: No, my hon. friend may keep his seat and not interrupt. I was answering the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's who said it was not a matter of interest to Canada to have the Prime Minister and his colleagues at the Peace Conference. I say that if the issues in that war were of sufficient interest to Canada to call upon us to raise 600,000 men and to leave 60,000 lying buried in France and Flanders, they were important enough for Canada to be represented at the Conference in an effort to secure a just and satisfactory settlement.

It is my desire to take issue with the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's in the most clear and emphatic manner on his whole conception of Canada's position and status in the British Empire and in matters that are of vital concern to Canada. I agree with the leader of the Opposition that not only would the Prime Minister and his colleagues have been derelict in their duty if they had not maintained our position, but they would have been even more derelict if they had wholly failed to attend the Peace Conference when matters of such vast importance to Canada were under consideration. Did not my hon. friend from Queen's and Shelburne (Mr. Fielding) to-night speak of the obligations imposed on Canada under this Treaty? And my hon. friend the member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) drew the attention of the House to the matter of our obligations under the Treaty. I shall not at present discuss these obligations, but if they are anything like as important as the hon. member for Queen's and Shelburne has suggested to-night, was it not the duty of the Prime Minister and his colleagues to be at the conference with a view to protecting the interests of Canada? Undoubtedly it was, and they were there in pursuance of that duty. My hon. friend says that this question of Canada's status in the League is of no importance to Canada. He says that it is of no importance to her to have a voice in the Assembly, and that she will never have any chance of being elected to the Council. Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not to-night intend entering upon a discussion as to the chances of Canada's being elected to the Council of the League. My hon. friend has characterized as absurd the idea that she might be elected. I shall only say that our position in regard to the governing body of the International Labour Organizations is precisely the same as that in connection with the Council of the League. There were eight powers named who were entitled to nominate members of the governing body and only four other nations were to be chosen and elected from all the nations of the world to name the remaining four members; Canada, at the very first meeting of the conference was elected as one of the nations entitled to name a member to the governing body. Therefore, notwithstanding any suggestions which my hon. friend may make to the contrary, there is no absurdity whatever in the idea that Canada might some day be elected to the Council of the League, the election of Canada at the Washington Conference indicates the fine standing which this country enjoys among the nations of the world. My hon. friend has referred to the discussions that are going on in Washington, and has been good enough to suggest that the remarks which I have made have not contributed to a good understanding between Canada and the United States. I beg respectfully to differ from him, they were made to avoid misunderstandings and to maintain a good understanding. I doubt very much whether the remarks which that hon. gentleman made either in the discussion of the Treaty with Germany last September or in the present debate will contribute to a good understanding between the two nations, or will aid in securing just recognition of Canada's position in the United States. I hold in my hand the Congressional Record of the Senate debates of the present week, and I find quoted therein a statement made by my hon. friend when this question was under discussion in September last. I find it quoted by the opponents in the Senate of Canada's position and as a justification for their action. In the course of the discussion, as appears on page 4307, of the Congressional

Record of Monday, March 8, the following statement appears, by Mr. McCormick:

> Mr. McCORMICK: Mr. President, let me ask the Senator one more question. Does he recall the speech in the Canadian House of Commons of Mr. Fielding, for 16 years a Minister of the Crown, in which he stated explicitly that logic was on the side of the contention of those in this country who insisted upon an equality of representation, in which he said that New York was more important to this Republic than the Dominion to the Empire? Surely the Senator will recall that speech.

If my hon. friend was right there would be no ground of criticism of his position. But I say he is not right, and it is just such speeches as that which he made in September and the speech he has made to-night that will be used against Canada in her effort to retain her position in the League. My hon. friend employed an illustration which is also quoted in the American senate; He compared Canada with the State of New York. It is very easy for our friends in the United States to fall into an error in connection with the situation, and I think their attitude in some respects is due to a misunderstanding—a misunderstanding materially contributed to by my hon. friend and others in reviewing the situation. Every one realizes that the British Empire bears no relation in its constitution to the United States of America. In the United States there is one government, the federal government, that conscripts men, levies taxation and carries on war. The edicts of that government run through every state in the American Union. It is the only government within the limits of the United States that has any authority to exercise these great powers. There is but one central government in the United States that wages war and makes peace. There can be only one member of the League and therefore only one vote. What is the situation in the British Empire? It is wholly different. No one government in the Empire wages war, conscripts men, levies taxation and negotiates peace. In the British Empire half a dozen governments exercise these functions. Canada did not act by reason of any law or edict of the Imperial Government, but on her own authority by the action of this Parliament, just as freely as the United States Congress and Senate acted when they undertook participation in the war. And I say it tends to mislead, not only the people of the United States but the people of Canada, to make any such comparison as my hon. friend made. As there are several self-governing nations in the British Empire each is a member of the League and each is entitled to a vote. I was also surprised at the remarks of my hon. friend from Beauce (Mr. Béland) in his reference to the terms of the Treaty and certain matters in connection with the boundary, remarks which met with the approval of the hon. member for Queen's and Shelburne. I do not suppose that any statesman present at the conference other than the representatives of the Balkan States, would be able to form any definite opinion in regard to the exact boundary, but the representatives of Canada would know just as much about the subject as the representatives of the United States. It is not a question whether they knew the exact boundaries or not. It is a question of making peace with a country with which we were at war. My hon. friend has referred to the Balkans as if it were a place in which we were not interested. Well, the Balkans do appear to be remote from us, but it was trouble there in June and July of 1914 that set the world aflame and called forth the troops of Canada and other parts of the Empire to Europe to wage war. And unless the Balkan situation is cleared up on a basis of justice and equity, by the best solution that the nations can devise, who can tell how soon trouble in the Balkans may again produce the same results and call forth our troops once more? I desire to dissent absolutely from the position and attitude of my hon. friend that a controversy which called Canada's sons to war and may do so again, is not a matter in the wise and sane solution of which the people of Canada are interested. My hon. friend from Beauce—and this also touches the point raised by the hon. member for Brantford—spoke of the provisions of the Treaty and stated that it was quite clear that Canada would not be entitled to be present and have a vote in the Council of the League in the event of the question of military contribution being under consideration. My hon. friend from Brantford wanted to know how the question of a military contribution would be settled. I desire to direct his attention to two important provisions of the Treaty.

In Article 16 this clause appears:

> It shall be the duty of the Council in such case to recommend to the several governments concerned what effective military, naval or air force the members of the League shall severally contribute to the armed forces to be used to protect the Covenants of the League.

It is the duty of the Council to recommend to the several governments. If my hon. friend will turn to Article 4 of the League, he will find this provision:

> Any member of the League not represented on the Council shall be invited to send a re-

presentative to sit as a member at any meeting of the Council during the consideration of matters specially affecting the interests of that member of the League.

It is set forth in language so plain that no one could mistake it that if the Council is called upon to consider a matter affecting the interest of any member of the League, that member must be present and is entitled to a seat. I should not have thought that the matter was open to argument at all. But in order to remove any doubt or apprehension from the mind of my hon. friend, I would like to draw his attention to a commentary on the Covenant of the League of Nations contained in an official document issued by the Government of Great Britain. This official commentary was prepared by the Rt. Hon. Lord Robert Cecil, K.C.M.G. and Lieut. General the Rt. Hon. Ian Christian Smuts, K.C., the two men, from the standpoint of the British Empire, who had more to do with framing this Covenant than any other two men and probably had considerably more to do with framing its general outlines than the President of the United States, although there were certain provisions which the President considered essential, and he was no doubt very largely responsible for their being included, particularly, Article 10. What do they say in their commentary on this article?

In the first instance, it is left to individual states to decide whether or not such a breach has occurred and an act of war against the League been thereby committed. . . . . It is the duty of the Council, with the help of its military, naval and air advisers to recommend what effective force each member of the League shall supply; for this purpose, each member from which a contribution is required has a right to attend the Council, with the power of veto during the consideration of its particular case.

I should have thought that that was quite clear without that commentary. I should have thought that that was the proper legal interpretation of the Covenant, but when you have that interpretation, which appears to be the fair, reasonable and proper interpretation in a commentary issued by the British Government, prepared by the two men who are responsible for the framing of the Covenant and which sets out in unmistakable terms the rights of any member who may be called upon to make a contribution to be present, to vote and to exercise the right of veto, I submit that the matter is not open to serious argument. It appears then that no nation can be called upon to make a military contribution without the consent of that nation given at the Council and with its representative present.

As far as Canada is concerned, she cannot be called upon to make any contribution unless her Parliament authorizes it and her representative at the Council approves of it.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: If that is the case why does the United States think it necessary to make the reservation I have just read as it has done with reference to Clause 10? The Senate of the United States evidently think that they will be called upon to make a contribution without being consulted under the terms of the Treaty.

Mr. ROWELL: I do not think it would be proper for me to express an opinion upon the reasons or motives which may have actuated the American Senate in adopting any particular resolution. The President of the United States did not think the reservation necessary, nor did his supporters in the House, when they considered it. The majority on the other side did, and now a sufficient number of votes in the Senate is apparently forthcoming to give the Republicans a majority in favour of the reservation that my hon. friend has referred to. I do not think it is desirable for us in this House to enter into a discussion of the reasons or motives which may have impelled them to take that action.

Mr. BELAND: Has the commentary from which my hon. friend quoted been distributed to the members of the House?

Mr. ROWELL: It was printed for distribution last session.

Mr. FIELDING: I presume it never in any way received the assent of the other nations?

Mr. ROWELL: I do not suppose it did.

Mr. FIELDING: Therefore, it might be debatable from their point of view.

Mr. ROWELL: It is only a commentary but I have never heard any serious question raised as to that being the proper interpretation. The President of the United States gave the same answer when he was asked by the Foreign Relations Committee as to the interpretation he would put upon the clause. As far as I am aware that is the interpretation put upon it by all the statesmen present at the Peace Conference.

It is not important and I should not take up the time of the House in discussing the matter, but my hon. friend referred to Sir George Perley suggesting that he had signed the Treaty without having read it. The an-

swer is here on record already that the principal terms of the Treaty were settled while the Prime Minister and his colleagues were in England although the final form and execution were delayed pending the completion of negotiations for the German and Austrian treaties.

My hon. friend from Beauce (Mr. Beland) put what he considered to be a poser when he asked what would happen in case one of the nations of the Empire did not desire to ratify the Treaty. It would depend entirely on the conditions under which such a question arose. My hon. friend, if he will recall the facts in connection with our history and our foreign relations, will realize that it is quite a common thing for Great Britain to sign a treaty on her own behalf and not on behalf of the self-governing Dominions. It is quite a common thing for her to ratify a treaty on her own behalf and not on behalf of her Dominions. I have in my desk one of those treaties, which will come before the House. That is the International Opium Convention. That was signed in 1912 but Canada did not have a plenipotentiary present to sign it. The Treaty is signed by the British representatives with the reservation of the following declaration:

> The article of the present Convention, if ratified by His Britannic Majesty's Government, shall apply to the Government of British India, Ceylon, the Straits Settlements, Hong Kong, and Wei-hai Wei in every respect in the same way as they shall apply to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland; but His Britannic Majesty's Government reserve the right of signing or denouncing separately the said convention in the name of any dominion, colony, dependency, or protectorate of His Majesty other than those which have been specified.

The situation would not be a new or novel one if this House declined to approve of an international obligation entered into by the British Empire, even if His Majesty decided to ratify in respect of Great Britain, or in respect of Great Britain and the Dominions that approved it, but did not ratify it in respect of Canada because Canada did not approve. Surely the situation is not difficult to comprehend and I do not understand all this argument which has been addressed to us in reference to the difficulties of such a situation.

Mr. BELAND: That is not the point. The point is that the Prime Minister said that if we did not assent we would no longer be considered a part of the British Empire

Mr. ROWELL: I said in opening it would depend entirely on the conditions under which it arose. If my hon. friend will read the whole statement made by the Prime Minister I think it is reasonably clear from his statement that this was his view. It depends entirely upon the conditions. We might take action under such conditions that we would be virtually declaring ourselves a separate nation of the Empire, but that would not normally be the result as I have pointed out in the case of this particular contention. My recollection is that the Japanese Treaty was in this form, that it did not bind the Dominions until they had expressly assented to it; and that after it had been ratified by His Majesty in respect of Great Britain it was subsequently approved by this House and ratified with respect to Canada. It is not a new matter, it is not a difficult matter. All the troubles that my hon. friends are conjuring up are figments of a somewhat disturbed imagination. They are not serious when you look the situation squarely in the face and recognize our constitutional development and the position in which we stand to-day.

I must say that I could not quite reconcile the statement of the leader of the Opposition, supported by the hon. member for Beauce, that there was danger of some occult centralizing imperialistic influence at work to destroy our autonomy, and the statement of my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) that this Government was proceeding along the lines which were disrupting the British Empire. The two statements cannot be correct.

Mr. BELAND: I do not know.

Mr. ROWELL: The truth is, neither is correct.

Mr. McMASTER: Might I ask a question? Is the President of the Privy Council unaware that for some years past an organization, with branches throughout the British Empire, has been busily engaged devising schemes for centralization; also that a very intelligent man has been spending years of his life going around propagating this idea and that a considerable amount of money has been expended in connection with it.

Mr. ROWELL: I am aware of it, but I might ask, has he converted my hon. friend to his views?

Mr. McMASTER: No, decidedly not, and I hope that he has not met any more success with other people. However, there has been the attempt. That is the point made by the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. BELAND: And some progress made.

Mr. ROWELL: If the gentleman in question has not met with any success in the case of my hon. friend he has not met with any greater success in my case.

Mr. McMASTER: I am a good Grit, it is hard in such a matter to make a success with me.

Mr. ROWELL: Perhaps it is not fair to allude to my hon. friend in that connection because he did, at the last session, offer the conspicuous example of a member of the Opposition who supported the views of the Government in reference to Canada's position. Therefore my remarks do not apply to the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster). I am very glad to see that the rest of the hon. gentlemen opposite have got back to the good Liberal position on Canada's status stated in my address of seven years ago and re-stated in my address on this Treaty, and which I found when I entered the Government was the good Conservative position also. I found that the Prime Minister and his Conservative colleagues were just as strong in maintaining Canada's right to full autonomy and self-government and her status within the British Empire as any Liberals with whom I have been associated. I found we were all agreed on that issue, and that has made our association in this important work in connection with Treaties of Peace of the most harmonious kind.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Hear, hear.

Mr. ROWELL: And even my hon. friend (Mr. Lapointe) to-day comes in behind our position supporting it and standing for that idea. "While the lamp holds out to burn" —there is an opportunity for my hon. friend.

Mr. BUREAU: We will be standing with the leader of the Opposition long after you are gone.

Mr. ROWELL: Then my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) said that we were not only creating some trouble between the United States and ourselves but there was danger of our creating trouble between Great Britain and ourselves. I was interested in the authority my hon. friend was quoting for that statement. Where did he go to get authority for the statement that we were creating trouble between Canada and Great Britain? My hon. friend went to one of the plenipotentiaries of the United States. The hon. gentleman by his position not only gives comfort to those who are opposing Canada's status, but he draws his inspiration from a representative of the United States not from a representative of Canada or Great Britain to attack our position here. If my hon. friend wants to find out the position of the British Government, there is no difficulty in doing so from the members of the British Government themselves. No man could have made a clearer statement, of the necessity and determination of the British Government to stand behind Canada in maintaining her status than did Lord Grey in that famous letter of his, in which he said that there could be no departure from the principle of the representation of the Dominions.

My hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's said he could understand what was meant by independence—he did not agree with that view but he could understand what it meant. He also said that he could quite understand what the old colonial relation meant—he did not agree with that view either but he could understand it. He did not, however, understand what we meant by the present position, the wonderful things that were to be accomplished at this constitutional conference. Well, I did not say that any wonderful things were going to be accomplished at the Constitutional Conference, and I do not think it is difficult to understand the position which this Government takes, which the Government of Great Britain takes, and which the Government of each of the self-governing Dominions takes as the present constitutional relations of the different nations of the Empire. It is this: Although the self-governing Dominions have had the rights of self-government for a long period they have occupied a more or less dependent relation to the Mother Country. They have been steadily growing more independent of the Mother Country in the sense that they have been exercising a larger measure of sovereignty over their own affairs, and the time has come when the Mother says to these Daughter States: "Well, you have been in a measure dependent upon me in the past. I now recognize you as my equals. We stand on an equality as nations of the British family of nations" or "the galaxy of British nations," as Sir Wilfrid Laurier termed it. Is that difficult to understand? A father may have his boys with him in business. They may not be partners although they may be managing various branches of it. The time comes when the father says "I will take you into partnership. You shall be equal with me in your status in the business, although you may not have as much interest, you may not have as much power." The father may retain the majority

interest in the business but the sons are partners, they have the status of partners, there is an equality of status. That illustrates the idea although of course it is not an analogy because you cannot apply the same rule to states. I only used the illustration as indicating what is meant by equality of status. What is the object of a Constitutional Conference? It is to provide improved machinery for consultation and co-operation in matters of common concern. Up to this present time Great Britain has been acting as trustee for all the other nations of the Empire in almost all matters of foreign policy. The time has come when actual participation in matters of foreign policy affecting the Dominions should be enjoyed by the Dominions, and some method of co-operation and consultation must be worked out to this end.

Mr. Speaker, the position of the Government is clear and unequivocal. I thought the position of the Opposition was also clear and unequivocal when my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, defined it this afternoon, but it has become somewhat clouded by the speeches delivered to-night. However, I would rather close the debate under the impression that the leader of the Opposition did speak for all his followers, and that the remarks made this evening which differed from his were but temporary lapses. I am glad to think that the House is unanimous in support of this resolution and of the principles embodied in it as set forth by me when I moved the resolution on Thursday last.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. ROWELL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move:

That a message be sent to the Senate informing their Honours that this House has adopted a resoluion approving the Treaty of Peace between the Allied and Associated Powers and Bulgaria, signed at Neuilly-sur-Seine on the 27th day of November, 1919, and requesting that their Honours will unite with this House in approval of said Treaty by filling up the blank therein with the words "Senate and."

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Sir George Foster the House adjourned at 11 p.m.

Wednesday, March 17, 1920.

The House met at Two o'clock.

PETITIONS FROM WAR VETERANS.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I desire to present to the House petitions from the United Veterans' League, largely signed, praying for certain legislation to be enacted in reference to returned soldiers.

PATENTS OF INVENTION.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Acting Prime Minister) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 19 to amend and consolidate the Acts relating to patents of invention.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

CIVIL SERVICE RE-CLASSIFICATION.

Mr. ETHIER:

Is it the intention of the Government to authorize and apply the provisions of the re-classification of the Civil Service, on the 1st of April, 1920, which has been prepared by American efficiency experts appointed therefor and under the direction of the Civil Service Commission; or is it the intention of the Government to reconsider and revise the said re-classification?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL: The re-classification is now in process of being applied and it is anticipated the work will be completed shortly.

BRITISH COLUMBIA FISH.

Mr. PECK:

What was the amount and value of fish caught in British Columbia during the year 1919 according to districts, in the following classifications: (a) salmon; (b) halibut; (c) other fish?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

Quantity of fish and value in British Columbia, 1919.

	Quantity cwts.	Value.
Southern district:		
Salmon	227,206	$2,483,897
Halibut	32,051	420,832
Other fish	98,619	509,242
Northern district:		
Salmon	759,036	4,744,939
Halibut	155,315	1,911,648
Other fish	56,023	126,847
Vancouver Island:		
Salmon	538,783	3,691,123
Halibut	2,761	33,748
Other fish	628,105	991,688

The values are those to fishermen at the boat's side.

RURAL MAIL ROUTES.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. How many rural mail routes were established during the year 1919?
2. How many rural mail routes have been established up to the present in 1920?
3. What is the average per mile and per subscriber rate for the delivery of rural mail under new contracts?
4. What is the present policy in regard to the establishment of new rural mail routes?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. 34.
2. 3.
3. (a) $38.89 per mile per annum—calculated on the basis of service performed six times a week. (b) $14.09 per annum for each subscriber.
4. The Postmaster General has considered it advisable in view of the financial conditions existing at present and the increase in the prices asked for the performance of rural mail delivery service, to put aside for a time the applications for new routes. When circumstances will permit further extensions of the rural mail system the petitions for new services will receive consideration.

WHARF AT STE. ANNE DE BEAUPRE.

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Is the Government aware that a certain contract was awarded to one Poliquin, to build a wharf at Ste. Anne de Beaupré, in the County of Montmorency?
2. Is the Government aware that the said work was to be fully and satisfactorily completed on or before the 6th instant?
3. Has the said work been finished accordingly?
4. If not, why?
5. When does the Government expect the work to be completed?

Hon. J. D. REID:

1. Yes.
2. No; date of completion is 31st July, 1920.
3. Answered by answer to No. 2.
4 and 5. When the contract was awarded the season was so far advanced that the contractor was unable to secure necessary timber. Work should be completed by August 1st next.

QUEBEC & SAGUENAY RAILWAY.

Mr CASGRAIN:

1. How many pasengers have been carried by the Quebec and Saguenay Railway since the 1st of October, 1919, to date?
2. What have been the net earnings of the Quebec and Saguenay since the 1st of October to date?

Hon. J. D. REID:

1. 14,273.
2. Deficit, $9,648.72.

[Mr. Ballantyne.]

ARMY BOOTS AND SHOES.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. How many pairs of army boots and shoes had the Government on hand at the date of the Armistice?
2. What was the initial cost of same?
3. How many pairs have since been sold or otherwise disposed of?
4. How much was realized from these sales?

Hon Mr. GUTHRIE:

1. Boots, 125,894 pairs; shoes, 188,355 pairs.
2. Boots, $674,358.65; shoes, $322,331.24.
3. Boots, 175,971; shoes, 161,906.
4. Boots, $879,840; shoes, $175,714.40. All these sales were made through the War Purchasing Commission.

NAVAL SERVICE AWARDS.

Mr. STEVENS:

Having regard to the following clause in the report of the Parliamentary Committee on Re-establishment:

"That members of the Naval Service who have served overseas in either Imperial or Canadian naval services or who have served in any seagoing ship in the Canadian Naval Service, outside of the three-mile territorial limit, shall be awarded the Class 'A' badge with 'Naval' or suitable words in place of 'C.E.F.'"

1. Have such badges been issued?
2. If not, by whose advice or instructions has the above recommendation been disregarded?
3. Will the Government take immediate steps to see that the Naval authorities comply with the report of the Parliamentary Committee which was approved by Parliament?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1, 2 and 3. The quotation mentioned in this inquiry is not the recommendation of the Committee. The recommendation was that "the suggestion should receive the immediate attention of the Government." The Naval Department, after consultation with the Militia Department, considered that the badge for naval service should be distinctive from the military badge.

C.E.F.—OFFICERS.

Mr. d'ANJOU:

What are the names of all the officers of the Canadian Overseas Forces who are at present employed at Militia Headquarters and who have been overseas but who have not seen active service at the front?

Hon. Mr. GUTHRIE:

List of Officers employed at Militia Headquarters who were on the strength of the Overseas Military Forces of Canada, but did not see service in France: Major-General Ashton, E. C., C.M.G., Lieut. Bawden, F. H., Major Dickinson, F. R., Captain Dunne, H M., Captain Guest, F., Captain

Holmes, A. W., Captain Kelly, P., Captain Melvin, J. P., Hon. Captain McKinley, J. F., Lt.-Colonel McCoy, S. H., Captain Nesbitt, C. H. F., Lieut. Shouldis, G.

MILITARY DEFAULTERS.—FINES.

Mr. MARCILE (Bagot):

1. Has the Government arrived at an understanding with the Quebec Government relative to fines paid by the defaulters of the Military Service Act?

2. If not, is it the intention of the Government to give instructions authorizing the Quebec Government to remit said fines to those who have paid them?

Rt. Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. Yes. So far as these fines have been received by the Province, they are to be returned to the Dominion.

2. Answered by No. 1.

RE-CLEANED SCREENINGS.

Mr. SUTHERLAND:

1. Did the Department of Agriculture contract for the purchase of the whole or any portion of re-cleaned screenings from grain at the grain elevators during the years of 1918 and 1919?

2. If so, what was the price paid per ton for same and at what price was it resold by the department?

3. What was the profit or loss to the department on the transaction?

4. Was it ground or unground when disposed of?

5. What was the weed seed contents of these screenings as found by analysis or investigations made by the department from time to time?

6. Have any measures been adopted to safeguard the purchasers of such screenings from the poisonous effects resulting from the feeding of such screenings and the distribution of noxious weed seeds?

7. Did Mr. C. Rice Jones, general manager of the United Grain Growers' Company state, on June 27, 1919, in evidence given before the special committee of Parliament, known as the Cost of Living Committee, that the average price of screening for the three years before the war was $4.91 per ton, and that the average price per ton for the past six years, including 1918, was $8.84?

8. Is the practice of distributing unground grain screenings still in effect? If not, when did it cease?

Hon. Mr. TOLMIE:

1. In November, 1917, the department contracted with the terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur for the purchase of all re-cleaned screenings (passing a set standard) for the crop year ending August, 1918. Later the contract was renewed to cover similar screenings from the crop year ending August, 1919.

2. Purchase price was thirty-five ($35) dollars per ton unground in elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur for the entire periods mentioned. Selling price to consumers was, from commencement until August 1, 1918, thirty-five dollars ($35) per ton f.o.b. Fort William, unground in bulk. August 1 to December 31, 1918, thirty-five dollars and fifty cents ($35.50) per ton f.o.b. Fort William, unground in bulk. January 1, 1919, to January 31, 1919, thirty-six dollars ($36) per ton f.o.b. Fort William, unground in bulk. February 1, 1919, to July 1, 1919, twenty-five dollars ($25) per ton f.o.b. Fort William, unground in bulk. July 1 to end of period, twenty-six ($26) per ton f.o.b. Fort William, unground in bulk.

3. Total loss to date, $96,446.29.

4. Material was disposed of both ground and unground at option of purchaser. When sold unground, purchaser invariably has made arrangements for grinding at local mill or elsewhere.

5. The botanical analysis of feed was as follows:

Broken and shrunken wheat ..	46.1	p.c.
Wild buckwheat	37.1	"
Wild oats..	8.6	"
Oats	1.0	"
Flax	0.1	"
Chaff..	5.65	"
Mustard	0.70	"
Other seeds	0.65	"

6. Apart from advocating to all purchasers of unground material the necessity of carefully grinding this feed and constant inspection by grain inspectors at Fort William and Port Arthur, no other measures have been adopted.

7. Have no knowledge.

8. No unground feed has been sold since August 15, 1919.

QUEBEC, ORIENTAL AND ATLANTIC RAILWAY.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure):

1. Has the management of the Canadian National Railways given any consideration to the acquisition of the Quebec, Oriental and Atlantic and the Quebec and Western Railways as part of the Canadian National Railway system, in view of the rapid development of business in the counties of Bonaventure and Gaspé?

2. If not, will they investigate the desirability of such acquisition?

Hon. J. D. REID:

1. No.

2. If matter is submitted to management it will be duly considered.

POSTMASTERS IN BONAVENTURE.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure):

1. How many postmasters have been appointed in Bonaventure county by the Civil Service Commission, and who are they?

2. How many of the said appointees are returned soldiers having served at the front and what are their names?

Rt. Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

1. (a) Thirteen postmasters have been appointed in Bonaventure county by the Civil Service Commission.

(b) Name and office: 1. Arsenault, Jos., Avignon; 2. Blois, B. W., New Carlisle; 3. Cyr, Ida K. (Miss), Maria; 4. Essiambre, Jean, Lagace; 5. Faure, Francisque, Milnikek; 6. Leblanc, Theophile, Black Cape; 7. Major, W. F., Hopetown; 8. Olscamp, Joseph, Restigouche; 9. Pike, Edith (Mrs.), Escuminac Flats; 10. Pitre, Wilfrid, Fauvel; 11. Poirier, Emilliene (Mrs.), St. Alphonse de Caplan; 12. Shaw, M. C. D. (Mrs.), Musselyville; 13. Theberge, J. A P., Milnikek, (abandoned the service August 27, 1919).

2. Three of these appointees are returned soldiers having served at the front, viz.: Faure, Francisque; Blois, Fletcher; Major, W. F. When the other ten civilians were appointed there were no qualified returned soldiers available.

ST. JOHN AND QUEBEC RAILROAD.

Mr. CALDWELL:

1. Has the Dominion Government made any agreement with the Government of New Brunswick whereby they will operate the St. John and Quebec Railroad between Centreville and Westfield Beach, in New Brunswick?

2. If so, what was the date of such agreement, and on what terms?

3. Did the Dominion Government make an agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to secure running rights for the said St. John and Quebec Railway trains over the said Canadian Pacific Railway between Westfield Beach and St. John?

4. If so, what was the date of such agreement and the terms?

5. And if the Dominion Government did not make such agreement, who did, and what are the terms?

6. Is the Dominion Government now operating the St. John and Quebec Railway as part of the Dominion Government Railway system?

Hon. J. D. REID:

1. An agreement was made between the Dominion Government and the province of New Brunswick and St. John and Quebec Railway.

2. Agreement dated November 9, 1916. The terms are as follows: The Government agreed to pay the St. John and Quebec Railway 40 per cent of the gross earnings.

3. No.

4. Answered by No. 4.

5. St. John and Quebec Railway Co. The terms are as follows: St. John and Quebec Railway Co., are to pay interest on a proportion of the value of the joint section plus a proportion of all working expenses calculated on a wheelage basis.

6. This line is being operated by the Canadian Government railways as part of the system.

CHAUDIERE STATION.

Mr. BOURASSA:

1. Is the Chaudière station, in the county of Lévis, under the control of the Government?

2. If so, is it aware that the station was burned over four years ago, and has been replaced by an unsanitary old freight car which is condemned by the Board of Health of the district of Quebec as being dangerous to the health of the employees and the public?

3. Does the Government propose to construct in the near future a station which will replace the one which has been destroyed?

Hon. J. D. REID:

1. Yes.

2. The railway is aware that the station was burned four years ago and that it has been replaced by a passenger car, but are not aware that it has been condemned by the Board of Health.

3. The railway does propose to construct a new station there but on account of the old building having been destroyed as a result of a collision, for which the Grand Trunk Railway was responsible, the question of the size and cost of the new station has been a matter of negotiation with the Grand Trunk and we expect to arrive at a definite understanding with them in the near future.

CANADIAN RAILWAY BOARD.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. Who compose the Canadian Railway War Board?

2. What are their respective salaries?

3. What was the total expense connected with this board during the calendar year 1919?

4. Is it the intention of the Government to dispense with the services of this board? If so, when?

Hon. J. D. REID:

The Canadian Railway War Board (known at its inception and for several months thereafter as the Canadian Railway Association for National Defence) was formed at a convention of executives of the Railways of Canada in the city of Montreal on October 23, 1917. The establishment of this organization was suggested by the Minister of Railways and Canals and had for its object the co-ordination of activities of the several railways to the end that the greatest degree of efficiency in the handling of

troops, war supplies etc., would be accomplished. When peace was declared it was found that this organization was so beneficial that the railways decided to continue the organization under the name of the Railway Association of Canada. The expenses are borne by the different railways belonging to the organization, and the Government are under no expense in the matter.

INTERCOLONIAL PROVIDENT FUND.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. How much did the Department of Railways and Canals contribute during the last fiscal year to the Provident Fund of the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways?
2. How many employees of the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways were entitled, during the said fiscal year, to participate in this fund?
3. How much did the department contribute to each employee on an average?

Hon. J. D. REID:

1. During the fiscal year ended March 31, 1919, the Department of Railways and Canals contributed $100,000.
2. 12,223.
3. $8.18.

EIGHT-HOUR DAY—JURISDICTION.

Mr. EULER:

1. Is the Government still of the opinion that this Parliament has no power to enact legislation fixing the hours of labour?
2. If not, is it the intention of the Government to enact the eight-hour day during the present session?

Rt. Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. Yes, unless such legislation should become necessary or proper for the purposes set forth in section 132 of the British North America Act.

2. The enactment of legislation is the function of Parliament. As to proposing legislation should such be called for under Article 132 above mentioned, the Government will announce its intention if and when that situation arises.

CIVIL SERVICE CLASSIFICATION.

Mr. FRIPP:

1. What are the names of the persons who prepared the classification of the Civil Service of Canada?
2. Where do they reside?
3. What has been their remuneration to date?
4. By whom were they engaged?
5. By whom recommended?
6. What is the period of their engagement?
7. When will their duties cease?

Rt. Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

1. The classification was prepared by the Civil Service Commission, assisted in a professional way by the firm of Arthur Young & Co., who assigned from time to time certain staff members to assist in the technical phases of the work.

2. Offices of the firm of Arthur Young & Co. are located in Chicago, New York, Ottawa, Milwaukee and Kansas City.

3. The firm of Arthur Young & Co. is compensated for its professional services through the payment of fees together with travelling and subsistence expenses for the staff members assigned. The total of these three items for technical assistance in the actual preparation of the classification amounts to $49,107.42.

4. The firm of Arthur Young & Co. was engaged by the Civil Service Commission in accordance with the Order in Council dated July 18, 1918 (P.C. 1778).

5. The firm was known by reputation to the Civil Service Commission as being the only one, not only in Canada but in the United States, which was equipped through experience and the necessary staff to undertake a commission of this sort.

6. No stated period.

7. As soon as the application of the classification is completed; this is estimated to be about May 1, 1920.

GREEK WHEAT CONTRACT.

*Mr. MURPHY:

1. Has the attention of the Government been drawn to the following article in "The Farmers' Sun" of February 14, 1920:

"GREEK WHEAT CONTRACT."

"The Greek wheat contract muddle in which Lloyd Harris, the Canadian Wheat Board and the Greek Government figure, may result in the Wheat Board being compelled to fulfil the contract entered into by Mr. Harris as Canadian Trade Commissioner, by which Greece received some 12,000,000 bushels of wheat at $2.47 per bushel.

"Prices are now at $3 and the Wheat Board claims that the contract was made for the amount of wheat at market prices.

"If the contract, which Mr. Harris upholds, is kept who will pay the fiddler? According to one prominent Toronto dealer, that is where the producers' participating certificates go up the chimney."

2. Is the contract mentioned to be fulfilled as to quantity and price in the terms stated in the above article?

3. If so, and a loss results, by whom is such loss to be borne?

Rt. Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

1. No.

2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN.

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. How many employees are there in the inside service of the Public Works Department?
2. How many are males?
3. How many are females?
4. How many males are French?
5. How many females are French?
6. How many males are Protestants?
7. How many females are Protestants?

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. How many employees are there in the inside service of the Post Office Department?
2. How many are males?
3. How many are females?
4. How many males are French?
5. How many females are French?
6. How many males are Protestants?
7. How many females are Protestants?

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. How many employees are there in the inside service of the Marine and Fisheries Department?
2. How many are males?
3. How many are females?
4. How many males are French?
5. How many females are French?
6. How many males are Protestants?
7. How many females are Protestants?

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. How many employees are there in the inside service of the Militia Department?
2. How many are males?
3. How many are females?
4. How many males are French?
5. How many females are French?
6. How many males are Protestants?
7. How many females are Protestants?

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. How many employees are there in the inside service of the Department of Interior?
2. How many are males?
3. How many are females?
4. How many males are French?
5. How many females are French?
6. How many males are Protestants?
7. How many females are Protestants?

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. How many employees are there in the inside service of the Department of Trade and Commerce?
2. How many are males?
3. How many are females?
4. How many males are French?
5. How many females are French?
6. How many males are Protestants?
7. How many females are Protestants?

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. How many employees are there in the inside service of the Secretary of State Department, including the Printing Bureau?
2. How many are males?
3. How many are females?
4. How many males are French?
5. How many females are French?
6. How many males are Protestants?
7. How many females are Protestants?

[Mr. Sifton.]

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. How many employees are there in the inside service of the Labour Department?
2. How many are males?
3. How many are females?
4. How many males are French?
5. How many females are French?
6. How many males are Protestants?
7. How many females are Protestants?

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. How many employees are there in the inside service of the Railway Department?
2. How many are males?
3. How many are females?
4. How many males are French?
5. How many females are French?
6. How many males are Protestants?
7. How many females are Protestants?

Mr. BUREAU: In connection with the series of questions which are now passed as orders for returns, I should like to ask the Acting Prime Minister (Sir George Foster) if the returns, when they come down, will indicate how many of those in reference to whom information is sought are naturalized British subjects and how many are not.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am afraid it will be pretty difficult to get all the information that is asked for in the questions as they stand, and in asking them to stand as an order for a return, we only bind ourselves to bring down such information as we can get.

Mr. BUREAU: The status is an easy matter to get.

Mr. SPEAKER: There can be no supplementary question under the order of "Questions," and in any event the question must be answered as it is placed on the Order Paper. If the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) desires additional information he should put a specific question on the Order Paper.

Mr. BUREAU: It is just supplementary information.

Mr. SPEAKER: It must be a question of the hon. gentleman's own; he cannot alter the question put by another member.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAY.

Mr. BUREAU asked:

1. Has any work been done on any of the lines enumerated in the Second Schedule of Chap. 13, 9 and 10 George V. being an Act to incorporate the Canadian National Railway Company and respecting Canadian National Railways?
2. If so, on what particular line has the work been done?
3. What kind of work has been done?
4. How much money has been expended for this work?

5. How much in construction? In surveys? In expropriations, and the purchase of the right of way?

6. How many station sites have been located on said lines, what is the name of each station and on what particular line?

7. What is the description of the land upon which it is located? How much was paid for said station site and who was representing the Government or the Canadian National Railways in negotiating the purchase?

8. If money were paid for any such sites, to what appropriation were they charged and on whose order were they paid?

9. Has any Order in Council been passed entrusting said Company with the management and operation of the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Intercolonial Railways?

10. If so, what is the date of the Order in Council?

11. If not, why has not such an Order in Council been passed?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Stands as an order for a return.

Mr. BUREAU: May I be allowed to ask why?

Mr. SPEAKER: It is entirely at the option of the Government.

Mr. BUREAU: May I ask when I may expect the return to come down? That is one way of evading a question.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman should put that question on the Orders of the Day. Question stands as an order for a return.

RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF SOLDIERS.

MOTION BY MR. ANDREWS FOR SPECIAL COMMITTEE.

Mr. G. W. ANDREWS (Centre Winnipeg) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the provision made for re-establishing in civil life the members of His Majesty's forces who served in the late war has in many cases proved inadequate, and that it is desirable that a special committee of this House be appointed to consider what provision can be made to meet such cases, the committee to have power to call for persons, papers and records, to examine witnesses under oath and to report from time to time.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it has been said that it is not so much what a man says as what he does that counts. Also, it has been said that by a man's service to his country his citizenship is proven. Also, "By their works ye shall know them." I do not claim that all the men who proceeded overseas were citizens of the highest possible type; they were not all plaster saints or high-born financiers, but I do claim that the great, overwhelming majority were amongst the best citizens of Canada prior to the war. Amongst them were the flower and youth of Canada. In spite of the fact that all were not possibly of the highest type, I claim that they were second to none in all those great qualities of self-sacrifice, discipline, courage, fortitude under punishment, and stability of character, which made victory possible. Perhaps I may be permitted as an Englishman to say that I believe there is something in the climate of this northern land of ours that produces men of great virility of character. Well do I remember as a new comer thirty years ago listening to the yarns of the old-timers about early days in Canada. Amongst the tales of endurance of the old settlers one story in particular occurs to my mind. It was told that a young man set out in the North country with a load of furs drawn by his dogs. He ran into heavy weather, lost all his food, his fish was all gone, but he made his way across the lake against heavy storms and at last, by the utmost perseverance and endurance succeeded in reaching the timber land. Here he built himself a fire, and being without food proceeded to cut off the tails of his poor dogs. He made soup from the tails, drank the soup, fed the bones to the dogs, and eventually arrived at the settlement. When he reached the trading post they said: "Hello boy, how did you get through?" And he replied: "A little short of tails but otherwise everything was jake." That, I think, illustrates the true spirit of our Canadians—absolutely unafraid in the face of danger, and full of initiative. The distinguishing characteristic of the Canadian forces overseas was the spirit of endurance and absolute determination to conquer or die.

The war has been an education. Men are thinking to-day as they never thought before, and as a result of their thinking these returned soldiers, who are amongst the very best citizens that we have, are organizing, falling into line, linking up for what is commonly known as "a square deal." My hon. friends may well ask: What do you mean by "a square deal?" It is pretty hard perhaps to describe it, because it means something different to almost every man. If hon gentlemen will accompany me for one day in the life of one of these men perhaps they will get a better realization of what a square deal means than in any other way I can suggest.

You will imagine, Mr. Speaker, that it is a June morning, after a more or less strenuous night of shell fire. The sun is just mounting above the horizon, and at this very moment—s-sh! a big shell is heard

coming, and it lands about a hundred yards to your rear. There is a lull and then again is heard—s-sh !—and another big shell lands about one hundred yards short of where you are standing in a little bit of a ditch, really a captured German communication trench. Another delay, and once again—s-sh !—followed by an explosion. The German gunners have the range and the trouble commences in earnest. From that moment, Mr. Speaker, for eight mortal hours everything in the way of shell fire, big and little, comes roaring into that trench. Your comrades are blown up, the trenches are obliterated, and becomes a shambles of dead and wounded. A runner comes from behind and the orders are to hang on at all costs—a German counter attack is expected the moment the shell fire ceases. It does cease after eight mortal hours during which time men face death a thousand times. Then each man stands up not only with his own rifle but with all the rifles that he can grab from his dead friends to repel the counter attack. In this particular case it never comes. But the strain is there—the men are waiting, waiting, waiting. A little later comes an order that the battalion will be relieved to clean up. That means, bury the dead; and our boy amongst others is told off for this purpose. He helps to dig a trench, and collect the dead, and on this particular day they number twenty-one. While the men are stretched there waiting, the officer comes up to read the burial service. He says, "Attention, men. Greater love hath no man than this, that he give up his life for his friend." The officer salutes and carries on. The dead are buried, and the job is nicely finished, when there is another strafe from the Germans, and the graves of the dead are uncovered. The job of burial has to be done once more. It is finally completed, and our man gets back into his little front line and waits to be relieved. It is while he is waiting there that he looks up aloft and sees the stars shining calmly down as they have shone for a million years. The tension of this terrible day relaxes, and he says, " My God, what is it all about? Who is to blame for this Hell? He asks, was it the men that he helped to bury—were they the cause of war? Was it his company officer? Was it the men across in the German trench, or the German gunners, who were responsible? They had no more to do with the war than we had. He knows it. Was it the brigadier? No, he is under orders. Was it the corps commander who was responsible? No. Was it the Government? If so, our friend makes up his mind, that if he is spared by the grace of God to get back, from that day forward he will take a hand in the government of his country. If he is a thinking man, Mr. Speaker, as hundreds and thousands of the men were, and an educated man, he does not stop with the Government, because he knows that the possession of wealth and the control of government can never be separated. Who supplied the party funds? Who came down in delegations from boards of trade and interviewed the Government without ever consulting their local representatives? Were these men the cause of the war and are they to blame? For a while he thinks, yes. But his mind is open, his mind is free, and he sees clearly. He realizes that rich men's sons lie in the grave that he helped to dig that afternoon. He realizes that the Military Service Act played no favourites—it took the rich man's son as well as the poor man's son. Then who is to blame? If he is of a socialistic turn of mind, he might think that it is time the economic power which is now held by a few men in all the countries of the world, which stands behind all governments and must ever stand behind them, was taken out of the hands of these men and placed with the representatives of the people. But that will not satisfy his mind because he knows that individuals compose the nation. What causes war between individuals? Is it lust for power and selfishness, Mr. Speaker? Is that the cause of war, the cause of strife,—selfishness and lust for power? If so, what is the opposite of selfishness? It is love, doing unto other men as they would be done by—the words of the white Christ, the "square deal." The square deal means much or nothing to many minds, but it is a slogan, almost a crusade, to-day with the fifteen millions of men that fought in this war. Nothing less will do. And, Mr. Speaker, the behaviour of our officers, non-commissioned officers, and men in this great fight was so splendid that I have come out with an abiding faith in the decency of human nature. It has been said " as a man sows so shall he also reap." That is true of countries, likewise, I am perfectly satisfied that the great majority of our men who fought, and the great majority of our people who stayed at home, were filled with the spirit of self-sacrifice. Otherwise, we would never have won the war. As we sow, so shall we reap. If this is not true, Mr. Speaker, it means that there is no justice in this world; it means that our civilization is a lie; it means anarchy—red anarchy,—back to nature,—red in tooth and in claw;—that is what it means.

So far as I can learn, Mr. Speaker, it was never the desire of our people that the war should be made a political issue. There may have been differences of opinion as to how the men should be recruited and in respect to other details, but never, so far as I can learn, was it the desire of our people that the war should be made a political issue. And so far as I can learn it is not now their will that the re-establishment of the men and women who suffered through the war should become a political issue. Therefore I appeal to hon. members to tackle this problem in the same spirit which animated our men in France and at home and which helped them to win the war.

Mr. CYRUS W. PECK (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I am seconding the motion of my hon. friend in order to get this question before the House. I am quite convinced that the Government is going to give us an opportunity for discussion. But I do not know that I agree with my hon. friend as to the method by which we can best attain the purpose he has in view. The only people I can see any chance of helping us are the Government, because none of the parties opposite have ever said what they are going to do for the returned soldiers.

If this question is brought up I think it should deal with all matters pertaining to the returned soldier in the following order: Pensions, re-establishment, gratuities. I am going to say right here that I do not for a moment pretend that I shall support the extreme demands for gratuities that have been made upon the Government. I have told my people that. At the same time, I think we should go into the whole question again, and have it properly ventilated, before, and fully investigated by, a committee sincere in trying to get to the bottom of it. I have every confidence that the Government is sympathetic, but if they are not I do not see any one else who will help us. Therefore I am going to depend upon the Government; I am sure they will not let us down.

Mr. RICHARD C. COOPER (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to discuss in any detail the motion brought forward by my hon. friend from Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Andrews), but I do seriously ask the Government to appoint either a new committee similar to the Committee on Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment which we had last session, or give added powers to the Pensions Committee to deal with this question. There are still many questions of vital interest to the returned men that have not yet been satisfied. There is only one I intend to mention, it is one that was dealt with by the Committee on Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment last session. I refer to life insurance. A recommendation was made to the Government that action should be taken to see what could be done in the matter. So far as I know nothing further has been done. It has been discussed already this session, and in my opinion it is one of the most serious questions we have to consider in the future in connection with the man who served in the front line trenches. There are very few men, who, even if not actually wounded, have not received some physical or mental disability, and they will have to be considered and helped so far as life insurance is concerned.

I heartily support my hon. friend's motion, and I sincerely trust that the Government will not waste any further time in stating their intention of referring the subject matter to a committee to be thoroughly gone into.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE (East Edmonton): Mr. Speaker, if the resolution were pressed to a vote I would support it. At the same time I think it unfortunate that the mover has not given a larger number of cases which this committee is supposed to deal with. In any event, I wish to say, if we are obliged to-day to call upon a committee to further study matters relating to our returned soldiers, it is due largely to the administration of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment. A number of the questions which were settled for them by the committee last year could have been settled by a deputy or a minister. The fact remains, Sir,—and my information is not only from friends in the House but from the soldiers themselves—that the deputy is a man whom they do not care to go to because he is not a soldier; he has nothing in common with them, although he may be sympathetic. The minister of the department is also, they say, hard to approach and does not give them the sympathy which they feel they ought to receive.

If it were not for the fact that I possess information that this department must necessarily cease its work very shortly, I would move an amendment to this resolution that, instead of having a committee of the House appointed to further inquire how matters may be dealt with, a minister should be appointed who is a soldier, and that his deputy should also be a soldier, so that the returned soldiers could tell their

grievances frankly and fully to men of their own kind who would be able to understand exactly what was required.

If it is not too late I would suggest that a deputy minister be appointed who is a soldier, so that these men may get a lot of their grievances redressed without coming before this proposed committee. A committee of this House is not satisfactory; it was not satisfactory last year. The report was unsatisfactory, and it may be that the report of the proposed committee will be also unsatisfactory.

Mr. JOHN H. BURNHAM (West Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I sent a copy of this resolution to Peterborough, where the convention of the Great War Veterans of the province is now being held. I asked them to pronounce upon it, and they said they would do so. As the convention is still proceeding I should like to ask the member for Centre Winnipeg if it would be possible for him to adjourn the debate. As we are all aware, the committee appointed to look into this matter last session brought in a report, but as that report in several respects did not quite satisfy the soldiers, and the House, it was held open, and after a somewhat strenuous debate it was agreed that the Government would hear whatever further complaints the soldiers had to make. I understood the report would be brought back to the House and be adopted in the usual way, but I have heard nothing about it since, nor have I heard what additional complaints have been preferred or what has been done with regard to the matter.

It would appear to me that the proposition contained in this resolution conflicts directly with the work of the committee already in existence, because, so far as I know, that committee has not yet been released. Perhaps the Government will tell us what additional work has been done in this respect since that debate of last session. It might meet the purpose of this resolution if the assurance could be given that while the work of that committee has not been brought to a conclusion, it is on the way to it.

Mr. A. B. McCOIG (Kent, Ont.): Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my approval of the resolution proposed by the member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Andrews). It is proper and just that a committee of this House should be appointed with a view to bringing about a more speedy re-establishment of the returned soldier into civil life. I know a number of cases in my section of the country where returned men who have been desirous of locating on farms and of taking up farming work as a profession have been held back for months and do not know whether or not they can get land for the spring operations. In some cases the men have been assured that farms would be allotted to them, but in the meantime the prices of agricultural implements and equipment have increased to such an extent that those who want to equip their farms for the crop of 1920 will be under the painful necessity of paying from 20 to 25 per cent more for implements and equipment than they would have had to pay had they got the land earlier. It would have been better if a committee had been appointed at an earlier day, but certainly the Government should now appoint this committee and see that all possible assistance is rendered to those returned men who are desirous of locating on farms, as well as those who wish to re-establish themselves in other occupations.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON (Muskoka): I desire to support this resolution and to join with the member for Skeena (Mr. Peck) in his intention not to support extreme demands made either in this House or out of it. I am not unmindful of the great service that has been done by this House to the returned soldier. The greatest service they did them or could have done them was the affording of sufficient support at the front. The gratuity which was given to the men on their return was a good one and one which they ought to be grateful for. I think that the great bulk of the men are grateful for it. But the first thing that this House and this country have to do is to look after the crippled, the widows, and the orphans. I cannot honestly say that that task has yet been fairly done. I hope that the Government will see its way clear to appoint a committee whose sole function will be to inquire into the matter of pensions. I do not say that the pensions have not been fairly well administered or that the scale of pensions is not reasonably high. Undoubtedly our pension scale is the highest in the world, and that is something for which our country ought to get credit. But in the actual administration of the pensions it happens that dependents, and the wounded and the crippled are in many cases not given enough money to live on. That, after all, is the main thing. The question is not whether our pension scale is the highest or the lowest; it is whether those to whom pensions are payable are receiving enough to enable them to live under present conditions. I think that a great deal of the difficulty in this re-

gard could be overcome through administrative acts. But after two years' experience in dealing with many of these cases I am thoroughly convinced that the medical man is one of the greatest sources of trouble. I would like the House to grasp that point. The Pension Board has to work under a disability which they cannot override; in many cases they are subject to the decisions of medical men who are not in touch with the returned soldier and whose judgments and opinions vary considerably in different cases. I could cite cases of men who are disabled to the extent of being unable to do any work at all and who are drawing only $12 to $15 a month by way of pension. I am not blaming the Government or the Pension Board for that; I believe that the three members of the board are efficient men who take a sympathic attitude and who are anxious to do justice to the soldiers and to the widows and orphans who are pensioners of this country. But as I have said, the board are too much bound by regulations; they have not enough freedom, and the medical examiner is not in sufficiently close contact with the applicant for pensions.

Closely associated with this matter is the matter of life insurance. Many men who have been disabled during the war were unable to obtain the benefit of life insurance because of the fact that the companies levied a rate higher than they were able to pay, and to-day they are unable to get the insurance. The Government will not be doing justice to these men until it puts them in the position they would have been in had they incurred no war disability. The first thing we have to do is to look after the disabled and the war dependents; the next thing is to look after insurance; and the third—in connection with which, I realize, there are great difficulties—is to re-establish the men in civil life. I am not in sympathy, and never was, with the demand for a $2,000 gratuity. I do not believe that any man who gave his services voluntarily, as most of our men did, has a right to come back here and make a demand like that upon his country. I go further and say that ninety per cent of the men are not making such a demand; I have not had five men come to me and ask me to support it. But a large number of returned men are finding it difficult to get back into civil life, and many of those who are becoming re-established are doing so under great disabilities and with much hardship. I can cite cases of bank clerks, for instance, who upon their return from the front were offered their former positions at the same salary that they were receiving when they left them five years ago, while those who had remained at home had got increases of perhaps $100 a year, making a difference of $400 or $500. Then there is the great student body; I think that a greater claim could be made out for them than any other class. Students are drawn from all classes of society, from the poor as well as from the rich. I am not in favour of differentiating at all; I believe that one man's effort is as good as another's and should be dealt with accordingly. Many of these students have suffered great hardships and met with great difficulty in getting re-established in civil life. The problem is a difficult one, I know; it is one to which the best thought of men in this House and out of it has been given. But I do hope that the Government will appoint a committee to go into this question, and this question alone, because I think it is big enough to engage the attention of a committee. The Pension Committee will have plenty of work on their hands. Let us try to do what we can to be fair and just to everybody. I would be the last man, I think, to ask in this House for anything that is unreasonable or unfair; but I think that Canada cannot afford to have it said that we did not at least endeavour to do justice to the men who have served this country for the last four or five years.

Mr. THOMAS W. CALDWELL (Victoria and Carleton, N.B.): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put myself on record as being in favour of the motion that a special committee be appointed to inquire into the re-establishment of returned men. One of the speakers on the other side has rather found fault that the mover of the resolution did not cite many branches of the service that should be investigated by this committee. I may be able to give some. I do not wish to cover the whole ground, but there are some cases that came under my immediate notice in our province and that I would like to bring to the attention of the House at this time. One is in regard to the matter of pensions which I think the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. McGibbon) mentioned a few moments ago. The hon. member spoke of the medical men being tied down by regulations; he said that they did not have free enough scope in deciding as to pensions. Another thing he said,—and I heartily agree with him—was that the medical examiner is not brought into close enough touch with the soldier who is applying for a pension. I have the papers here in regard to a man about whom

I spoke briefly, on Monday, who was granted a disability pension in July, having been in the military hospital for something like three months or more before this pension was granted to him. The physician who examined him for the pension was the physician who had attended him during those three months. I visited the man in the hospital during that period, and for a certain length of time he was allowed to walk out only fifteen minutes in the forenoon and fifteen minutes in the afternoon. Later on, he was allowed to walk out for thirty minutes in the forenoon and thirty minutes in the afternoon. So, it will be understood that this man was in rather a weak condition. At the end of about three months in the hospital he was granted a full disability pension, this being the finding of the doctors at that time:

BOARD OF PENSION COMMISSIONERS FOR CANADA.
43 Canada Life Bldg.,
St. John, N.B., July 18, 1919.

Sir:—I have the honour by direction to inform you that this office has given full and careful consideration to the proceedings of the Medical Board which examined you prior to your discharge from the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment and to the other documents and information on your file. It has been decided to recommend that you be awarded a Class 1 pension at the rate of $600 per annum. If you are married, you will be entitled to a further $96 per annum. If you have children you will also be entitled to a further $144 per annum for the first child, $120 per annum for the second child and $96 per annum for each additional child. Your pension commences on July 5, 1919.

This man had three children, and he was paid this pension from the 7th day of July until the end of August. You will notice, Mr. Speaker, that he was granted this full disability pension after careful consideration had been given to the proceedings of the Medical Board and on the examination of a physician who had been attending him for at least three months in the hospital. On November 3, this man received the following notice, and I understand this latter decision was made by a physician who never saw the soldier. This is from the Pension Commissioners at Ottawa:

BOARD OF PENSION COMMISSIONERS FOR CANADA.
Ottawa, November 3, 1919.

Sir:—I have the honour to inform you that very careful consideration has been given to the recommendation that you be awarded pension covering total disability as the result of tuberculosis.

It is noted that you were discharged in 1916 as the result of over age and debility. Several examinations in the course of the next two years showed that you had no disability other than a slight difficulty in walking as a result of gunshot wound of the leg.

Almost three years after discharge you were taken on the strength of the Department of Soldiers' Re-establishment for sanatorium treatment, and upon discharge it is shown that very sparse and scant signs of tuberculosis exist, and such as are at present would not appear to be in any way related to your military service, after careful perusal of the history of your case.

Future payments on your account will, therefore, be made at the rate in force prior to your commencing treatment with the D.S.C.R., covering the disability shown to exist to the extent of five per cent.

Your obedient servant,

STANLEY B. CORISTINE,

The Secretary, Board of Pension Commissioners for Canada.
Per. M.

This soldier is receiving for this five per cent disability $3 a month; for his wife, 75 cents a month; and $1.75 a month for his three children. Notwithstanding the fact that the doctor who had been attending him for three months pronounced him totally disabled, the doctor who, I understand, never saw the case, after giving careful consideration, not to the case but to the history of the case, decided that the man was only five per cent disabled. As I pointed out to the House on Monday, this family applied in January, 1920, for aid from the Patriotic Fund, and Dr. Rankine, the doctor whom the military authorities had appointed in Woodstock—and I may tell the House that this gentleman is one of the foremost doctors in our province, a man of the highest integrity, a man whose honour has never been questioned—signed this man's application for aid from the Patriotic Fund and declared him to be one hundred per cent disabled. This doctor had also been attending this man, as I think can be proved by looking up the records in the Pension Bureau at Ottawa where it will be found that the Pension Commis-

3 p.m. sion paid this man's doctor bill for treatment at the man's own residence. They also paid, or have agreed to pay, Dr. Grant for attending this man in his own home. Dr. Grant also signed this man's application for aid from the Patriotic Fund and declared him to be one hundred per cent disabled. There is something wrong with our pension law or with the putting of it into operation, and I should be inclined to think that there was something wrong with both phases.

There is one other matter in regard to soldier's re-establishment about which I wish to speak, and that is the settling of returned men on the land. I am perhaps in as good a position to speak of the facts as any other hon. member, having been in

close touch with that work in our province since it was first organized. I was the Chairman of the Agricultural Qualification Committee from the time it was first organized until I had to resign to accept the nomination to run in the by-election last October. I was also a member of the Loan Committee, and in this way I was in very close touch with the work in our province. I do not wish to criticise the Soldiers' Settlement Act unnecessarily, because I believe it is a good Act and was designed for a good purpose, and is largely fulfilling that purpose. I do not, however, think that it is going to increase production in the eastern provinces, although it may do so in the western provinces where there is virgin prairie land on which they can settle these men. In New Brunswick and perhaps all the other eastern provinces there is very little such land. Nearly all the virgin lands in the East are wooded, and such lands can be worked best by men who have had experience in these conditions of cultivation. I do not think production will be increased by putting on such a farm a total stranger to conditions in the particular district. I have no fault to find with the purpose of the Act; I think it a very wise thing to establish these men in one of the noblest callings of the present day, that is, the production of the food necessary to feed the starving millions of the world. I think, however, that the terms of the Soldiers' Settlement Act require modifying in some respects. As hon. members are aware, these men have twenty-five years to pay for the farm on the amortization plan; they have six years to pay off the loan for stock and equipment, beginning with the third year, —they do not pay anything for the first two years on the stock and equipment loan, and that, I think, is a very good provision. I think the time for paying off the loan for stock and equipment should be extended for a longer period, and I will show the House a little later on how I arrive at this conclusion. Every man who was associated with me in that work in New Brunswick—and I do not think I am violating anyone's confidence in saying this—during the past summer and the previous winter, held the same view that I hold, namely, that it will be utterly impossible for these men to make their payments the third, fourth, fifth and sixth years. We had a detail d report made of what the cleared land was worth per acre, as well as the wooded land, together with a value of the buildings. We also secured a statement of the last two crops raised on the farm, and if it was impossible to get this we asked our inspector to make an estimate of the possible crop production of the farm. We took first the price asked for the farm and estimated what the man's yearly payments would be for the farm with stock and equipment necessary to operate it. From the total crop production of the farm we then had to deduct the actual cost of producing the crop, in which were included the man's living expenses for himself and his family for the year, and other indispensable expenditures. We were then in a position to know precisely what the man would have left at the end of the year to make his payments. Let us take the case of a soldier receiving the maximum loan—and in this connection I desire to express my conviction that there is another room for improvement in the Act. The maximum loan, in my opinion, is too small to be of any practical advantage to the borrower, for you cannot buy a very extensive farm with proper buildings for $5,000. Any hon. member in this House who has ever engaged in farming will realize that a farmer must work a certain portion of his land for the keep of himself and his family. If you double the acreage, the net profit from the added portion is far greater than from the first. It would nearly take a hundred acre farm to support an ordinary family. The man getting the maximum loan of $8,000 would pay $5,000 for the farm, $2,000 for stock and equipment and $1,000 for permanent improvements. His payments yearly for 25 years on the farm would be $390. On the third, fourth, fifth and sixth years his payments on stock and equipment would be $564 a year. And on a farm of this kind his tax would be in the neighborhood of $60 and his insurance $20. His total payments would therefore be $1,034 a year for these four years, which would take almost 13 per cent of a net profit on the whole investment of $8,000. In figuring up the purchases which we made during the summer—we had about one hundred applications per month in New Brunswick alone—we found that very few of the farms would return a net profit—after allowing for actual cost of production not including wages for the man and his family—apart from actual living expenses. We learned that very few of these farms would bring a net profit of more than ten per cent, and some less. I believe, however, that if the time were extended for payment of the loan for stock and equipment to twenty-five years beginning at the third year it would be possible for the borrower to meet

his payments. If we allowed twenty-five years for the whole payment of the loan his payments would be $544 yearly and his taxes and insurance $80, making a yearly payment of $624 a year for twenty-five years, or nearly 8 per cent on the total investment. Of course, one objection that might be raised to the extension of time in regard to stock and equipment would be that the stock and equipment would not be good security after six years. But if I understand the Act correctly, and I think I do, everything that the man ever owns, farm, stock and equipment, including increase of his stock or any equipment he may acquire later, will still be held as security for the land; and as he cannot keep on farming without replacing his equipment when it wears out he will necessarily always have complete equipment of machinery on the farm, as well as stock. The man would be farming under Government supervision so that it would be impossible for him to allow his stock or equipment to deteriorate without the board being immediately aware of it. The field supervisors are supposed to pay these men monthly visits. Let us suppose that a man were given twenty-five years in which to make his payment; we shall see what the Government's security would be like at the end of six years. In the first place, he has to pay down 10 per cent of the purchase price—in the case assumed, this payment would be $500—before he gets possession of the farm. At the end of six years he would have paid $390 a year on his farm, or a payment of $2,340, and $154 a year, or within a fraction of that sum, for the third, fourth, fifth and sixth years on the stock and equipment loan. Thus at the end of six years he would have paid $3,456. This would make this property a better security to the Government than it was at the outset. For if the man has to pay out every last dollar that he can rake and scrape in order to meet his payments he will not be able to replace his stock and equipment; but if he is given a sufficiently long time in which to pay he will be able to make replacements when necessary. There is also a provision in the Act permitting soldiers to make payments more quickly if they see fit and are able to do so, and my belief is that these men would be only too anxious to make their payments as quickly as possible, because the more they pay yearly the less their interest charges. These men have no equity in the land and no credit with any one. They are not able to do business the same as other men until their loan is fully paid. During the present session I have received a number of letters from those who were settled last summer inquiring as to what method they should adopt to secure fertilizer for the coming spring's planting. The fertilizer dealers will not advance them any fertilizer because these farmers have no security to offer; you cannot collect a cent from them unless they are willing to pay, their property being held by the board until the loan is paid. This is right, because, I admit, the board must protect itself. I desire to read that section of the Act dealing with repayment to show why it is necessary to make it possible for the men to meet the payments when they fall due:

> All sales of property, real, personal or other, made pursuant to the provisions of this order and whereon any balance of the sale price shall remain payable by instalments, shall be evidenced by agreement of sale, which shall fully set forth the terms of sale. If any instalment mentioned in any such agreement of sale is not punctually made, or if default is made in respect to any other provision of such agreement of sale, the Board shall be at liberty, without any formal re-entry or re-taking, and without resort to proceedings in equity or at law, to rescind such agreement, to cancel such agreement of sale and to recall the property, real, personal or other, to another settler. The effect of such rescission and cancellation shall be to vest such property in the Board absolutely free and discharged of all rights and claims of the settler and of all persons claiming or entitled to claim through or under him for any estate in, or lien, charge or encumbrance upon or against such property. If and when such property is resold by the Board any surplus remains in its hands beyond the amount owing to it as balance of the sale price and interest at five per cent per annum and expenses of taking over and reselling the property, the Board may pay such surplus to the settler, but if, instead, a deficiency arises, that deficiency shall be paid by the settler to the Board, which shall have a right of action against him therefore. Before exercising the rights by this section given the Board shall give to the settler notice of its intention so to do, which notice shall be deemed duly given if mailed in any post office by registered letter addressed to the settler at his last address known to the Board thirty clear days before the Board acts thereunder.

There is another feature of the Act to which I think some attention should be given. The man's wife does not have any right of dower in the land until the loan is fully paid, and no judgment bill of sale or any other lien can be executed against the property pending that time. Even his crop cannot be seized for debt. I do not find fault with these provisions; they are absolutely necessary, I think, to protect the Soldiers' Settlement Board. On the other hand, I think it will be realized that it is imperative that the Government should not pass any regulation the terms and condi-

tions of which it will be impossible for these soldier settlers to comply with and I think I have made it clear to the House that it is practically impossible for these men to meet their payments in the third, fourth, fifth and sixth years under the Act as it is at present.

There is one other feature of soldiers' re-establishment that I would like to speak of as briefly as I can—because I think there is a feeling in the country that the time of the House is wasted in long speeches and I do not want to be among those who transgress. What I desire to say has reference to university students who enlisted and went overseas. The pension law, I believe, makes provision for a man who comes back disabled and not able to take up his vocation where he left off. He is given training in some other department that he may wish to take up. While these students may come back absolutely fit physically, they are not in a position to take up anything and become earning entities in the country. They will have to spend two, three or four years before they are in a position to take their places in the world and even to earn their daily bread. I believe these men should be granted something by way of gift or loan. I am not very much in favour of a gift to anybody, and I do not believe that any money given in that way can be considered as a gift or charity at all. I do not want to be misunderstood in that respect. I believe they are asking for a gratuity in order to educate themselves. I think they should have some assistance along these lines in the way of a gratuity and that they should be granted the balance of the money they need by way of loan to enable them to finish their education.

Mr. R. J. MANION (Fort Willian and Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, I shall not take up very many minutes of the time of the House on this question, but I should like in a general way to support the resolution favouring the appointment of a special committee, or perhaps the continuation of the same committee as that which dealt with this question last year, to further consider the matter. Last year when the committee brought in their report, the House as a whole, including the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Andrews) adopted it. But at the same time there was an understanding that there would be further consideration given to some aspects of the report. One clause of the report said that the pensions in the case of the dependents of some of the soldiers who died at the front were inadequate. Having mentioned it before this session, I will not take time to discuss it further, but I believe they are inadequate and I think that is one of the questions which should come before that committee, or whatever committee deals with the question. The question of insurance was another matter which was discussed and favourably commented upon by the Committee. I believe that should be looked into also. Last year in my remarks, I took up the question of extending loans which the committee had recommended to disabled men. I suggested that these loans be extended to all needy cases. I have seen no reason to change that opinion since last year. I shall take a moment to read my remarks in the House last year upon that question:

> The committee have suggested loans only to the disabled. I personally cannot see why it should be absolutely impossible to work out a system of loans which would be extended to the needy as well as to the disabled. My hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Cooper) makes the statement that they would all be needy. I do not admit that. I think there would probably be 200,000, or half of he soldiers who came back from the front, who would be looked upon as not demanding a loan made to men who absolutely needed it. My hon. friend from Vancouver, my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Griesbach) and I are all returned soldiers, and we would be amongst those who would not under any circumstances touch a loan of that kind. . . . . I am merely offering this as a suggestion. I may be wrong but still it is something that I should like to have the Government consider. If 200,000 men asked for a loan of $500 each, these being needy cases, it would only amount to $100,000,000 and it is not impossible to raise that $100,000,000 in this country.

I also took up the question of insurance at that time and I said, regarding that proposition:

> The third proposition which I have to make is in regard to life insurance. The committee has gone into the question of life insurance and it has recommended that the matter should be further inquired into. I agree with that. I think the Government has a duty to perform and that is to work out some scheme to provide for men who have served and who cannot get insurance in the regular way from the legitimate insurance companies.

I also said:

> Finally, in many cases, the pensions have been inadequate. I believe that the rate of pensions should be increased in a large number of cases, as was suggested by the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) this afternoon.

These are a few of the things I said last year and they dealt with a number of matters in the report which I do not think were completely worked out, not because the committee neglected to work them out, but because of lack of time. The committee admitted themselves that they should have

had more time to discuss them. As these questions could not be settled in the time at their disposal, it is not unreasonable to ask the Government to either reappoint this committee or to appoint some special committee to take up these different phases of the question and any other matters that may be brought before them. I sincerely hope that the Government will favourably consider this resolution as moved by the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg.

Rt. Hon. Sir GEORGE E. FOSTER (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to take the place of any hon. gentleman who wishes to speak but up to the present it has all been from one side. The discussion begins to look as if it were a little lopsided and it is probably as well that I should make the few remarks I am going to make now. It might be in the beginning of the debate, or the middle of it or towards the end of it, depending on the members who are here assembled and who wish to take part.

I regret one thing and it is that to-day when this motion has come up my hon. friend the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) is not here. As all members on both sides of the House know, he had a very important and responsible position in connection with the committee which made the examination last year and in the consequent discussion that took place in the House. He has also had a great deal to do with, and has had a great deal of experience of, the administrative work and measures consequent upon the report of the committee and the action of the House. He is unfortunately prevented from being here on account of illness and I think it is to the disadvantage of the debate, because of information that might be given, that he is not here. That, of course, we have to put up with. For myself, in reference to these different measures, I have only been able to give a general sort of observation and attention to them. I have not been intimately connected with either the examinations of the committee or the administration of the different departments which have been carrying on the various parts of this work. But there are two or three things which occur to me, and I mention them because I think that as reasonable men on both sides of the House we are quite disposed to take them into consideration. In the first place, there is a very large number whose interests and whose conditions are to be taken into account.

The returned soldiers number hundreds of thousands.

There were direct disabilities and indirect disabilities ranging from ninety per cent disability to many and far removed lines of contingent and consequential hardship which appeal more or less to all of us as being the residue of a great and cruel war in the causation of which the victims had no part but from which they inevitably have to suffer. Then there are large lines of relief and of re-construction which are set out. Take for instance the pensions. That is one, and the main one we will say, along certain lines of aid. The pension law comes to be on the statute book by virtue of the deliberations of Parliament, and it sets out what at the time of the enactment of that law was the aggregate opinion of the Parlaiment of Canada. Thereupon, Pension Commissioners are appointed to carry out the law; and it is well for us all to remember first that Pension Commissioners are human and liable to mistakes; that they have to operate through a long line of subsidiary helps of whom the same must be said; and that they have to deal with thousands upon thousands of cases removed, most of them entirely removed, from their own personal observation or acquaintanceship. There, I think, comes in a plea for a good deal of moderation and a good deal of consideration in the criticisms which are made and which, viewed from the point of the individual case, are perfectly well founded criticisms. All that I am pleading for in this respect is, that taking into account the area and scope of the duties of the Commissioners and the human instrumentalities, widely distributed and impossible of direct supervision, through which they work out their duties of administration, it is absolutely impossible but that individual cases which, from one reason or another are not as speedily as possible or as adequately as possible dealt with, must necessarily occur —cannot be avoided. And therein a good deal of hardship, a considerable amount of grievance, and a good deal of well-founded criticism can come; but if we take into account what I have said, I think we would be disposed to be moderate and human in our criticism.

Then take the soldiers' re-construction under Sir James Lougheed, one of the members of the Cabinet. I do not suppose that any minister in any Cabinet is so endowed that it would be possible for him to be entirely to the satisfaction and entirely to the liking of everybody who has to do with

his administration. That I think we may set down as being a fact. But I am bound here, as a member of the Cabinet and a colleague of the minister who is administering that work, to add my testimony not only to his diligence, his application and his interest—in the great work with which he is connected, but also to his sympathy with that work, and I think cooler moments with all of us, and a little examination into the real work being carried out and into the difficulties encountered in doing it, will help us in the end to appreciate according to its merits what is being done under the administration and leadership of Sir James Lougheed. I have looked into it somewhat, and I have also looked somewhat into similar operations and administrations carried on by other countries, and I have been myself—I say it honestly and I say it as I think it ought to be said—astonished at the amount of work, the quality of the work, and the saving nature of the work, which has been carried on under the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment. I think we will all be agreed on that point. But some things have not been done and some things have been done wrongly; so it happens in all our business transactions; and the number of these will be greater or less according to the scope and the variety of the business which we are trying to administer. But I want to give my testimony, as one who knows something about it, to the work which has been carried on under that administration.

Then we have the Land Settlement scheme. There again if we look at it from one point of view, there is no country of all those which fought in the war which has a system so extensive and so broad-based, so generous in the point of the assistance given, and in the way of methods towards putting soldier farmers back upon the land or enabling them to go after training at first hand upon the land as this Dominion of Canada has. That we have done all we should do in that respect I am not claiming, but that we have done a great work and that the minister who has it in charge has given his whole soul and energy to the perfection of that system I think goes without a manner of doubt in the saying of it. But we have criticisms also upon that. My hon. friend from Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell) went into a long criticism, and I am not going to say that he had not foundation for it; I did not quite take in all that he said, I did not hear him very well. But I think this is true: That if you put up a hundred or a thousand practical farmers to criticize that scheme you will have probably fifty, sixty or seventy per cent of different ideas upon it, and you cannot carry out any scheme in accordance with so many ideas. You have got to get some aggregate, some compass of the best, and carry on your system on that basis. And so, while individual criticisms may be well based, we yet have to settle down, in our judgment of that branch of the reconstruction that we are carrying on, as to whether we have got the best average foundation and whether that can be approved or not. But it is a great work that is being carried on and it shows well, there is not the least doubt about that.

Now we come to the other parts of the subject and hon. gentlemen have stated some things with reference to which they think this system of reconstruction, as we call it, may still be more extensive than it is. I think it may be. The Government itself is of the opinion that it may be, but the Government has to administer and to find the funds for that administration and has—apart from the nature of the trust reposed in it and the duties that are cast upon it— to give consideration to all sides of the question and to make that consideration as thorough and as well based as possible, not only as to what will be done as to individual lines of action but as to where they would lead on the successive lines which are advocated—and advocated in good faith and on good grounds—by gentlemen on both sides of the House. That is a duty which the Government has to take upon itself, though it is a duty the discharge of which will to a certain extent fail in meeting all points of view, and which necessarily will make for comparative slowness in carrying out what is actually determined upon in the end.

Now, the work of that committee has been reviewed this afternoon. It was a good committee. It put its back into the work. But it did more than that; it put its brain and its heart into the work as well. There was not a man on that committee whose heart was not in the work as well as his physical labour and his brain power. That committee had pretty abundant and extensive sources of information and a good deal of time in which to gather and digest it. But they did not cover the whole field, they did not get all the information which it is possible to get, nor did they explore thoroughly every branch that is possible of exploration. Therefore, it is the determination of the Government to appoint a committee this year. It will be either that

committee with additions, or a new committee comprising some of the old, or maybe all of the old members—I do not know. But it will be a committee empowered to take up and carry on from the point that the old committee left off, examination into what further can be done for the benefit of our soldiers. The Government is not this afternoon in favour of coming to a decision off the bat to commit all this to a special committee. I think the Government has a right to ask the House to give it time to see what are the best means that can be taken to get the most thorough and complete exploration of the different fields which are yet to be explored.

It is a question that requires a little thought. Now, do not let any ungrateful personage on either side of the House at once say, "There you are; the Government is trying to shelve the thing." No, that is not the proposition at all. The Government does not propose to burk or smother the question or to defer it unduly. It proposes after a little consideration to take the best means in its power to see that these investigations are carried on.

My hon. friend (Mr. Manion) from the head of the inland waters of this country, has reiterated some of his suggestions of last year, and good suggestions they are. He takes up, for instance, the insurance question. I may say that there is to-day before the Government the scheme of a Bill, and if it can be worked out upon any kind of a reasonable basis, that Bill will be submitted to Parliament for consideration. So that the Government has not lost sight of that, but in conformity with the desire of the committee and with what is but reasonable and right, they have given it further examination and are now considering the concrete point. I hope the Bill will be submitted to the House before very long.

Then there is the question of the administration of relief. The relief itself, although it did not come just as every soldier thought it ought to come, was voted by this House and has been administered, and from what I know it has been administered in no mean or niggardly spirit; in fact, the administration has gone as far as it possibly could in the way of the actual relief of the distressed and the needy.

I confess to great sympathy, first, with the disabled soldier—the man who does not come back 100 per cent able, and in many cases but a fraction of 100 per cent. His case, by pensions and otherwise, demands the very first consideration of the country and of the Parliament which represents the country. My sympathies go out then to the widows and orphans, the dependents of those who fell. I do not think that this country can hold up its head whilst the widows and orphans of the men who fought for our ideals, representing the whole country, are left without fair and reasonable means of sustenance and support. For those classes that I have referred to, I have the very deepest sympathy and the liveliest interest, and the same may be said of all the members of the Government.

There are other classes that appeal to me—for instance, the men who have been mentioned here this afternoon. There is the student. I have been a student myself and know what it is to work one's own way through college and university—I have done it myself—and I have every sympathy with those young men who have to do it. It is hard enough for them if they are not crossed in their path by the sweep of a great war which takes them out of their orbit and delays their course for two, three or four years. There are objections to helping that class because it leads into other classes of help, the outcome of which we cannot very well see at the opening of the path, but I think the sympathies of the House are well based as they go out to that class.

Then you come into the broader and wider field of those who were put out of business, or wrenched away from their occupations, and after an absence of three or four years find it difficult, for various reasons, to get back again into the old business to which they were accustomed. If there is any way by which on a careful and reasonable basis help can be given to certain classes of those that have been hardly wrought with by the war, I should like to see that help granted.

Now, my sympathies do not cost anything to Parliament except the time I take in mentioning them. They do not go any further towards real relief than the expression of those sympathies goes. But I know, as most men in this House know, that sympathy is very often incalculable in dollars and cents, and it is not a worthless thing to throw into the currency of the world at such a time as this. How far those sympathies can be carried out in actual practice is something which calls for cool deliberation and a sense of justice and fair play, which I think we all wish to see exercised in our dealings with those who have come back over the sea and with their dependents.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not say anything more on this subject except to reiterate

that I am not going to ask my hon. friend to withdraw his motion. I am just simply going to say that in the light of the considerations which I have put before the House, I intend to move that the debate be adjourned, and in the meantime members on both sides can go on discussing it for all the afternoon and give us their ideas, because we shall be very glad to have them. The Government will take the matter up and within a very few days—I do not think I need ask the House to wait very long—we shall be able to put before you what we propose as a committee and what powers that committee will have.

Mr. G. C. POWER (Quebec South): Will the hon. gentleman allow me—

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion for the adjournment of the debate is not debatable. Unless the minister withdraws it the member for Quebec South cannot proceed.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Then I will not put the motion just yet; some one else may do it. I do not wish to cut off discussion.

Mr. POWER: I thank the leader of the Government for his kindness. I would not be acting consistently with my own views or with those of the party which I have the honour to support if I did not approve most heartily of the resolution introduced by the member for Winnipeg Centre (Mr. Andrews). In the closing days of the last session a report of a Committee on Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment was brought in. It was moved by the leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie King) that the report be not concurred in, but that it be referred back to the committee for further consideration. The reason for this concurrence was that the provisions for the re-establishment of the soldier was not adequate. Surely if those provisions are not adequate now, they were not adequate then, when we were on the threshold of a very hard winter. What astonishes me is to hear the leader of the Government—whose attitude I assume, is supported by members of the Government and also by hon. gentlemen on the other side who have spoken as well as some who have not spoken—say now: "It is quite true that the provisions for the re-establishment of the soldier are not adequate. Last year they were adequate: We had to vote $40,000,000 without delay; we had no time to study the matter further." But now, four months afterwards, when some of the men who needed the money then may have since starved,—I know some provision was made for necessitous cases, but a great many of the necessitous cases did not apply for pubic charity—now, I say, when a great many of these men may have starved, the provisions for the re-establishment of the returned soldier are no longer adequate.

Mr. Speaker, I support the motion of the member for Centre Winnipeg, but I hope that the adoption of the suggestion embodied in this resolution—and I say this without desiring to make any reflections upon my hon. friend (Mr. Andrews)—will not be used by the guilty parties—by the members of the Government and hon. gentlemen opposite who are guilty of having said to the soldier: "We will do this and we will do that for you," but have neglected to fulfil their promises;—I hope, I say, that this committee will not be used as a camouflage to be presented to the Great War Veterans' Convention which is to meet in Montreal next week. I sincerely hope that when the soldiers justly complain to their representatives and to the Government that such and such a promise was not kept, they will not be told once more: "We have appointed a committee to look into this." The soldiers are sick and tired of committees. We have been appointing committees on this and committees on that ever since the soldiers first put their claims before the public. I hope, therefore, that it is not with this object in view that a committee on re-establishment is being granted. Suppose we had a committee on re-establishment, may I ask the hon gentleman whether the Government—

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: When the hon. member supports this motion, is he not himself supporting another committee now?

Mr. POWER: I am supporting another committee now, as I supported a committee last November, on the ground that the provisions made for the re-establishment of the soldier were inadequate; and if they were inadequate then, they are inadequate now. I am quite consistent, therefore, in supporting such a committee.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But not in condemning committees and supporting them at the same time.

Mr. POWER: I am not condemning committees. I say that the soldier is fed up with hearing about committees and having his just claims shelved by reference to committees. I am quite willing to serve on any committee and to show once more that promises have not been kept and that the Government has not well administered matters in that respect. But in what respect, if the provisions made for last year were in-

adequate, should we have a new committee? Shall it be on pensions? We are to be granted a committee on pensions. The President of the Council (Hon. Mr. Rowell) told us the other day that a pensions committee was to be appointed this year to inquire once more into the whole question. There is, therefore, no need for a super-committee on pensions. Is it to be with regard to the question of a cash gratuity? The Government have already made up their mind that there is to be no gratuity of $2,000 or of any such extra amount. I suppose they have not changed their minds materially since last November, unless from some unknown source we have discovered another billion or so to augment our revenue. I hardly think we have. We may have spent that much, but we have hardly discovered another billion.

Mr. BUREAU: It is on the wrong side of the sheet.

Mr. POWER: I support this motion because I think that a thorough investigation should be made into the land settlement scheme, but not by such a committee as the Re-establishment Committee of last year, which was largely composed of city men. For instance, I was on the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Committee of last year, and when the question of land settlement came up I was in the position of not knowing a plough from a harrow. I did not know anything about land settlement, and I am sure that other members of the committee were similarly situated. The Government will be well advised—this is by way of advice, not of criticism—to pick out those particular phases of re-establishment which really need to be looked into and have them dealt with by separate committees, each made up of men competent to judge of what should be done. So far as land settlement is concerned, I would recommend that the Government address themselves to our worthy friends of the former cross benches who now sit on my left; I am quite sure that the Government could obtain considerable information from them.

The question of insurance was left in abeyance last year. That is a subject which really requires a special committee; an ordinary committee cannot possibly go into such a question as that of sub-standard insurance, the technical term, I understand, for the kind of insurance demanded by the member for Muskoka (Mr. Peter McGibbon). On such a committee there should be technical men, men trained in the profession of insurance, men who know something about the matter.

Vocational training is another sphere of activity in connection with soldiers' civil re-establishment. I understand that in February of this year vocational training ceased and that work is no longer being carried on. If the committee is to be a committee such as we had last year and is to bring in recommendations similar to those brought in last year, I cannot for the life of me see the utility of it. If we are going to take up separately new subjects, subjects that have not been so far treated, then the committee will be doing good work and I congratulate the Government on having on this late date granted this committee. If it is to repeat again recommendations which we gave last year and act on them as we acted on last year's recommendations, then we might as well not appoint a committee; we do not want it. The whole thing amounts to this; the first principal question which should be treated with regard to the re-establishment of the soldier is this, that the soldier be treated and looked after by soldiers. The first advice I shall give to the Government is: Dismiss your Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment. The second word of advice is: Dismiss your Deputy Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, and the third word of advice is: When you appoint another minister, let us have him in this House where we can see him and talk to him. I am willing to wager that 50 per cent of the members of this House or of the people throughout the country hardly know the Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Who is he?

Mr. POWER: He is a member of the other Chamber.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Mr. Blondin?

Mr. POWER: The hon. gentleman mentions a member of the other chamber who is not the Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment. Had he been Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, there would, perhaps, have been a reason for his presence in the Cabinet as at any rate he was a soldier; he was at the front; but I maintain that such an important department as that of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment should certainly have a minister in this House.

In conclusion, in supporting the motion of the hon. member for Winnipeg Centre (Mr. Andrews), and in supporting the suggestion of the leader of the Government (Sir George Foster) I hope this committee will have some definite results. Let us divide it

the way we like, but let us have such results that we can say to the soldier: "At last, after all our promises, after telling you that we would do everything for you when you returned; that nothing was too good for the man who shed his blood for us on the plains of Flanders, this is the concrete thing we are going to do for you; we promise you no more; we are going to do this; we will not put you off with more promises; this is what you have; either be satisfied with it or not, we cannot do any more; we find that impossible, our funds will not permit us to do any more; our willingness will not permit us to do any more; something will not permit us to do any more." At any rate let us be frank with the soldier, and tell him: "We will give you this, and we will give you nothing else, or we will not give you this," so that the soldier may know exactly where he stands and every one of them will be thankful to this Government and his representative if the soldier is ever placed into that happy position.

Mr. MORPHY: I understand the hon. member's argument to be a condemnation of the work of the special committee of last year?

Mr. POWER: On the contrary, I must say that the work of the commitee of last year was very efficient, and that the work of the hon. gentleman himself was, perhaps, more efficient than that of some of the others.

Mr. DANIEL D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, this question is by no means a new one; we have been dealing with soldiers' re-establishment and soldiers' questions for some time. I am sure I need not tell the hon. member for Winnipeg Centre (Mr. Andrews) that I thoroughly agree with what he says about the deserving returned soldier; nor need I tell him that I agree with him as to the excellent work that was done and the bravery exhibited by our men overseas. We all concur in that. But I think the soldier, who patiently fought in the trenches and who was looking forward from day to day to the end of the war, had his patience pretty well exhausted in operations of that kind without being put to the extreme test of waiting until this Government would do something by way of relief. The war was tedious enough, but the tediousness of the war is not to be compared with the dilatoriness and the "tediosity," if there be such a word, of this Government. This institution, this very excellent Government, who in turn put up one after another of their best speakers—and they have some good speakers—to praise themselves and to tell of the excellent things they have done and the excellent things they intend to do—had decided this question almost a year ago without obtaining any evidence. We had the exhibition in this House of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) standing up in his place as the then leader of the Government and saying that the Government had reached the conclusion that they were not going to do anything along those lines; that the financial condition of the country was such that they could not spend another dollar, and the argument was that they had done as much or more than any other country and that they could not be expected to go any further along those lines. But if they had stood by that decision, we would have some respect and regard for them, and at all events, felt that they had reached a conclusion and they were prepared to stand by it and to let the people of this country pass judgment upon them as to whether or not they had done what was fair and reasonable in connection with the matter. But there was considerable agitation in the country amongst the returned soldiers, and reports were coming to the ears of the Government that their decision was not popular, and that the returned soldiers, when they had an opportunity, were likely to condemn by their votes and influence the action of the Government in regard to dealing with their respective cases. A decision was reached in the Government that they would have to do something. That something was the appointment of another committee to inquire into the judgment that they had already passed. I am an old practising barrister, and we have in some courts in this province, at all events in my province, a provision by which a judge may review his own decision. My experience of some twenty-five or thirty years is that I never came across any judge who would change a decision which he had already given; he always stood by it. That has been our experience with this Government. The evidence that was collected throughout the country was simply evidence to justify the decision that the Government had already reached. The chairman of that committee, a capable and astute politician, called to the witness stand such persons as would justify the attitude which the Government had taken in saying that the finances of this country were exhausted and that they would not stand any further

4 p.m.

strain. The ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White), who is always a ready relief for this Government, was called into the witness box to say that he knew the finances of this country, and that not another dollar could be expended along the line suggested by the soldiers. As might be expected, the chairman of the committee and other friends of the Government, and other men who were not friends of the Government, brought in a report confirming the decision that had already been reached that nothing could be done. When that report was brought down, my honoured leader (Mr. Mackenzie King), moved an amendment in this House, after having heard arguments pro and con in respect to the report, and that amendment, as it appears on page 1892 of Hansard for the special session of last year, reads:

> That the said motion or amendment be not concurred in, but that the said report now under consideration be sent back to the said committee for further consideration.

When the report of the committee was before the House a great many opinions were expressed by hon. members on both sides, but particularly on the Government side and it was suggested that certain means could be devised by which money could be raised for the purpose of relieving the soldiers. The hon. gentlemen who are to-day asking for further inquiry, by their votes on that occasion pronounced in a decided manner that no further investigation was necessary and that the report was good enough. We voted against the report on the ground that it was unsatisfactory and we said that one or two of the suggestions should be acted on and an effort made to find some means by which the soldiers' needs could be met in a way that would be at least fairly satisfactory to these worthy men. It is somewhat surprising, Sir, that hon. gentlemen supporting the Government who were perfectly satisfied with the report and voted for it should to-day come back and allege that it was unsatisfactory and inadequate and urge that something further should be done. It would be desirable to know when the end of this seemingly endless chain is going to be reached. One report after another is made. Hon. gentlemen opposite who are supporting the Government will vote for a committee and its report, which they will eulogize as being entirely satisfactory, and as soon as it is ascertained that it is really inadequate and does not meet the requirements of the soldiers, they immediately stand up and ask for another committee and a further investigation. This, Mr. Speaker, is merely temporizing and offers no relief to the unfortunate soldiers. My good friend, the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government (Sir George Foster) will no doubt appreciate the fact that committees' reports, however beautifully expressed they may be, will not put meal into the pot, or keep it boiling for the poor children of the returned soldiers, who need money in order to obtain the very necessaries of life to support them through the hard times now prevailing in this country. Something tangible should be done. If it is necessary to provide help for the soldiers—and I believe it is—time is of supreme importance, and we should take action at once. Surely if we have had, from the inception of the department down to the present time, a competent minister at the head of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, with facilities for obtaining ample information, he should know by this time what is necessary. The ministers are not overpaid, of course; but shall it be said that we are entrusting them with the control of departments of government, and furnishing them with every necessary staff and equipment, with every means of obtaining any information they may require, and, when anything is to be done, find that they know nothing about the subject with which they have to deal but must call for a committee of the House of Commons, who have never had anything particular to do with that subject, but whose duty it must be to inform the ministers upon matters peculiarly within the precincts of their departments? Yet, Sir, that is the condition of things, and I have no other conclusion to reach than that an effort is being made to postpone necessary action from time to time and give to the soldiers camouflaged unreality in place of real help, throwing dust in their eyes in the hope of appeasing them. I do not think that anything more will come of this committee. Indeed, I do not believe that a committee can be appointed which will be better than the last one, or whose report can be more exhaustive; and if the finances of the country could stand no strain last year, I venture to suggest to the present Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) that there is less likelihood now of their being able to do so. I observe that in the month of January, if I read the reports correctly, we plunged into an indebtedness of something like $64,000,000 over and above the income that ought to meet the demands upon the exchequer for that month; and I presume that other months since we parted last November were not very much better. Under these circumstances is it proposed

that this new committee shall find money and devise means by which it is to be properly distributed for the re-establishment of soldiers? I submit that this motion is rather indefinite if we are to deal with any special subject. I do not want to find fault with the mover or seconder on that score, for I presume that if the motion is carried steps will be taken to specify more particularly what the subject matter of the inquiry will be. All that we are informed here is that the provisions so far made have proven inadequate.

We have no very great provisions except the Soldiers' Settlement Act, and when time will have developed what takes place under that Act and have fully shown the results, I fear it will be found that the provisions of that Act are unsatisfactory. I am told that the soldier who is put upon the land and to whom money is lent cannot call his soul his own, and in no respect can he exercise his own judgment. The plough, the horse, and the cow he gets is bought for him by emissaries of this Government who are capable of making any amount of graft as middlemen between the farmer and those from whom the articles are bought. They are charged to the farmer, who is supposed to pay for them, but evidently he has nothing to say about the price. The articles are not his; they are branded as Government property and the man has no credit or standing in the country. He has really nothing to say about the property, being as a matter of fact a ward of the Government, and in such a way that his own personality and initiative play no part in the start he has in life. I sincerely trust that these men who are re-established on the farms will make a success of their calling, but I think that provision should have been made for those who follow other occupations. When the Act was before the House I urged upon the minister in charge of it the desirability of having a general policy of settling the soldiers besides establishing them on land. I said that it would not do to frame a policy applicable only to men who desired to be farmers, but that consideration should be given to lumbermen, miners, fishermen, etc., who might be anxious to pursue these occupations. The soldiers were drawn from different classes, and there certainly should have been established a general policy embracing men of every calling in life so that the soldiers of every vocation might have an opportunity to resume his work. The Government, however, thought proper to single out agriculture as the industry in which to re-establish the men, spending enormous sums of money on the farms and paying no attention to the other classes I have mentioned. The results is that we have not only discontented farmers, but discontented lumbermen, fishermen and others, and are experiencing a general dissatisfaction because nothing has been done for those who did not and could not undertake farming. I do not wish to be regarded as unfair to the Government. I know that a great many things have been done, such, for instance, as educating young men in different walks of life, and it would be unjust of me to say that nothing has been undertaken. It is evident from the general discontent from Vancouver to Scutari among the returned soldiers that what should reasonably have been done has not been done.

I voted for a further inquiry last year. I thought the amendment of the leader of the Opposition should have been adopted by the Government and that further inquiry should have been made. For that reason, if there is a motion for the appointing of a committee, I am here to say that any further inquiry that may be necessary should be given. But I would suggest to the Government that a committee sitting in this House is not the best means of inquiring as to what is taking place in British Columbia, the Northwest, Winnipeg or the Maritime Provinces. Of course, we are sick and tired of roving commissions and we are sick and tired of ministers and departments who know nothing about their business. Nevertheless, if a thorough investigation is to be made—

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: These general assertions are sometimes not very pleasant. Instead of including the whole Government among those who know nothing about their business the hon. gentleman should tell us who are the ones who do not know anything about their business. It would be interesting.

Mr. McKENZIE: We are dealing at present with one department—the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment. One big committee undertook the task of gathering information for that department. We have a Government of twenty, or twenty-one, with mutual, governmental responsibility. Perhaps my right hon. friend (Sir George Foster), with his magnificent capacity for phrase making would say that he represents the soul responsibility of the ministers. If there is one man among them who does not seem to comprehend the responsibilities of his office, the duty devolves upon the other twenty, or twenty-one, as

the case may be, of trying to penetrate the cranium and of imparting to him some of their surplus knowledge.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: You are going along well.

Mr. McKENZIE: Last year the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government was asked to tell us how many ministers there were. He said, "Let it stand as an order for a return." He could not tell how many there were. This will be one of the Orders that we will ask the minister to bring down at the earliest convenience. So many have left the Cabinet since that the list will not be such a long one. I am far from saying that every one, or that any one in particular, is dull, stupid or incompetent. I will leave that for the country to decide. But we are dealing with a department now in which it seems a hopeless job to get anything done in a proper or practical way. If the dullness is impenetrable and if it is not possible to get any action out of that department, not only is the department itself responsible but the rest of the Government are equally so because there is a mutual responsibility. That responsibility devolves particularly on the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government and who is responsible not only for the department over which he presides himself but for every other department over which he indirectly presides because he leads the Government. I charge them all with incapacity. They all know about it and their friends all over the country have reached the conclusion that the harvest is past, that the summer is ended and that this Government cannot be saved.

I wish to reiterate what I said before that there has been too much delay, too much putting off, too much dilly-dallying with this important question and if the soldiers, their wives, and dependents, are to get any relief from any action of this Government, it should be quick, as direct and as expeditious as possible. No hon. member of this House should be a party to any further delay in dealing as effectively as we can with the many questions connected with the soldier with which we have to deal. I understand that a motion is soon to be made that the debate be adjourned which, I presume, means that the further discussion of this matter is pitched over the fence and into the graveyard and that it will stay there perhaps till resurrection dawns. I hope however that such will not be the case and that some definite action will be taken by the Government.

[Mr. McKenzie.]

Mr. E. W. NESBITT (North Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I understood my hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. McKenzie) to say that Mr. Calder who was the Chairman of the Committee that was appointed last year to look into Soldiers' Re-establishment ruled out any evidence that did not tend to bear out what he, Mr. Calder—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. NESBITT: What he, the hon. Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) did not want introduced. I understood my hon. friend to say that the Minister of Immigration and Colonization entirely ruled the actions of the committee and that he absolutely kept out any evidence—

Mr. McKENZIE: I did not say anything like that. I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. NESBITT: Then my understanding must be getting bad.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. McKenzie) a question?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Cape Breton North (Mr. McKenzie) has not the floor; the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) has the floor.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The hon. member (Mr. McKenzie) still has his voice.

Mr. NESBITT: I thoroughly understood my hon. frend (Mr. McKenzie) to say that. In any event he insinuated that and he insinuated that the Government had a plan that they would not go beyond a certain amount for the returned soldier and that the committee was selected for the purpose of working out that plan.

Mr. McKENZIE: Yes, I said that.

Mr. NESBITT: And that the Minister of Immigration and Colonization was put at the head of the committee so as to keep the committee in control and so that no evidence would be brought out that was not in accordance with the plan.

Mr. McKENZIE: I did not say that.

Mr. NESBITT: Well, my hon. friend insinuated that and sometimes insinuations are as dangerous as plain statements and even worse. I would like to ask my hon. friend if he attended any of the sittings of the committee.

Mr. McKENZIE: No.

Mr. NESBITT: Well then I think that for a man of his age it is very unfair to criticize the work of a committee whose sittings he did not attend. I think it is not only unfair but it is absolutely mean.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I do not think the hon. member intended to convey the impression that he did by using the word "mean" in respect to the remarks of the hon. member for Cape Breton North. I would ask him to withdraw that expression.

Mr. NESBITT: I do so with pleasure and I will leave it at "unfair."

Mr. McKENZIE: I must rise to a question of privilege. I said nothing whatever about it.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not proper for an hon. member to arise to a question of privilege while another member has the floor.

Mr. NESBITT: I am very pleased to hear that my hon. friend did not say anything against the committee, but for fear he should have any suspicion in the back of his head that the committee were not absolutely independent I will refer him to those members of the committee who sit on his own side. There are the member for Lambton (Mr. Pardee), the member for North Essex (Mr. Kennedy), the member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff), I think—

Mr. DUFF: I rise to a point of order.

Mr. NESBITT: Pardon me, the member for Westmorland (Mr. Copp), the member for Beauce (Mr. Béland) and several other hon. gentlemen. I sat with those hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House for several years and I know them to be very competent and very upright. The Chairman of the committee never personally, to my knowledge, asked for any particular evidence to be submitted to the committee. Various organizations asked to be heard and the chairman put it to the committee whether their request should be granted or not. It was seldom that any evidence was objected to or ruled out excepting when it was proffered by organizations connected with the Great War Veterans, and then the committee asked that their evidence might be submitted through that body. I am sure that no committee composed of members of this House ever tried more strenuously to do their duty or attended more closely to that duty than did the committee on the Soldiers' Civil Re-esablishment. They sat three times a day for over a month, they listened to testimony from witnesses from districts ranging from Vancouver to Ha'ifax and they paid the closest possible attention to that evidence. But they had to take into consideration the interests and financial condition of the country as well as the interests of the returned soldier. No man, not excepting even my hon. friend from North Cape Breton and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) could have listened with greater attention to the evidence that was submitted than did the Minister of Immigration and Colonization, and no human being could have given that evidence greater attention than he did, or could have allowed, no matter what exertion he put forth, more evidence to be brought forward unless the committee had sat all last fall in order to listen to it. I repeat that no one could have allowed more evidence or greater latitude or opportunity for evidence to be given, than did the minister in question. I rose for the purpose of resenting any insinuation that the committee were governed or ruled in any shape, manner or form by the Government or any member of it, or that the judgment of the committee was influenced in any manner whatsoever by the Government or any person representing the Government. Personally I resent any insinuation that I was influenced or dominated by anybody it does not matter by whom. The only authority that has any influence over me in my judgment of any case that comes before me to be judged—and that influence is directed so that I do not know it—is the Lord. So that I naturally resent any person insinuating that I was elected a member of the committee because it was desired that a certain verdict would be given. The same thing is true of every member of the committee in my humble opinion. Remember that the report of the committee was unanimous; I do not believe that any of the Opposition members on the committee who were my strong personal friends were influenced in any degree whatever by any human being; they were influenced solely by the desire to do justice to the returned soldiers as near as it was humanly possible to do so.

As to the Land Settlement Board we were not appointed to consider anything with respect to their operations. It did so happen that we had to secure some evidence with respect to the board in order to find out what was being done in the re-establishment of the soldier. Now if there is anything wrong in connection with the Land Settlement Board—judging from my experience prior to and since the sittings of the committee—the errors are all on the

side of the soldier and not on the side of the country. The Land Settlement Board is managed with good judgment—the very best judgment I think that could be brought to bear in connection with it—but the proposition is a very difficult one. I listened with a great deal of interest this afternoon to the observations of an hon. gentleman opposite who had been working on the Land Settlement Board in New Brunswick for the reason that the hon. gentleman in question has had experience of, and is familiar with, the question. There is a good deal to be said from his standpoint, but there is also much to be said in opposition to it. It is one of those questions that a committee could sit down quietly and thresh out when the views of the majority of course would prevail.

Just a word about the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment. I have had more or less experience in connection with that work, especially since the meetings of the Parliamentary Committee and it is because of that experience that I say that any errors arising in connection with that work have always been in favour of the soldier. And errors are almost impossible to avoid. Not even a man endowed with the wisdom of Solomon could entirely avoid imposition in connection with the work of the Soldier Settlement Board, and the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment and especially the Vocational Training Branch. Even if everything was done that it was humanly possible to do I do not think we could escape from imposition, and as I say, any errors that have resulted, according to my experience, have always been in favour of the soldier. It is hardly possible for these departments to escape being imposed upon to a certain extent. I have tried to work out some scheme under which imposition would not occur but it seems to be hopelessly impossible to avoid it altogether.

As to the resolution under discussion it is possible that there are certain things in connection with the re-establishment of the soldier that have not yet been investigated. The same may be true with respect to the provision made for the soldiers' dependents. Still while a good many questions have been investigated, I see no reason why, as the leader of the Government pointed out a few minutes ago, a committee could not be appointed to investigate certain questions relating to the returned soldier that have not yet been inquired into and to suggest any remedies where remedies are found to be necessary. Personally I would think that as there is a motion on the Order Paper for the reappointment of a committee to inquire into the working of the Pensions Act, perhaps any other question relating to the returned soldier that has not already been investigated might be referred to that committee.

During the present session I have listened to several debates dealing more or less with this question, and several hon. members have stated circumstances that seemed very harsh, I did not hear all that was said about pensions this afternoon, but I do know that when the Pensions Committee sat for three years—and I happened to be a member of it from its organization—we inquired into a great many complaints, and I think I can say, without the slightest exaggeration, that in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred the committee found the Pensions Board were right. I remember only two instances in those three years where we found the Pensions Board were not correct in their findings in the judgment of the committee; and it must be borne in mind that that committee was composed of members of the House of Commons, whose inclination was, if anything, towards the complainants.

A great many of these cases appear very hard while you have heard only one side, but no one knows better than a lawyer that when you come to hear the other side they may assume a very different aspect. I do not think that complaints against either the S.C.R. or the Pensions Board should be aired here by individual members unless they have been inquired into by them personally. I said the other day that after I had inquired into any complaints brought to my notice, if they were within the regulations of the Pensions Act and were capable of adjustment by the Pensions Board, they were immediately adjusted. I can only repeat that statement. Hon. members must bear in mind that the committee of the S.C.R. and the Pensions Board are governed not by their own ideas but by the provisions of the Statutes controlling them. It would be a fatal thing for those two bodies to act according to their personal inclination, because then we would immediately have complaints of favoritism, and that would be the worst thing that could possibly happen.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would not have taken any part in this debate—in fact, I had no intention of doing so—had not my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) insinuated that the committee—and, by the way, I have seen this stated in the papers before to-

day—that the committee had been hand-picked as to some of its members, who were appointed purposely to carry out the will of the Government. I rose to give that statement the most emphatic denial. I see on the other side of the House two or three of my brother committeemen and I leave it to them to say whether any influence was brought to bear to shut out any evidence that should have come before the Committee.

Mr. O. TURGEON (Gloucester): Mr. Speaker, I wish first to congratulate the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Andrews) on the eloquent manner in which he has placed his request before the House, and, secondly, I wish to state that I shall give my support to the resolution, hoping, as has already been stated by my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), that a committee will be given an opportunity of further studying this question.

I do not rise for the purpose of criticising the report of the old committee. The amendment which my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition brought in at the end of last session was that with the further light and knowledge furnished to the House during the discussion the report should be referred to the same committee for further consideration. Therefore that amendment was not a condemnation of the report or of the personnel of the committee. In speaking briefly on the subject at the time I declared myself favourable to a gratuity—not to the extent which had been asked for before the committee, involving an expenditure of perhaps $800,000,000, but to an extent scarcely reaching twenty or twenty-five per cent of that amount. It is true that at that time the leader of the Government to-day as well as the hon. Minister of the Interior declared to the House and to the country that we were not in a position to grant any further money to the returned soldiers. However, the next day the Government came down with a proposition to acquire the Grand Trunk Railway system, and they did acquire it, and laid on the country an immense amount of further indebtedness. Now my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior having been able to gratify his ambition in that respect, I am sure that his ingenuity is not exhausted, and that he will be able to find the means necessary to give our returned soldiers what they really deserve and what to a great extent they have a right to expect, from the country.

At that time in seconding the resolution of my hon. friend from Winnipeg I had different considerations in view. I felt that the most needy soldier is generally the most humble, and will not go before a committee to receive charity. I know hundreds of cases in my constituency, Mr. Speaker,—and when I say hundreds of cases, do not think for a moment that I am exaggerating—I repeat, I know hundreds of cases of returned soldiers suffering in many ways. A returned soldier not able to suit himself according to his ambition will not apply for charity because perhaps he has a brother who will give him a home, or he may be able to go to his paternal home, although filled with other children. But that is the very soldier who requires the attention of the country. The only fair way is to give something to every soldier. I may be answered that to grant such a gratuity to a great many will be an invitation to waste. 400,000 soldiers are to-day still waiting for re-establishment of the 600,000 who went overseas. The soldier is human, just like any other man, and no doubt a few might waste the money that they got from the country. But the majority of them are sensible men and will re-establish themselves not only with a view to enjoying life, but also with a view to proving the value of their citizenship after the winning of the war.

I represent a lumbering, farming and fishing constituency. I know of a number of cases of returned men in my constituency who are without the means of following their occupation of fishing. It may be said that $400 or $500 would not be sufficient to enable a returned man who wanted to engage in the fishing business to buy a sailing vessel or motor boat. That is true, but if he is willing to invest the $400 or $500 in the construction or purchase of a sailing vessel or motor boat, some one may easily be found in the locality who will be willing to trust him with the balance. There might be a tendency not to advance the man the whole amount necessary to establish him in business, because of an apprehension that he might not, having put no money into it himself, be sufficiently industrious and energetic to carry it out successfully. But having invested $400 or $500, he gives a guarantee of his good faith and some person of means in the locality would surely be willing to help him out.

Then, there is the case of the students. Many young men who were on the point of leaving college and entering university went to the war and upon their return they

have tried to get the means to attend university. We will say that it would take two or three thousand dollars to put a man through university. Well, if you gave him $400 or $500 he would be enabled to carry on his studies for a certain length of time, and a doctor or a lawyer or other good neighbour in his district would undoubtedly be willing to furnish the means necessary to enable the young man to finish his course, although he might not have been willing to run the risk of advancing the cost of the whole course. I hope, therefore, that the leader of the Government, whose generosity seems to increase year by year since he has acquired a good knowledge of the French language and an appreciation of the sentiment of those who speak it, will, in cooperation with the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Meighen) be able to arrange for a committee to look into this matter.

Canada is not bankrupt; Canada can assist her returned soldiers as generously as other countries assist theirs. In fact, Canada has done better for her soldiers than any other country has done. But the Canadian soldiers won a lasting name in the battlefields overseas; his name is of universal repute. When we boast of what the Government or the country has done in relation to the war we must remember that it is the Canadian soldier who did it. It was the Canadian soldiers who saved the Empire at the very beginning of the war; by their courage in maintaining the line until reinforcements came they kept the Germans from breaking through and reaching the sea through France and Belgium. So that I hope that a committee will be appointed which will consider the matter from every angle with a view to doing something to allay the disquiet which prevails throughout the country, particularly on the part of returned soldiers, and to provide generously for the re-establishment of these men into civil life so that they may be enabled to exercise their citizenship in accordance with the true British spirit.

Mr. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver): Mr. Speaker, I invite the attention of the House to the wording of the resolution proposed by the member for Winnipeg Centre (Mr. Andrews). It reads:

> That, in the opinion of this House, the provision made for re-establishing in civil life the members of His Majesty's forces who served in the late war has in many cases proved inadequate, and that it is desirable that a special committee of this House be appointed to consider what provision can be made to meet such cases.

[Mr. Turgeon.]

And so on. It will be noted that the first statement in the resolution is that the provision hitherto made for re-establishment of our returned soldiers has proved inadequate. I think we ought to be careful not to allow the impression to go abroad that here is real ground for the contention made by some that the country has grossly neglected the returned soldier. Generally speaking, and holding in reserve for the moment special cases to which I shall refer later, I think that Canada has succeeded beyond the hopes of the most optimistic in solving the general problem of re-establishment. Or, to put it in another way, a very large proportion of the returned men are to-day happily reinstated in civil life. In saying that I do not for a moment wish to throw out the inference that the country has discharged its debt of gratitude and otherwise to the returned soldier. That is a debt which we shall never be able to repay, but it is a debt which comparatively few of the men themselves desire to have capitalized in the form of dollars and cents. But that does not alter the fact that I have already mentioned, namely, that in the main the great problem of re-establishment has been most intelligently and fairly successfully dealt with. I am conscious, however, that there are some cases—some classes, if you will—that have not, in my estimation, and I think in the estimation of a large number of the people, been properly dealt with. Indeed, Sir, the right hon. leader of the House (Sir George Foster) this afternoon expressed sentiments which lead me to believe that he himself concurs in that view. I suggest, therefore, that the member for Winnipeg Centre has, perhaps, made the wording of his resolution a little loose, because he generalizes in saying that the re-establishment scheme has proved inadequate and he makes no specific statement of the cases which he desires should go before the committee. Such a committee, appointed under this resolution, would have the whole field to travel over again. I submit that it is inadvisable for this Parliament to appoint another commitee which, by inviting from different parts of the country witnesses and others who desire to present schemes and cases, will traverse again the wide field which was gone over with such care and in such detail last autumn. I would, however, prefer that either the Government itself by a Cabinet committee, or the House by a special committee, deal in some effective manner with specific cases, some of which I shall present to the House this afternoon, which should be

considered. It is a matter of gratitude to me to note that the President of the Council (Mr. Rowell) assured the House that the Pension Committee would take up the matter of pensions. I desire, however, to take this opportunity—as it comes within the purview of this resolution—to refer very briefly to pensions. I am going to give the House two illustrations indicating a principle of administration of the Pension Board, which I desire to characterize here as, in my estimation, iniquitous, to put it mildly. It is a principle indicated by the two cases I shall submit to the House. Five boys of one family went overseas, and three of those boys were killed in France. The mother was an elderly woman who had married again, so that there was a step-father. Both of those people were too old to keep themselves, and they were dependent upon those boys for a living. When the three boys were killed, the Pension Board granted a pension of $48 a month to the step-father and the mother. This pension was gratefully received and no complaint was made, they being apparently satisfied with the amount. But this old couple, desirous of reducing the cost of their living, removed from the environs of the city to a place about ten miles outside, secured a small piece of land and built a cottage on it, thereby eliminating rent and raising in their garden some of the sustenance of life. As soon as the Pension Board learned that this couple had attempted to supplement their meagre pension in this way, they reduced the pension by ten dollars a month on the ground that the couple now had to pay no rent. Can you, Mr. Speaker, and hon. members, imagine a more iniquitous practice than that? I give you one other case, and these two are indicative of many more. An elderly lady, a widow, lost her only boy overseas. She owned in Vancouver a house which was heavily mortgaged. She received a pension, I think, of $48 a month; it may have been a little more, but it was the ordinary regular pension, with which she was satisfied. In the rear of her lot she had a small building, and she spent $70 in fitting this building up, making it habitable, and she rented it for $15 a month, thus supplementing the meagre pension she was receiving and assisting her to carry on in this life. The Pension Board again seized upon that and reduced her pension by $15 a month, the amount of the pittance she received from this shack in the rear of her lot. Not only did they do that, but they totally ignored the fact that the woman had spent almost a hundred dollars in fitting up the building. These two cases are sufficient indication of a pernicious regulation being practiced constantly by the Pension Board, and it is such irritating and, I consider, utterly unneeded practices as this that cause a great deal of dissatisfaction. I give these illustrations to the House so that we may address ourselves to remedying regulations which are, on the face of them, wrong, unfair, unjust and, as I say, iniquitous, in this case.

I proceed to another phase of the question. I shall not discuss pensions further, because they will go before another committee. We have the claim of the student. I shall not traverse the ground gone over last year in this regard, but the student undoubtedly has a peculiar claim upon this country. This country above all others, and, indeed, in common with the leading countries of the world, realizes that a fair education is a great asset to the community. Indeed, in most of our provinces, we have a law of compulsory education, and why? Simply because we know that a man who has a fair education is a better asset to the country than a man without any education at all. The bulk of these students, particularly in the universities, stopped in the middle of their course and gave their services to the country. Having been for the time being dissociated from their studies, when they come back they find themselves somewhat handicapped, and they are asking that some consideration shall be given to them. The only objection to the proposal hitherto has been that it will interfere with other classes; or in other words, there will be other classes of returned soldiers which would claim the same privilege. I at once admit that there is an argument in this; that it is possible that it would cause the Government or the administration having charge of the matter some difficulties and confusion. But if we are going, as a Parliament, to refuse to do what is eminently just and in the interest of the country simply because it presents difficulties, then we are derelict in our duty to the country, and the sooner Parliament recognizes that it is by adjusting these individual cases that we shall make progress towards social and industrial peace, the better for the country at large. Therefore, I believe the case of the student whose studies were interrupted by the war, is a case worthy of special consideration, irrespective of its relation to other individual cases.

I pass on to another case to which I wish to refer with the utmost brevity, and that

is the vocational training group, the men who are taking vocational training. This is not a criticism of the government; but as we progress in this hitherto untravelled field, we learn things that we ought, if we are wise, to take advantage of in order to effect remedies. In this particular realm, it has been discovered that a man will start a course as a bookkeeper, or as a mechanic, or in the motor transport, or as a carpenter, or in some other vocation. He may go on for two or three weeks or a couple of months, and it may be perfectly clear to those in charge that the individual is in the wrong vocation; that he is going to make an utter failure of it; that if we train him for three or six months as the case may be and turn him out, he will be useless and not, in any sense, a credit to the training he has received. It is the function of Parliament, the duty of the Government and of the department concerned to formulate such regulations that, when or if it is discovered that a man is pursuing a course which it is clear he will fail in, he may be changed over to some other course where he may have an opportunity of making a success. That is a real, tangible grievance that should have the consideration of Parliament and of the Government.

A good deal has been said regarding the Land Settlement Board, and I wish to take this opportunity of paying a tribute to that Board. I am not going to analyze its work in detail, because I have not had an opportunity of studying it very closely; but I have criticised it, as I think, in a constructive manner where I felt I was warranted in doing so. But I must confess to this, that as far and as impartially as I can judge, the Land Settlement Board is doing excellent work in Canada. It is administered by a man at the head, Mr. Black, I believe, who is not only doing his best but enthusiastically devoted to the work. I do not think a more capable man could be chosen. What I suggest to hon. members is that we should rather refrain from careless and general criticisms of the Land Settlement Board and seek to point out any specific weakness and take it up directly with that Board, or through the Government or, if a committee be appointed, through such a committee. But the point I wish to emphasize is this, that rather than make general and sweeping criticisms, we should particularize and seek to bring out some useful criticism which may offer an opportunity of a remedy being effected.

I wish to say to the hon. member for North Cape Breton and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) that I take second place to no man in this House in respect for his experience in Parliament, but I was seriously disappointed at the attack which he made upon the Government. He, if I remember rightly—and I am subject to correction if I am in error—said that the people were sick and tired of Royal Commissions and that a committee of this House would be useless because it could not understand conditions in British Columbia or the Prairies or the Maritime Provinces. Well, Sir, what in the name of common sense do we want? What justification is there for these sweeping condemnations of the Government? This is an entirely new problem, a new field that has never been trodden before. We are the pioneers in this field, other countries having patterned their vocational training and re-establishment much after the original steps taken by this Government and this Parliament. I say, therefore, that rather than general criticisms, rather than sweeping condemnations of the Government, rather than feeding the fires of discontent in this country, the duty we owe to the people, to the returned soldier in particular, and to ourselves, is that, when we bring before Parliament a resolution of this kind, we should attempt to state as specifically as possible what grievance it is that we are desirous to remedy.

So far as I am concerned, I do not feel that I am at all in duty bound to support the resolution in its present general terms, but I do bring to Parliament, as I have already said, such specific instances as have been laid before me in order to invite attention and correction, although not subscribing in any sense to a general condemnation of the work that has been undertaken, without knowledge or experience, and carried forward, as I believe, with a larger measure of success than has attended any similar work of such gigantic proportions.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON (East Algoma): I desire to say a word or two on the subject that has been introduced by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Andrews). While I agree that it is desirable that Parliament should make further investigation of all the conditions surrounding the problem of re-establishing the returned soldiers in civil life, I do not by any means concur in the statements that have been made to the effect that the work done by the several departments of government which have been dealing with the re-establishment of our men has been inefficient or insincere,

or that the men who have been charged with the responsibility of carrying out that work have been incapable of properly discharging that responsibility. I shall refer briefly to the statement of the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power), who I believe was a member of the committee that dealt with this subject at the last session of Parliament, that we should make an effort to reach a definite and final conclusion as to what should be done in the interests of the returned soldiers in order that they might know once for all what they might expect.

While I am on my feet I shall also make reference to what was said by the hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) in the same direction. In the course of his remarks that hon. gentleman, in referring to the possibility of a further investigation by a parliamentary committee said: "When will this endless chain end?" Well, Mr. Speaker, my own judgment is that for Parliament or the Government to undertake now, or a year from now, to lay down a concrete policy that shall not be digressed from in dealing with the problem of the returned soldiers, would be to undertake something that is humanly impossible, and something that would not be in the interests of the soldiers. There were about six hundred thousand men in the Canadian Expeditionary Forces. A very large number of these men reached France, and of them perhaps one hundred thousand have come back more or less depreciated in mental and physical strength; and fifty-eight or sixty thousand will never come back. In view of this fact, therefore, I would say, as a member of the House of Commons, that so long as a dependent of any one of these men is alive the problem of the returned soldier will rest with the Government and the people of Canada, and our responsibility to our gallant men will never be discharged so long as there is a single one of them in any state of mental or physical incapacity. So that in dealing with this vast problem that has been forced upon us, just as the war was forced upon us, while we are in a state of absolute unpreparedness to deal with it, to say that we should undertake to lay down a concrete and rigid rule that shall not be departed from, notwithstanding any new conditions and problems that may arise in the future, is, I reiterate, to undertake an utterly impossible and insensate task.

Something has been said concerning the object with which the committee of this House that heard the whole question of re-establishment at the last session of Parliament was appointed, and the methods which that committee followed; and it has been inferred that because members on this side of the House agree with the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Andrews) that the subject should be re-opened, we are therefore inconsistent, having voted against the resolution, moved in the dying days of the last session, that the matter should be referred back to the committee. Let us analyze his question for a moment. Had the amendment of the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) carried last session and the matter been referred back to the committee, what opportunity would the committee have had for giving anything like adequate consideration to the subject before the prorogation of Parliament? I think it is hardly necessary to say, because it is so obvious, that the committee could not sit during the recess. A committee of the House of Commons must sit while the House is in session, and had the matter been referred back to that committee there would have been an end to the proposals which the report contained for dealing with the immediate necessities of the soldiers, and the whole subject would simply have been left in abeyance. Having, however, adopted the report of the committeeè it was possible for the departments of Government to act on the recommendations made; and this House, as the free parliament of the people, was at liberty at this session to take up the question again and adequately deal with it. Like my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) I have one or two specific cases which I desire to bring particularly to the attention of this parliamentary committee or the Department of Government, either with the Pensions Board or the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, whose duty it may be to deal with them. These cases, which I shall cite in a moment, are, I think, an absolute evidence that there are regulations binding the Pensions Board which make it impossible for them to deal in an ample manner with problems that may call for consideration. There are two cases in particular in which I have been endeavouring to get the Pensions Board to revise their decision and in regard to which I have finally reached the conclusion that under the regulations the board can do nothing. The first is the case of a couple who lost their only two sons in France. The woman is seventy-one years of age and her husband seventy-five. They are both in a dependent condition, being ordinary working people without any income except such

money as can be earned by a man of this ripe age. He is not in the most robust state of health, and although he and his wife live in their own home, they. are not in a position substantially to augment their pension of $48. Now, because this man of seventy-five was fortunate enough to secure some light employment during the months of August, September and October last in order that he might earn a meagre pittance, the Pensions Board, after sending an inspector to investigate his case, reduced his pension by half, so that he now receives only $24. One of the reasons adduced for this action is the fact that these people are living in their own home, and do not have to pay fifteen or twenty dollars a month rent. The other case is that of a widow who lost her only son in France, but who has at home three daughters who are domestics.

The Pension Board takes the ground that because these three girls, who are working out as domestics, are in receipt of an income, the mother should not get any pension at all. There is something wrong with regulations that will call upon a board representing the Government and Parliament of Canada to say that because a widowed mother who lost a boy in France has three daughters working out as domestics she is not entitled to some compensation on account of the loss of her son. I say, as I said to the Pension Board, surely these three girls are doing all they should be asked to do when they maintain themselves.

In regard to the Department of Soldiers Civil Re-establishment and the criticisms that have been levelled against it, I am not here to defend any department particularly but I must say in justice to that department that having had a number of cases of returned men to deal with in my own district and having been asked by these men to intercede for them, I have never received more sympathetic consideration from any department of Government, nor has any one ever gone further than the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment has gone in every case that has been brought before them. My judgment is that if there is anything wrong with what they are doing, or if their work is not adequate, it is because the machinery has not been made adequate and the responsibility rests upon the House of Commons to see that it is. Therefore, the suggestion made by the right hon. the Acting Prime Minister (Sir George Foster) that a committee is to be appointed meets with my absolute approval.

In so far as a cash gratuity to physically fit returned men is concerned I want to make myself absolutely clear to this House as I have to the branches of the Great War Veterans' Association in my own district. I have said to them, and I say to this House, that the responsibility of the country to the disabled men, those who are not fit to go back into civil life or to the same positions that they occupied before they went overseas, and our responsibility to the dependents of the men who fell, will never be properly discharged until we have gone to the limit of the country's resources. I submit that if we dissipate a large part of the country's resources in providing a further cash amount to physically fit men we will be thereby rendering ourselves less able to take care of the physically unfit and the dependents of those who fell. It is not because we would not like to do it. I do not believe there is a man on either side of the House but who would give his last nickel to a returned soldier who needed it. It is not because Canada does not want to do it but because there is a limit to the resources of the country, and it will tax these resources to the very limit if we take proper care of the widows and orphans of the men who fell and of the men who have come back physically unfit.

I agree heartily with the spirit of the resolution moved by the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Andrews) and with the spirit of the statement made by the Acting Prime Minister (Sir George Foster). I think there should be a committee. My wish would be that the same committee which did such splendid work last year might take hold of the subject again and give the House and the country the benefit of their judgment as to the best means of discharging our responsibility to the returned men.

Mr. W. A. BUCHANAN (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, when the re-establishment question was before the House last year I did not enter into the discussion, but I favoured the appointment of a committee. When that Committee brought down a unanimous report I supported its recommendations. I think I can say that I have a mind of my own but at the same time when representative men from both sides sat in committee afternoon, night and sometimes into the morning, men who had served in the trenches, men who have given their sons in the war, men who were acknowledged to possess sound business capacity, and men coming from both political parties, I felt that I would require some very sound reason before I differed from their recommendations.

If this country could afford it I would like to see divided among the returned soldiers the $200,000,000 that was asked for. But it is impossible to do that. I accepted the report of the committee last year, and I went back home and defended my course. It was not a popular course to defend. I was often faced with criticism even by the reasonable men amongst the returned soldiers. When I told them that the committee said it was impossible for Canada to finance some of the schemes that were proposed and that we had to economize on account of the great obligations incurred through the war, they came back at me with statements to the effect that the Government was extravagant, that it was wasting money, that the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment was overmanned and that there was unnecessary expense in connection with it. They had me floored because I was not familiar with the facts in regard to the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment. If, as the Government claims, the country cannot afford to expend this money, it should be the business of Parliament to see that this Government is not wasting any money. I am not saying that the charge against the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment is correct; all I am saying is that the charge was made. We should see that all these institutions controlling the affairs of the returned soldiers are manned sufficiently and economically so that we can convince the returned men that the attitude we are taking in this Parliament is backed up by actual facts.

There are cases, such as have been mentioned on the floor of the House to-day in which pensions should be provided for at this session of Parliament. I have one complaint to offer to the House and it comes from a great many of the returned men. It is in connection with housing. They have come back from overseas and they are unable to find homes to live in. They cannot avail themselves of any housing scheme in Alberta at any rate. If this Government in some way could help the returned men to acquire homes of their own, not by gift but by loan, they would remove a great deal of the criticism that exists.

Again, the suggestion was made last year —and I think it was left open for consideration—that loans should be extended beyond disabled men. I know it is impossible to grant a loan to every man who asks for it but it should be possible to consider the merits of a man just as a loan company or a bank considers them. We should assist such a man in that way provided we were satisfied that he was a gilt edged proposition and would use the money to the advantage of himself and the community in which he lived and, in due course, pay it back. If a loan scheme along this line were adopted I think it would meet the demands of the reasonable men amongst the returned soldiers. We cannot satisfy the extremists in any movement. Even if we can satisfy one reasonable man by a proposal of this kind we should try and do so in any further consideration of the case of the returned men.

I have no objection to the appointment of a Committee to consider further problems in connection with re-establishment provided it deals with the necessities of the moment and deals with questions that it is possible for the country to solve. I am convinced that it is impossible to satisfy the demands of those who are asking from this country more than it is possible for the country to raise. We should be frank and honest enough to say that. But we should attempt to deal with all the reasonable demands which are made and try and solve the question so that we can get rid, if it be possible, of the returned soldier problem, get rid of it for our own satisfaction and get rid of it so that the returned men, or the bulk of the reasonable men amongst the returned soldiers, may be satisfied.

Mr. WILLIAM GARLAND McQUARRIE (New Westminster): I also would like to say a few words on this resolution. Like the prevoius speaker I understood when I voted for the adoption of the report of the committee last session that the door would be left open for further discussion of the question of the re-establishment of the returned soldier. There are some matters which I think should be dealt with by any committee which is to be appointed and I hope the committee will be the same as the committee that acted last session. That committee, in my opinion, did excellent work, and there is no reason why they should not be asked to continue their labours and they will have the advantage of the opinions that have been expressed here to-day. I agree with the member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) that some assistance should be given to university students. These are mostly youths who went overseas from the courses which they were taking. They are now unable, or perhaps some of them are unwilling, to continue their courses because of the years

they have spent in service to their country. Now it seems to me that it is in the interest of Canada that these young men should be assisted to continue their courses in the university, and I hope that some means will be found to help them to do so. We must also consider the case of those just over the age of eighteen years who enlisted and served many years in the war and who now find that because they were over eighteen they are not entitled to the assistance which is being given to boys under that age. I think that age limit could very well be increased to twenty-one years, and I hope the committee will take this matter into consideration.

I was pleased to hear from the Acting Prime Minister that the Government was considering bringing in a Bill to cover the question of insurance and I support the stand which the Government is taking in that connection. I believe that a man who was physically fit when he went overseas but who finds himself unable to get insurance when he returns to Canada, should be looked after.

Then there is the question of better pensions. I believe that the pensions should be increased in amount in a great many cases, and also that the scope of the pensions granted should be enlarged. We have heard to-day of many cases of mothers and wives who should in all justice be entitled to pensions but cannot receive them because of the existing regulations, or because of the law as it stands at the present time.

I do not agree in any way with the criticisms that have been directed against the minister in charge of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment. I have found that minister courteous at all times and invariably willing whenever I have had occasion to speak to him, to do what he could. But in a great many of these cases I have been met with the reply that although the minister thinks they are deserving of consideration, unfortunately owing to the regulations that are in force he can do nothing.

Another matter I would like to refer to is that of the Emergency Fund which was provided for last year. We all know that the returned men did not take advantage of that fund as we expected they would. The reason for that was that they considered it as a dole or a charity and they do not want charity—they want work. What I want to suggest is that the Government should consider opening up public works so as to give the men who are willing to work the opportunity of doing so. I do not believe in extravagant expenditures but I do believe that instead of handing out a charity dole this Government should provide work for men who are willing to do it, and in my opinion the great majority of the returned men are willing to work if that work is given to them. I know in my constituency there are a lot of men who are not saying anything, who are not making any complaints, but who are, and have been, unable to obtain employment. I hope the Government will give that matter serious consideration. I would like to go further than some hon. gentlemen have done. I would suggest to the committee that is about to be appointed the advisability of considering the granting of some assistance to those who need it if work cannot be given them, I am like all the hon. gentlemen who have spoken here to-day in that I believe first consideration should be given to the disabled men and to the dependents of those gallant fellows who gave up their lives overseas. At the same time I think there are those not classed as disabled men who are entitled to some consideration, and I would impress upon the committee that they should endeavour perhaps to go further in the direction of granting assistance to these men than has yet been attempted.

Mr. E. B. DEVLIN (Wright): I shall not detain the House at any length in speaking to the resolution under consideration. Let me begin by saying that I am a man of peace and not a man of war. I am not disposed to pay compliments to hon. gentlemen opposite because of the advice of a very old politician who once told me that it was a bad practice to compliment the other man for he would not believe you anyway. However, if such a thing were at all permissable to one who is so much younger I would like to say that in listening to the words of the leader of the Government—when he spoke with all the earnestness that he possesses upon this subject and said that he was doing his best—I did feel he meant every word he said. After a long life given by the right hon. gentleman to the public service of the country in all the departments he was called to administer I feel that his administration of those departments has been characterized by that thrift which, I am sure, every citizen in this country will recognize.

A complaint was made as to the work of the committees of the House. I was a member of the first committee formed to

deal with the subject of pensions, and I want to say that hon. members on both sides gave to the work of that committee the best that was in them in their endeavour to do full justice by the men who had fought for a righteous cause, while not forgetting that the Administration was the custodian of the taxes of the people. That committee was presided over by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell), and occupied a great deal of the members' time, sitting morning, afternoon and evening for weeks, and they only knew what was happening in this Chamber through their perusal of Hansard or the public press. I must confess that last year when asked to again sit upon the committee I did not feel that I could give to the subject all the time that it deserved, and I sympathize with the men who did act, because I know they were intent on doing their duty between the soldier boys and the taxpayers.

I have heard complaints made about the pensions granted. Yes, those pensions might be higher. They were granted after careful study by that committee and were based upon the Workmen's Compensation Acts of various countries and upon the experience of those countries which had pension lists. It was a new incident in this country's history. We had been through a war more gigantic than has ever been seen before in the history of the world. That there should be things lacking I can conceive to be possible, and that those omissions should be remedied I conceive to be a proper stand for the soldiers to take.

I also feel, Sir, that the Soldiers' Committee, the Pensions Committee and the other committee formed to deal with the claims of soldiers have reported sufficiently to this House to have the Administration assume to-day the full responsibility of carrying out the recommendations of those committees—improving upon them where improvement is possible, and rectifying any faults that have become apparent—and I think hon. gentlemen to-day who spoke upon this subject from both sides of the House should direct all their energies towards making the Government feel their responsibility in the matter. It should not be shelved on to committees again; the Government is now fully seized of the matter and should be prepared to act.

There was a time, Sir, before the war was over and before demobilization began when we were told that the Government was well advanced in the development of a scheme by which the returned men would find all that was coming to them on their return home. That time has arrived, and our returned men who fought so bravely and were wounded deserve everything that is coming to them—not alone from the Government but from Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard it stated by some hon. members that the returned men have not been able to obtain employment—I have heard that complaint on the street, in my office, in my home, on trains, and I have read it in the press. I am not in favour of turning out all civilians in the Government service and putting returned soldiers in their places. I believe, Sir, in the Civil Service being the most efficient that we can have. I believe in the soldier having a fair share in the public service. But what I do believe in more, Sir, is that the widow, the dependent, the student and the other classes who require immediate aid should be granted that aid.

Now, as to such part of the resolution as bears upon what I have said, I am prepared to support it. But I am not prepared to go to the extent of saying that the provision made for re-establishment in civil life of the members of His Majesty's forces who served in the late war has in many cases proved inadequate. Perhaps it has. The hon. member who proposes the resolution is, however—or was until quite recently—more in the secrets of the Government than I am, and if he states there are cases wherein this resolution will help the soldiers—will help them in returning to civil life, will help them in becoming as they were before, good citizens of this Dominion, will help them for the sacrifices which they have made—then, Mr. Speaker, I will without qualification support the motion of the hon. gentleman.

On motion of Mr. H. B. Morphy (North Perth) the debate was adjourned.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I ask my hon. friend who is leading the House what business we shall take up to-morrow?

Mr. ROWELL: I beg to move the adjournment of the House. Thursday is private members' day during the first four weeks of the session; therefore to-morrow is also private members' day, and any resolution which private members have on the Order Paper may be brought up for discussion. I may point out that if private members desire to have their resolutions disposed of it is desirable that they be prepared to go on at a time when there is opportunity to consider them; later in the session there may not be that opportunity.

If there is not sufficient business arising out of the resolution standing in the name of private members, Government business on the Order Paper will be taken up—resolutions standing in the name of Government members and any Bills that are ready. Some of the Bills are not yet printed in English and French; therefore we are not in a position to go on with them.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 5.50 p.m.

Thursday, March 18, 1920.

The House met at Three o'clock.

PETITIONS CALLING FOR MONEY EXPENDITURE.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to present to the House the report of the Clerk of Petitions dated the 18th of March. I would direct attention to the latter portion of this report which is as follows:

> He has also examined the following petitions and finds that as the granting of the prayer of the said petitions would involve the expenditure of public money, they should not be received.

Then he recites certain petitions which have been presented by hon. members of the House and the prayer of these petitions. It is in conformity with the invariable practice, as well as the rules of the House, that petitions of that character cannot be received.

REPORTS AND PAPERS TABLED.

Second Annual Report of the Historical Documents Publication Board, together with accompanying printed volumes, being the second edition revised and enlarged, of the first volume of the Constitutional Documents relating to Canada, 1759-1791, now issued in two parts.—Hon. Mr. Rowell.

Orders in Council together with a copy of a letter addressed to the Chairman of the Canadian Section of the International Joint Commission dated January 1, 1920, relating to the development and use of the waters of the St. Lawrence forming the boundaries between the United States and Canada.—Hon. Mr. Rowell.

Returns, Reports and Papers concerning the railway station at the Palis in the city of Quebec; appointment of harbour master in port of Canso; the dismissal of James Conner; bonds and secuurities registered; amount of Canadian securities previously held in Great Britain; refunds in tolls and duties; number of commissions appointed by the Government since 1914; number of commissions appointed since 1911; construction in the city of Quebec of a tunnel to facilitate the entrance of the Transcontinental railway; total number of persons of both sexes now employed by the Federal Government; contract between the Canadian Government, through the Canadian Wheat Growers, and Greece; construction of a dam over the St. Charles river; transfer of wharves on the St. John river.—Rt. Hon. Mr. Sifton.

RACING—DR. RUTHERFORD'S REPORT.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I beg leave to move, with the consent of the House, that seven hundred and fifty copies in English and two hundred and fifty copies in French of the report of Dr. Rutherford, commissioner appointed to inquire into racing, be printed forthwith, and that Rule 74 be suspended in relation thereto.

Motion agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.

On the motion of Sir George Foster the name of Hon. Mr. Tolmie, Minister of Agriculture, was added to the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

CANADIAN NAVY.

Mr. DUFF:

1. How many cruisers, destroyers, submarines, trawlers, drifters, tugboats, etc., comprise the Canadian Navy, exclusive of Fishery Protection ships?
2. How many of this number are in harbours on the Atlantic coast and how many on the Pacific coast?
3. How many are in commission on the Atlantic coast and how many on the Pacific coast?
4. What was the total cost to Canada for naval expenditure from March 1, 1919, to February 20, 1920?
5. How many cadets are being trained at the Naval Colleges or elsewhere?
6. How many naval ratings are in the Service?
7. How many officers are in the Service?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. Cruisers, 3; destroyers, none; submarines, four; trawlers, fifty-six Imperial for charge only; drifters, seventy-two Imperial, for charge only; tugs, etc., twelve.
2. Atlantic, 143; Pacific, 4.
3. Atlantic, 2; Pacific, 1.
4. Naval appropriation, $257,794.65; demobilization appropriation, $5,820,007.21; demobilization suspense, $937,907.49.

5. 45.
6. 374.
7. 158.

PUBLICATIONS IN FRENCH.

FARMERS' ACCOUNT BOOK.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Why has not the "Farmers' Account Book" been printed in French yet?
2. Why has not the publication known as the "Birds of Eastern Canada" been published in French yet?

Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

1. The "Farmers' Account Book" was published by the Commission of Conservation and has been printed in French. The French edition is exhausted and a new edition is now on order in the Printing Bureau.

2. "Birds of Eastern Canada" (Memoir 104, Geological Survey, Department of Mines) was published in October last, and work on a French translation was undertaken at once, and will be completed shortly. The usual practice of the department is to defer translations into French until the English editions are published. This is done in order that any additions or alterations made by the author prior to or during publication may be included in the translations.

HON. MR. BLONDIN'S TRIPS TO EUROPE.

*Mr. TOBIN:

1. How many trips has the Honourable P. E. Blondin made to England, France or any other European country since December, 1917?
2. For how long was he absent from Canada on each trip?
3. What were the total amounts of the bills submitted to the Government or any member of the Government, for expenses incurred by Mr. Blondin on these trips?
4. What was the total cost to the country of each trip to Europe made by Mr. Blondin?
5. Have all accounts incurred by Mr. Blondin when overseas been paid?
6. If not, what amounts remain unpaid?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. One.
2. From October 4, 1917, to July 5, 1918.
3. $2,433.33.
4. Answered by No. 3.
5. Yes.
6. Answered by No 5.

PRESS CENSORSHIP.

Mr. McMASTER:

1. Does the press censorship still exist?
2. If not, when did it terminate?
3. What has been the total cost of the press censorship since the 11th November, 1918?
4. How has said sum been expended?

Rt. Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

1. No.
2. December 31, 1919.
3. $24,693.29.
4. Salaries, $18,010.41; travelling expenses, $452.90; translations, $1,647.95; newspapers, books, etc., $118.25; printing and stationery, $804.37; rent, $2,600; lighting, $1.79; water, $76.69; sundries, including postage, telegrams, telephone conversations, freight, express, etc., $980.93.

BRIG.-GENERAL LANGTON.

*Mr. TOBIN:

1. Did Brig.-General Langton, Paymaster-General of the Militia Department, have any service overseas during the European war?
2. Was Brig.-General Langton a Lieut.-Colonel in the Canadian Army Service Corps when the war broke out in 1914?
3. What was his age at that time?
4. Did he volunteer for service overseas on mobilization in 1914 or at any other time?
5. Did he receive a communication from the officer administering the C.A.S.C. asking him whether he desired to have his name noted for service overseas?
6. What reply, if any, did he make to the communication?
7. What was the reason for Lieut.-Colonel Langton not proceeding overseas?
8. On what date was he appointed Acting Paymaster-General?
9. On what date was he appointed Finance member of Militia Council?
10. Prior to the appointment of Lieut.-Colonel J. G. Langton as Acting Paymaster-General—(a) what practical experience had he in the duties of an officer in charge of the Pay and Accounts of a Military Force, either in peace or on active service, and (b) in what capacity did he acquire this practical experience?
11. In regard to the statement by Major-General Mewburn, then Minister of Militia, in the House of Commons on the 29th April, 1919, that "as far as I am concerned every (permanent) appointment that is made will be given to a man who has seen overseas service," what is the reason for departing from this principle by the appointment of Brig.-General Langton to the Permanent Staff on the 8th of October, 1919, nearly six months after the above-quoted definite statement of the Minister of Militia?
12. What special qualifications justified the promotion of Colonel J. G. Langton to be a Brigadier-General and for his appointment as Finance Member of Militia Council?
13. Were there any officers in the Canadian Pay Corps who had the necessary qualifications and experience for appointment given to Colonel J. G. Langton? If so, why were they passed over when Colonel Langton was appointed?
14. Did Mr. J. W. Borden, the former Accountant and Paymaster-General, administer both the Accounts Branch and the Pay Branch of the Militia Department?
15. Does Brig.-General Langton only administer the Pay Branch?
16. What was the total salary paid to Mr. J. W. Borden immediately prior to his retirement?
17. What rate of pay and allowances per annum has Brig.-General Langton received since he was appointed Acting Paymaster-General?
18. What rate of pay and allowances does he receive now?

19. What is the total amount of money received by Brig.-General Langton for the twelve months ending 29th February, 1920?

20. Was Brig.-General Langton's permanent appointment made on the recommendation of the members of Militia Council?

21. Did any members of Militia Council oppose this appointment?

22. Upon what grounds was Brig.-General Langton's appointment opposed?

23. Did Colonel Edwards and Major Stiff, Chartered Accountants, investigate or inspect and report to the Minister of Militia on the condition in which they found Brig.-General Langton's branch?

24. What was the date of this report?

25. Was this report complimentary or adverse?

26. Will the report be tabled in the House in so far as it deals with the Paymaster General's Branch?

Hon. Mr. GUTHRIE:

1. No.

2. Yes.

3. 46 years, 10 months.

4. Yes. He placed himself unreservedly at the disposal of Lieut.-General Sir Sam Hughes, then Minister of Militia, in August, 1914, and reported immediately for duty at Valcartier, and was detailed as Railway Transport Officer on mobilization, and Embarkation Officer of First Contingent.

5. No such communication appears on the official files of the Militia Department.

6. Answered by No. 5.

7. Lieut.-General Sir Sam Hughes, then Minister of Militia, reports as follows: "General Langton's services were placed at my entire disposal early in August, 1914. He made repeated requests to be allowed to go overseas, and I am responsible for the retention of his services in Canada, as, in view of his experience and organizing ability, I desired his services in ths country."

8. 8th February, 1918.

9. 8th October, 1919.

10. (a) and (b). After embarkation on First Contingent, General Langton was specially selected by the then Minister of Militia as Deputy Inspector General in charge of Regimental Audit and Accounts of Units of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, which work was performed by him in such an efficient manner that he was selected and appointed by the then Minister of Militia, Major-General Mewburn, as Acting Paymaster-General.

11. This partial quotation of General Mewburn's speech is further qualified in said speech, and never was intended to deprive the officers who had been compelled to remain in Canada of all future chances of either promotion or appointment, and the reason General Langton was selected was on account of his valuable services in the Canadian Expeditionary Force.

12. The financial responsibilities of General Langton as Acting Paymaster-General, owing to the fact that demobilization of the Canadian Expeditionary Force was well under way, became greater and greater, and it was considered that this officer, on account of his valuable services, deserved such promotion on appointment as Finance Member of Militia Council.

13. After due and careful consideration of the claim of Permanent Force Officers in the Pay Corps, the then Minister of Militia was of opinion that General Langton's appointment was in the best interests of the public, and, therefore, recommended to Privy Council that General Langton be appointed as Finance Member of Militia Council.

14. Yes, until such time as the burden of the administration became too heavy for one officer alone, causing his health to become impaired to such an extent that he had to retire to pension.

15. Yes.

16. As a civil servant—not an officer of the Permanent Force—he received the maximum salary of his class, i. e., $4,000 per annum.

17. 8th February, 1918, to 31st March, 1918, $6,000 per annum; 1st April, 1918, to 20th February, 1919, $7,000.

18. $7,000 per annum.

19. Pay, $7,000; travelling allowances at rates prescribed by regulation, total $172.

20, 21 and 22. Appointments to Militia Council are made on the recommendation of the Minister of Militia to Privy Council. and are not considered in Militia Council.

23, 24, 25 and 26. Colonel Edwards and Major Stiff did make an investigation of the three branches of the financial organization of the Militia Department, i. e., the Pay Branch, the General Auditor's Branch, and the Branch of the Chief Accountant. Verbal reports were made from time to time to the then Minister of Militia, and coordination between these branches proceeded at the same time as the inspection took place. At the conclusion of their work, these officers wrote a personal letter to the then minister, which was for his own information. There is no record in the department of this letter.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES IN PETERBOROUGH.

Mr. BURNHAM:

1. Are those employees of the Government in Peterborough who, by reason of age are entitled to superannuation, in receipt of the same?

2. Are they in any case retained after the age of superanuation set out in the Act?
3. If so, why?

Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

Customs and Inland Revenue—

1. One employee is entitled to superannuation. There are four employees each of whom is over 60 years of age but they do not contribute to the superannuation fund.

2. Yes.

3. The physical and mental capacity of the employee is still unimpaired and he is capable of efficiently performing his duties.

Railways and Canals—

1. The employees of the Department of Railways and Canals at Peterborough are not contributors to the superannuation fund.

2. and 3. Answered by No. 1.

Trade and Commerce—

1. The Department of Trade and Commerce has one officer who is over the age limit, but as he does not contribute to the superannuation fund, he is not entitled to superannuation.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. Answered by No. 1.

BUTTER IN COLD STORAGE.

Mr. SUTHERLAND:

1. What quantity of butter was held in cold storage in Canada on September 30, 1918?
2. What quantity of butter was held in cold storage by the several companies engaged in the manufacture of oleomargarine in Canada on the following dates: September 30, 1918, July 1, 1919, November 1, 1919, and March 1, 1920?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1. Quantity of butter held in cold storage in Canada September 30, 1918.

	Lbs.
Butter, creamery	25,009,812
Dairy	2,081,442
Total	27,091,254

2. Quantity of butter held by firms manufacturing oleomargarine on:

	Lbs.
September 30, 1918	3,622,830
July 1, 1919	1,777,814
November 1, 1919	6,630,070
March 1, 1920	2,469,536

COST OF EXTRA PARLIAMENTARY SESSION, 1919.

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

What was the cost of the extra session of Parliament in the year 1919, including indemnity and travel of Senators and Members of the House of Commons, salaries or wages of officials, printing and all other expenses?

Rt. Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

House of Commons.

The following approximately covers the Session,

Indemnity	$580,737.40	
Sessional Clerks	10,810.17	
Stenography	14,437.79	
Ex. Committees	3,905.89	
Newspapers	110.22	
Sessional Messengers	13,420.50	
Pages	1,860.25	
Servants	4,122.25	
Sess. Charwomen	2,065.00	
		$631,469.47

Approximately.

Stationery	$ 4,674.55	
Postage	731.87	
Miscellaneous	2,844.33	
Debates	17,751.70	
Tradesmen and others	2,137.09	
Printing	22,579.22	
		$ 50,718.76
Total		$682,188.23

The Senate.

The cost of the extra Session of Senate, 1919:	
Indemnity, Senators	$225,000
Transportation	5,000
Salaries and Contingent expenses including printing	12,000
	$242,000

Of this amount $230,000 is Statutory.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. SEGUIN:

1. What is the total amount received by the Government from fines imposed on conscripts for default under the compulsory Military Service Act?
2. What is the amount by province?
3. What is the amount for the district of Joliette?
4. What is the amount for the county of L'Assomption-Montcalm?
5. Is it the intention of the Government to reimburse such fine to those who have paid?

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. On what date was a branch of the Public Works Department first established at Antigonish, N.S.?
2. What counties in Nova Scotia were originally under the jurisdiction of the Aintigonish branch?
3. When was the North Sydney office established?
4. What were the names of the employees in the Antigonish branch prior to the change and the amount of their yearly salaries?
5. What were the names of the employees in both offices on December 31, 1914, and their yearly salaries?
6. What are the names of the present employees in both branches and their respective yearly salaries?
7. How much was expended in public works in the area under the jurisdiction of the Antigonish branch for five years prior to December 31, 1911?

8. How much was expended in the public works in the area covered by both the Antigonish and North Sydney branches during the five years subsequent to January 1, 1912?

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. STEVENS (Vancouver Centre):

For a copy of Order in Council No. 1589 for creation of a Wheat Board and for a copy of Order in Council stating salary of the Chairman and Assistant Chairman and for the providing of remuneration for travelling and living expenses, showing the amount of same and rate per day of expenses allowed, etc., etc. Also for a return showing departmental cost of the administration of the Canada Wheat Board to March, 1920, or latest date for which information is available.

Mr. ROBB (for Mr. Sinclair, Queen's):

For a copy of the report of the Committee or Commission appointed in 1919 by the Minister of Militia and Defence, of which General Morrison was Chairman, for the purpose of visiting the different Military Districts in Canada and ascertaining, among other things, the most suitable method of incorporating in the proposed reorganization of the Permanent Force the members of the Canadian Expeditionary Forces; and also the report of the said Committee on the Special Commission given them by the Minister of Militia to inquire into the return of the Military District to Prince Edward Island.

CIVIL SERVICE CLASSIFICATION.

Mr. A. E. FRIPP (Ottawa) moved:

For a copy of all representations, complaints and other correspondence filed with the Civil Service Commission regarding Classification of the Civil Service of Canada.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in asking the House for this return I desire to make one or two observations. The question of the classification of the Civil Service of Canada is a most important one, and it has proceeded now for some months, but from the information I have obtained I think it is time in the interests of the Service that a halt should be called.

Under the Act of 1918 respecting the Civil Service of Canada, the Civil Service Commission were empowered to classify the Civil Service. I submit the proper reading of the Act will be found to be that the classification was to be performed by the Civil Service Commission, or by such persons as they might engage and to be afterwards confirmed practically by the heads of the different departments.

It will be very interesting to the House I am sure to learn just how this classification has been carried out. In the first place, the Commission engaged an American firm, the Arthur Young Company of Chicago, to perform the work. I for one, Mr. Speaker, desire to register my protest against the employment of this firm.

[Mr. J. H. Sinclair.]

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. FRIPP: If it was necessary to employ a firm of experts to classify the Civil Service—which I do not admit—surely there were persons and firms carrying on business in the Dominion quite competent to perform the work.

I asked for a return with regard to the cost up to date of the services of the Arthur Young Company, and I find that the answer given yesterday is not correct. I would like to draw the attention of the Secretary of State (Mr. Sifton) to the figures which he placed on Hansard in answer to my question. I ascertained at the Auditor General's office this morning that instead of the sum mentioned in answer to my inquiry as having been paid to these gentlemen for this work, viz., $49,-107.42, the correct figures are as follows: Up to the 31st March, 1919, $34,695.76, and for this fiscal year to the end of September last $56,536.17, or a total of $91,-231.93. The appropriation ran out in September last, so no payments have been made to the Arthur Young Company for the last five months. The Auditor General estimates that that further expenditure will be in the neighbourhood of $60,000 to the first of March.

Mr. PROULX: A great waste.

Mr. FRIPP: So the House will see that the total sum already paid and proposed to be paid to these Chicago gentlemen amounts to over $150,000.

Mr. BUREAU: Just for classification work?

Mr. FRIPP: That is for classification work only. Now, Mr. Speaker, had this work been carried out in any businesslike way, perhaps, apart from the objection I have already noted, one could not say very much against it. But I venture to submit that if a committee be named by this House to investigate the work done by these gentlemen it will be found to be most inefficient and in many respects absolutely absurd—in fact, they have attempted to classify the service without any proper idea of the work to be performed.

What do you suppose, Mr. Speaker, was the mode of procedure of these young men from Chicago, ranging from twenty-five to forty years of age, who have been performing their work in the city of Ottawa for several months past? In order to classify a department one would imagine that they would have at least gone first to the deputy minister and ascertained from him the status of the different persons under his

control. No, Mr. Speaker, that was not their procedure, because that would have resulted in a very few weeks' work to complete their so-called classification. Instead of adopting that course they made out a simple card index, and every clerk in the service was handed a card with the request that he fill out his name, age, present occupation and duties. Having obtained that information the young gentlemen sat down in their office, without, I am informed, any consultation with the deputy heads of the departments, and made out a list of the civil servants with the salaries which in their opinion should attach to their positions.

In order that the House may have some idea of the manner in which this work was carried out, and the results obtained, let me give one or two illustrations. I find that dealing with the following secretarial positions the Arthur Young Company classify them in this way:

Secretary of the Civil Service Commission	$4,620
Secretary of the Pensions Board	4,200
Secretary of the Research Council	3,300
Secretary of the Post Office Department	4,200
Secretary of the Department of the Interior	2,400

Every hon. member knows that the Department of the Interior, being one of the largest and most important in the public service, requires a man as secretary with a knowledge of the department from A to Z, and to classify him as worth only $2,400 a year, while the secretary of the Civil Service Commission, who requires no knowledge at all except of clerical work, so far as I am aware, is classed as the highest of them all, is but one instance of the many absurdities contained in this so-called classification.

Then to give another example. In a certain department there are two young ladies, —I want to show to the House just how they were classified by these experts. One of them—we will call her Miss B—was appointed temporary clerk in September, 1916, was made permanent in 1918 and is now a 3-B clerk at $750 a year. She has been graded by these experts as a junior clerk at a salary of from $660 to $960 a year. Miss H, a temporary clerk in the same department, doing the same class of work, was appointed only in July, 1917, and had been classed as a 3-B clerk at $700 a year. Upon being asked for a report upon the work performed by these young ladies, the gentleman in charge of the branch replied in the case of Miss B, as follows:

> She came to us highly recommended and I have found the estimate of her ability well merited. She is a clerk of splendid qualifications and has already proved capable of taking charge of work of considerable responsibility. She holds a first-class professional certificate from the Department of Education of Ontario, also a Commercial Specialist's Certificate, and has had several years' experience as a high school teacher in Ontario. She has been rated altogether too low by the Civil Service organizers.

Of Miss H, he reports:

> This lady has been performing very good services, but as there are not enough vacancies available Miss H might well wait a year or two on account of her youth and her recent appointment.

How were these young ladies graded by this Civil Service expert? Miss H, of recent appointment, with only a year's experience in the department, is graded a class higher than Miss B, with a salary of $960 to $1,260 a year, while Miss B is rated, as I have said at $600 to $960, absolutely in defiance of the recommendation of the man who was in the best position to form an estimate of their ability.

Now, the difficulty with this classification —which, I think, ought to have been foreseen by those who brought in these experts, —is that, not having had any experience in the service, or any intimate knowledge of the manner in which the work of the different departments is carried on at Ottawa as well as in other portions of Canada,—because this classification affects all classes of the service, both inside and outside—they have classified the jobs; they have said: "This job is worth $800 a year," and they have totally disregarded the individual ability and aptitude for work of the different clerks in the several branches. The whole classification, therefore, is nothing but a stupendous farce. Any business man in this House knows that you may employ, for instance, three stenographers; one of them may be worth $900 a year to you; the other two may be worth $500 or $600 a year, but under this classification they are all put in at $900 a year without any distinction at all as to their respective merits and qualifications. These illustrations, Mr. Speaker, ought to show the House that the work of classification has been very badly done, and if I may offer any advice to the Government it is that they get rid of these gentlemen at the earliest possible moment, and call in the deputy ministers and the chief clerks of the different departments who, I venture to say, can classify the public service of Canada in a much more efficient way than has been done by these experts.

These gentlemen have also been asked to deal with the re-organization of the Printing

Bureau. It is hard to know what department or what minister has control of the Printing Bureau, but one would have thought, having regard to the manner in which these American gentlemen have dealt with the other departments, that in the reorganization of the Printing Bureau the King's Printer or the Assistant King's Printer or both would be the men to say who should be laid off and who should be retained when the staff was being reduced. But you will be surprised when I tell you that, if my information is correct, this young gentleman, so-called expert, goes down to the Printing Bureau and, under the authority of the Government, selects two classes of men who are to be laid off: Men over 65 years of age and the men whom he thinks—whom he thinks, forsooth—are inefficient. Now, whether or not the gentleman who undertook this work in the Printing Bureau is an expert in the printing business I do not know, but I do know that upon his recommendation hundreds of men have been laid off or are to be laid off, many of whom are amongst the most efficient men in the Printing Bureau and are under the age of 65. I need mention only one name. A sub-foreman named Pritchard, under forty years of age, one of the best men we had in the Bureau, has been laid off by this so-called expert on the ground of inefficiency, although the King's Printer and the Assistant King's Printer tell me that he was one of the most efficient men in the branch of the department in which he was employed. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is patronage of the worst kind. To hand over to Americans the authority to go into the public service of Canada or any part thereof and to say to John Smith, "You shall stay," and to William Brown, "You shall go," is patronage of the worst kind and should not be tolerated by this Government who are responsible to the people. Personally I am opposed to going back to the patronage system; I had some experience in that regard as member for Ottawa during the past ten years. But in my judgment this classification by this American concern has done more to weaken the policy of this Government in connection with placing the control of appointment under the Civil Service Commission of Canada than any other thing could possibly have done. The Government have probably not been made aware as I have been made aware of the conditions that are existing in the Service to-day. Ninety-five per cent of the members of the Civil Service to-day are upset. They are discouraged; a feeling of unrest prevails among them. Why, Mr. Speaker, in the Department of Mines alone nine-tenths of the scientific men there employed have resigned during the last six months. Most of them, of course, have been offered and will receive a much higher remuneration than the Government has been giving them, but many of them have told me that having regard to the advantages of being in the service, having regard to the fact that they were doing work that they liked and with which they were thoroughly familiar, they had been willing to forego the increased emoluments offered to them from outside in the hope of expectation of their receiving a proper superannuation to provide for their older days. They were, however, compelled to leave the service on account of the classification. What has happened? I am informed, on very good authority, that this condition of affairs has reached such a pass, especially in the scientific branches of the service, that another commission, consisting of three very estimable gentlemen, has been called in to go over and pass upon the work that has been done by the firm of Arthur Young and Company.

I felt it my duty, as this matter affects not only the Civil Service in the city of Ottawa which I have the honour to represent, but the Civil Service of Canada as a whole, to bring it to the attention of the Government and to urge upon them to withdraw from the Civil Service Commission the power that they have given them to employ these American gentlemen, to dispense with the services of these gentlemen at once, and to have the service reorganized by the men most competent to do so, namely, the deputy ministers and their respective chief clerks.

Mr. JOHN H. BURNHAM (Peterborough West): Mr. Speaker, it will be remembered that the fault which has now been exploded, if I may say so, by the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Fripp), was the work of the members of this House who put themselves on record as being unfit to recommend anybody for anything. The members having declared that they were unfit for that duty, it only remained for the Government to take up the job. Possibly these hon. gentlemen knew themselves best and whether they were fit or unfit, but for myself I took the opposite course. The only distinction between what was done in the old days and the course adopted at the present time as outlined by my hon. friend, (Mr. Bureau), is simply this: You have removed the responsibility one degree further from the electorate; you have cen-

tralized it instead of leaving it in the hands of those who were not only directly but immediately responsible to the people. If any hon. gentleman, we shall say, of the Opposition, made a false or bad recommendation or passed upon a recommendation in a wrong way, he would be immediately brought to time by the electorate. But the present system as to recommendations has been adopted instead of leaving the responsibility in the hands of the representatives of the people. I admit, of course, that if the people are no good and their representatives are no good, it is all up; but if the representatives are fit and proper men, as they ought to be, then notwithstanding what they have said about themselves, the stigma they have left upon themselves, the very low value they have set upon their own characters——

Mr. BUREAU: I rise to a point of order. My point of order is that I do not wish to accept the statement that I have stigmatized myself. I deny that.

Mr. BURNHAM: The hon. member has risen to a point of order. A stigma is a point, and a point is that which is without dimensions.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member (Mr. Bureau) has risen to a point of order. I must say, in all deference, that I do not see that the remarks of the hon. member for Peterborough West reflect in any way on the character of any hon. gentleman in this House. It is his opinion that by the House taking a certain course, it has stigmatized itself, but I do not understand his remarks as casting a reflection on any member.

Mr. BURNHAM: Quite so, Mr. Speaker. I had no intention of casting any reflection; they cast their own shadow. But the members having by their own indifference given out of their own hands the duty of looking after the Civil Service, inside and outside, and having handed over their responsibility to the Government, what could the Government do but centralize the authority and centralize patronage in itself? Since they had been told by the representatives not to look at them, not even to dare to speak to them with regard to anything concerning their constituencies and any recommendations in connection with their constituencies, what could the Government do but consult other people in the constituencies? The fact of the matter is simply this, that the members of the House, through laziness, indifference, or failure to see what was coming, handed over the authority and responsibility which belonged to them. In this, they were helped on by the newspapers who saw the ebb and flow of a sensation and who simply hurried them into this catastrophe, and here we are with $150,000 worse than wasted. I have no doubt that the press when they have discovered this error, will take up the matter again and blame the House of Commons for what they have done, and the press will be quite right. There is no getting away from the fundamental principle, that if you are not honest, no system will make you honest. It is not the system; it is the administration——

Mr. BUREAU: The legislation.

Mr. BURNHAM: Not the legislation; legislation is only the expression of the will of people who have no will.

Let me say, however, in closing, that if you are going to renounce the fundamental principle that an honest man will do honest work; that those who have brains enough and application should receive promotion and pay; and if the people and their representatives cannot be trusted to carry out a simple thing like that, then it is all up.

Mr. SPEAKER: I trust, if any other hon. members speak upon this motion, they will not broaden the question unduly. The question of patronage might be indirectly referred to in this matter, but it is my duty to point out that this is a specific motion calling for papers having to do with the classification of the Civil Service of Canada.

Mr. EDMOND PROULX (Prescott): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Fripp) has mentioned several cases where the so-called experts have failed to appreciate the importance of the duties of certain civil servants. I want to mention another case, which is a glaring one. They classified the translators of the debates of this House and of the Senate, of legislation and of the different departments, and they put those translators into the class where the minimum is $1,260; contending that their qualifications would be those of high school graduates. Any one who has had experience with high schools in Ontario knows very well that the French language is not taught sufficiently in those schools —and I think the same may be said of high schools in other provinces—to qualify high school graduates to be translators of the debates of this House or of departments of the public service. The position of a translator to-day is, one might say, a profession, and it requires a university education in

both languages; a man must follow a course of studies as long as if he were studying for a profession, and it is absurd to say that a man who has gone through a university and acquired a thorough knowledge of both languages should be put into a class where his salary would begin at $1,260. If that is going to be the case, we shall have very poor translators; many of those who are already in the service, if they are not too old to get out, will get out, and those who will replace them will certainly not be as well qualified as those who have left the service. There are many other cases; but I want to point out especially this case, and I am of the same opinion as the hon. member for Peterborough West (Mr. Burnham) that the money spent in employing these so-called experts was worse than wasted.

The Civil Service of this country is composed of different branches, and we have two languages. How did the so-called experts know what qualifications were required of officers whose duties included work in both languages? We had Canadians much better qualified, and I do not see why it was necessary to go to the United States to get so-called experts to do this work. The Government must have gone back on their policy of past years. It was not so long ago when they would have no truck or trade with the Yankees, but now they cannot classify the Civil Service in this country without going to the United States for experts. I think there has been too great a tendency on the part of the Government for some years past to "pass the buck," to shelve their responsibilities to commissions and experts. Who could be better qualified to classify the Civil Service of this country than the deputy ministers and the chiefs of the different branches of the service? I do not think any better qualified men could have been chosen. They knew the personnel of the service, their qualifications, and the importance of the duties pertaining to the different offices. What could men from Chicago or New York know of the importance of the duties, for instance, of the secretary of the Interior Department? My hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Fripp) has pointed out the glaring inconsistencies in classifying secretaries of the different departments. I would also like to cite the classification of the Translation Branch. If we wish to have efficient service rendered by that branch it will be necessary to have it re-classified by genuine experts, such as university professors, who have been educated in both the French and English languages.

[Mr. Proulx.]

Hon. NEWTON W. ROWELL (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, there is no objection whatever to the motion made by my hon. friend (Mr. Fripp), but in view of some of his observations I think it is only right that a few words should be said lest a wrong impression might be created, and I am sure my hon. friend does not desire that.

I regret that the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) who, while a member of the Government, looked after this branch of the work, and who is familiar with all its details, is not in the House. He has followed this reclassification from its inception and knows all about it. I am not in possession of all the information, and therefore am not able to inform the House as I should like to be able to do with reference to a number of matters mentioned by my hon. friend, but as a member of the Government I have a general knowledge of the situation, and am therefore able to correct some of the misunderstandings which I fear my hon. friend has fallen into.

As the members of the House will recall, the general Civil Service Act which was passed in the year 1918 made provision for the reclassification of the service. This Act was passed by this House and at that time the question raised by the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) was a perfectly proper question to raise. The hon. member has been consistent throughout. He did not believe that the proposal to put all appointments in the public service under the Civil Service Commission was a wise one in the public interest, but at that time this House affirmed the principle of putting the Civil Service under the Civil Service Commission and it provided for a reclassification of the service. Members of the House who are familiar with the service know that prior to that time the inside service was classified, and I think some sections of the outside service had been brought under a measure of classification. So far as the inside service is concerned, it was divided into one, two, or three classes, with various grades in those classes, and men were placed in these different classes, not necessarily in accordance with the importance of the actual work they were doing, but in many cases because of the length of time they had been in the service. A man entering the public service might continue to perform exactly the same duties year after year over a long period of years and yet by means of being promoted from one class to another have his salary very greatly in-

creased. The result is that there are men in the service who under the old classification are being paid twice the amount—I use that figure roughly, I am not familiar with the details—that others are receiving who are doing exactly the same class of work, simply because they had been longer in the service, or had been pushed forward when others had not been pushed forward. In different departments of the Government, under the old classification, men performing the same class of work were in different classes, and were paid different salaries. Every one recognized that it does not promote efficiency in the service to have men doing exactly the same class of work paid radically different salaries, nor does it promote efficiency to have one man paid a smaller salary than the man who is performing much less important work in the same branch. But that situation did exist under the old classification. Now the House in 1918 affirmed not only the principle of placing civil servants under the Civil Service Commission, but

4 p.m.

of providing for a reclassification of the service. Reclassification was entrusted by the Act to the Civil Service Commission. They were authorized and instructed to undertake the work, and in undertaking that work they called to their assistance Arthur Young & Company. Speaking for myself I had never heard of that firm until they were retained by the Civil Service Commission for this work. The Commission advised the Government, and I have no reason to doubt the accuracy of the advice they gave, that after canvassing the whole field the best experts who could be secured for the purpose of undertaking this most important and responsible work—the largest civil service classification ever undertaken up to that time on this Continent—was Arthur Young & Company. This firm had a large number of experts with a very high reputation in classification work, and so it was called in to assist the Civil Service Commission in classifying the service. Arthur Young & Company are not responsible for the classification: The Civil Service Commission is responsible for it.

Mr. JACQUES BUREAU: Did Arthur Young & Company or the Civil Service Commission make the classification?

Mr. ROWELL: The Civil Service Commission.

Mr. BUREAU: Then what was the object in calling in Arthur Young & Company?

Mr. ROWELL: They were the experts who advised the Commission and did the detail work, just as my hon. friend when he was in charge of one of the departments of the Government was responsible for the work of that department, although the actual work was performed by the men under him in that department.

Mr. BUREAU: And I chose them myself.

Mr. ROWELL: The Civil Service Commission chose these men themselves.

Mr. BUREAU: Were Arthur Young & Company brought here to tell the Civil Service Commission what kind of work was being done by each branch of every department?

Mr. ROWELL: No, they were not.

Mr. BUREAU: Then what was the use of their services?

Mr. ROWELL: They were here to advise and assist the Civil Service Commission in working out the reclassification—

Mr. BUREAU: They knew nothing about it.

Mr. ROWELL: —and that is what they have done. They continued their work during the year 1918 and the greater part of the year 1919. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) laid on the table of the House last year the result of the reclassification up to date. He introduced a Bill approving of that reclassification. That Bill was referred to a committee of this House for consideration and report. That committee of this House had Arthur Young and Company before them, they had all the information before them and after the committee had considered the matter they reported the Bill and the reclassification back to this House. With that report before it, the House passed the Bill. Whether that action was wise or unwise, this House is responsible for the principles embodied in that classification. This House adopted it and it is that classification that is being worked out.

One or two words with reference to certain other points which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fripp) has raised because in respect to these he is under a misapprehension, as I know by reason of matters which have come under my observation in my own department. My hon. friend said that the method by which they collected information about the work of the public service was a card index, a card being sent out to each civil servant on which he should write out his

present position and the character of the work that he was doing. That is perfectly correct but it was required that the deputy minister or head of his department or branch should approve that statement before it came back to the Civil Service Commission. Whatever the definition of the duties of any man in the Civil Service might be, it only came back to the commission with the approval of the deputy minister or the head of the branch concerned. All the information that the Civil Service Commission has received has gone to it with the approval of the deputies or the heads of the different departments.

What was the duty of the Civil Service Commission and their experts when they had received these cards defining the duties? It was to seek to classify them so as to secure a measure of uniformity in all branches of the public service. My hon. friend has referred to stenographers. Well, take stenographers; is it right that stenographers of the same skill and ability should be receiving $200 or $300 more in one branch of the public service than that same class of stenographer is receiving in another?

Mr. BUREAU: It depends on the work.

Mr. ROWELL: I refer to equal quality of work in all branches of the public service. My hon. friend has taken stenographers as an illustration of the classification. They create different classes of stenographers with a different scale of remuneration depending upon their skill in stenography. I have not the figures before me and I am not able to state the range of the salary among stenographers. I know there is a wide range. I think they start at $800 or $900 in one class and go up to $1,500, or something like that although I am not sure of the figures. There is a wide range between the lowest and the highest grade of stenographers. All stenographers in all branches of the service are classified on this basis. New stenographers coming in all come in at the same rate of pay in every branch of the public service. When stenographers in any branch of the service have attained a degree of efficiency which entitles them to promotion to a higher class, they are promoted to that higher class. That is the principle which applies to other classes and branches of the service. The basis of the classification is that all employed in the public service should be paid in accordance with the character and quality of the work they do, not in accordance with the personal will or likes of any minister or any deputy minister or any member of Parliament; not according to their political affiliations and not necessarily according to their length of service except there is some advantage in length of service because there is a provision for annual increases in these different classes. The basis of the classification is payment in accordance with the value of the work done.

Mr. BUREAU: What about the ability of the worker?

Mr. ROWELL: And the ability of the worker. Take the class that I have mentioned—stenographers. They cannot be appointed as stenographers until they have passed a qualifying examination which indicates that the person is qualified for the post. That is, when a stenographer first comes into the service all who enter are paid on that basis. After they have been admitted to the service and are doing more advanced work they are entitled to go into a higher class.

Mr. COPP: Who examines them in the case of the promotion examination?

Mr. ROWELL: The Civil Service Commission is responsible for the examinations for promotion as well as those for entrance into the public service. I am quite aware that there has been dissatisfaction in the Civil Service in connection with this matter. It would be impossible that the situation could be otherwise with the classification of a service of 50,000 employees. It is only right that the House should know that if the Civil Service Commission, and if the experts, had been willing to give a general advance in salaries beyond what would have been justified, much of the opposition would have been removed. They came to the Government, submitted the case and said: "The fact is that tremendous pressure is being brought to bear upon us to move up the classes beyond what we think is right and in the public interest, and to move up salaries beyond what people could earn in similar positions outside the public service; it means the expenditure of public money; what do you want us to do; the question of finance is peculiarly a matter for the Government, do you want us to yield to this pressure from the Civil Service and move salaries up beyond what we think is right and in the public interest or do you want us to do what we think is right?" The Government said: "Your duty is to do what you think is right in classifying the Civil Service of Canada and we will stand behind you in doing it."

Mr. BEST: Did the Government do their duty by increasing the salaries of a number of people from $100 to $1,000 when this report was expected down at any moment? Was the Government justified in putting into the Estimates increases in salaries ranging from $100 to $1,000 a year for certain members of the public service when this report was expected down at any moment?

Mr. ROWELL: There were in the Estimates, as my hon. friend (Mr. Best) has said, in 1918, or 1919—

Mr. BEST: 1919.

Mr. ROWELL: —in the spring of 1919 before the classification had gone into effect, the names of certain officials appeared in the Estimates for increased salaries. I do not question what my hon. friend has said. Personally, I have no hesitation in saying that I think the Government made a mistake in including any names in the Estimates brought down in the year 1919. I think all should have stood over until the Civil Service Commission report was brought before the House. These, however, were very few; there were very few cases of that but I think we made a mistake when we did it at all. We should have left all over until the classification was brought down—I have no hesitation in saying that. We are not infallible, we do make some mistakes and that is one that we made in connection with the Civil Service.

My hon. friend has referred to the question of the experts and the employment of experts is a difficult question. I know it because I have had difficulty myself in retaining chemical experts in the Food Adulteration Branch of the Department of Health. I was called upon to look into this matter by reason of the difficulties arising in this branch of the service owing to the retirement of a number of men from the service. It was stated to me that the reason for their retirement was because of the unsatisfactory result of the classification. I looked into the matter, and I found the fact to be that the re-classification provided a substantial advance for those men over the salary which obtained under the existing Civil Service regulation. But while the re-classification provided for an advance, the fact was that commercial institutions were in a position to pay them very much more than even the advanced figure, and as a result they left the Civil Service and accepted these commercial positions. Now it may be that the demand for expert service is so great at the present time, it may be that commercial institutions are in a position to pay so much for skilled and trained experts, that the Government of Canada must substantially increase its payment if it is to retain those experts in the public service. I want to point out, however that the responsibility for the existence of these conditions does not rest on the Civil Service Commission or the experts advising them. They did provide for a substantial increase over the salaries previously being paid. It may be, as I say, we will have to review the whole situation and provide for the payment of experts in the public service on a substantially higher scale than has been paid in the past, or the country may entirely lose the benefit of the service of such men.

Then my hon. friend has referred to the classification of the individual in the service. I may tell the House and my hon. friend, that the classification as framed and set out in the Act, or in the schedule to the Act, simply defines the different classes in the different branches of the service. To apply that classification to the existing service is a matter of great difficulty and in that application of the classification the deputies are all consulted and always consulted. The application of the classification is submitted to them and they are consulted with reference to it, but under the Act, final authority is in the Civil Service Commission. The Act of last session authorized the Civil Service Commission to review, or amend, or modify any of the classes provided for in the report laid before Parliament. Since that time the Commission has been busy reviewing the classification where complaint has been made, and I am glad to be able to inform my hon. friend that in the great majority of cases the result has been to give satisfaction to the parties concerned. A Board of Hearing has been formed consisting of two representatives of the Civil Service themselves, two deputy ministers and a member of the Civil Service Commission, which Board hears the complaints and appeals from the classification, and as a rule it is able to reach a reasonable degree of unanimity in its conclusions. The Civil Service Commission has always acted upon its findings and when the decisions arrived at come to the Governor in Council, I believe we have invariably approved them. In cases where particular individuals are dissatisfied with the application of the classification in a department they may appeal direct to the Civil Service Commis-

sion and the Commission hears that appeal and disposes of it. The members of the House will realize that in classifying such an enormous service mistakes are bound to occur. I have had matters brought to my attention where I think mistakes did occur and where a better result might have been secured, but those are all being rectified. The Civil Service Commission is dealing with the matter, and I believe is earnestly, faithfully, and effectively working out the application of the classification solely from the standpoint of the public interest and what is absolutely necessary for the Service. We should give the Commission a chance to do so, and give them a thorough opportunity, in the reclassification of a public service as extensive as ours is in Canada, to prove its worth and show what the results will be. While in my own department there have been some applications of the classification which I think could be improved it has not at all shaken my faith in the merits of the system, in the wisdom of Parliament in adopting it, nor in the beneficial results that will come to Canada when it is thoroughly worked out, and I believe it will mean a great deal to the efficienry of the whole service.

Mr. JACQUES BUREAU (Three Rivers): My hon. friend stated just now that he did not have full information about this matter. Could he give me any information with respect to the rule followed in classifying translators, for example, and state under what classification these gentlemen come?

Mr. ROWELL: I am sorry I cannot answer my hon. friend's question because I really have not the information except that I know there are different classes of translators. What the limits of the classification are I cannot say, but I shall be glad to get the desired information for my hon. friend.

Mr. BUREAU: My reason for asking the question is because of the difficulty, if not impossibility, of correctly classifying translators. They must be first class men possessing not only a thorough knowledge of both languages but considerable literary and scientific attainments.

Mr. ROWELL: I agree with my hon. friend that a translator must not only be well educated and thoroughly understand both languages but that he should have literary qualifications also.

[Mr. Rowell.]

Mr. BUREAU: Likewise technical.

Mr. ROWELL: These qualifications are necessary in order to enable them to translate from one language into another in a style that will be accurate and suitable in literary form. At the same time I think my hon. friend will not dispute the fact that there are degrees of efficiency and qualification even among translators. Nature and long experience will doubtless qualify one man much better than another.

Mr. BUREAU: Naturally.

Mr. ROWELL: Long experience will greatly help one man over another.

Mr. BUREAU: But nature must have done its part first.

Mr. ROWELL: A distinction might properly be drawn between translators that have just entered the service and are doing work not of great importance and translators of long experience engaged upon more important work.

I do not think it is necessary to add anything further. I only wished to make those general observations with reference to the work of re-classification lest there should be a misunderstanding owing to the remarks of my hon. friend.

Mr. J. A. C. ETHIER (Laval-Two Mountains): Let me draw my hon. friend's attention to the fact that there is a difference between the translators of debates and the translators in other departments. The debates translators are under the control of the House of Commons and are dealt with by the Debates Committee. When a vacancy occurs examinations are supposed to be held under the supervision of the Chief Translator. Some years ago when I was a member of the Debates Committee it used to meet regularly but of late I have not heard of the committee holding any sittings. It seems to have vanished.

Now, to come to my point. If the debates translators are under the control of the Speaker, how is it that the so-called experts in classification claimed the right of classifying those officials? Have they a right to usurp the authority of a committee of this House and to classify employees who are specifically under the control of Parliament? All the other members of the Civil Service in the various departments are under the authority of the Civil Service Commission, but the translators and the reporters of the debates, I repeat, are under the control of this House, and I think I am right in denying to the so-called experts any power to interfere with the Debates

Committee. There is great confusion in regard to the classification of the translators and official reporters of the House of Commons and of the Senate, and it should be cleared up.

My hon. friend has just reminded us that when the Hon. Mr. Maclean presented the Classification Bill last year he stated that the civil servants would have an opportunity of stating their grievances to an Appeal Committee of the Civil Service Commission. Those men are very anxious to know what remedies they now possess in regard to this faulty classification, and before the first of April, when the classification is to take place, I think the Government should take the steps mentioned by my hon. friend for Ottawa (Mr. Fripp), with whose remarks I am perfectly in accord. I have myself on the Orders of the Day a motion for papers in regard to the same matter, but I did not expect this question would be brought up to-day. I have not one or two, but fifty, complaints from civil servants with respect to the reclassification.

In regard to the scientific men in the service, I wonder how many analysts are now employed in the Department of Inland Revenue? If I am well informed, twenty of the most efficient have resigned and only four now remain; those who have left the service having been offered better salaries outside. The classification of their positions was simply ridiculous, and I am confident that the classification of other branches is equally ridiculous.

I endorse the remarks made by my hon. friend for Ottawa (Mr. Fripp), and when the opportunity comes next week I shall be glad to furnish to this House complete information in regard to the way this classification has been worked out, and the injustice which is bound to follow by its application to the service.

Mr. FRIPP: Mr. Chairman, ——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I must remind the House that the hon. member is about to exercise his right to close the debate, and if any hon. member desires to add anything to the debate he should speak now.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North and Victoria): I have followed with a great deal of interest the remarks of the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Fripp) with reference to the Civil Service classification, I might remind him and other hon. members that we have been discussing this subject quite a number of times. I remember that about a year ago we appointed a committee to inquire into the Civil Service, and that committee subsequently made a report. I am sorry to say that I do not think the Civil Service were able to get any great results from that committee. I have no doubt they worked faithfully, but their investigation was conducted more or less concurrently with the classification efforts of the firm brought from the United States, and I imagine the two bodies were working at cross-purposes.

Let me say to the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Fripp) that the first thing that struck me as serious was what he declares to be the system of dismissals. I watched with interest the answer of the President of the Privy Council to that point, and, if I followed him correctly, I do not think he touched on it at all. If a man has rendered faithful service he had a right to expect generous treatment at the hands of the Government in regard to promotion and otherwise. I think if what my hon friend for Ottawa stated is correct—and I have no reason to doubt it; it is not controverted by any member of the Government—that men of the highest standing of their grade in the service are dismissed without any investigation whatever, except some man stepping into an office, where perhaps there are thirty men working, and, with his eye on one of them, tossing a cent and saying, "Heads you stay, tails you go out," —that appears to me to be a very poor system of dealing with such an important service. I do hope that if there is to be a certain weeding out of the department the greatest possible care will be taken and that some more reasonable system will be established and followed by the Government than that described by the hon. member. I must accept his description as being correct, for I noticed that the hon. gentleman who spoke for the Government, and who is always ready to put forward everything that can be said in defence of the Government—

Mr. ROWELL: Will the hon. gentleman allow me? I do not think I should permit my hon. friend to make any such assumption. I did not speak on that point because I had not the details, but I am quite sure when the facts are investigated it will be found that every consideration has been given to retaining men in the service. In the public interest it is most desirable to release those whose services are not required. Where such men are released the Government has made provision for them and the House has voted money by way of recognition.

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not think the hon. President of the Privy Council has

any right to interrupt on that point and for that reason. My hon. friend knows the rules that would govern if during the course of an address to a jury I stated that there was no evidence on a certain point, and the learned counsel on the other side stood up and said: "If the judge will allow me I am going out into the highways and byways to get evidence on that point, which I will produce the week after next." My hon. friend knows that in a case of that kind the judge and jury would have to deal with the matter on the spot, taking the evidence as it stood. In view of the fact that no remarks have been offered by the President of the Council to justify the course that the Government are taking in regard to dismissals, I do not think he was up to his usual form in interrupting me and stating that some day in the dim future the Government are going to do better; are going to adopt some other system that will be more humane in dealing with their servants. For the present, Sir, we have to accept the statement of the member for Ottawa (Mr. Fripp) and believe that this is the unsystematic, unscientific and improper manner in which the Government are dealing with their servants, with men who may be called workmen, because they are workmen in the service of the Government and of the country generally.

No one in this House who has had any experience in public life has any doubt as to why it is so extremely difficult to grade and keep graded the civil servants. When this Government came into office they dismissed 11,000 civil servants—at least, that was the record up to last year—and in their places appointed 24,000. Now, these 24,000 were dumped upon the deputy ministers, and the deputy ministers could not leave them standing on the streets or in the halls of the public offices; they had to put them somewhere—twelve here, ten there, five somewhere else, and absolute confusion was the result. Moreover, when we start to grade them, the men who are in charge cannot do it because there was no system about it; many were dumped into positions that were not required to be filled, simply because places had to be found for men who were chosen by ministers for appointment, possibly in fulfilment of an ill-advised promise made before or during the election. That is why this classification has run beyond the power of the deputy ministers and why these outside men were called in to do the work.

Why, Sir, extraordinary positions have been given to men in the public service. I was told the other day of a young fellow who shortly after this Government took office came to one of the departments seeking a position and bearing a letter from one of the ministers to the deputy minister. Well, there was nothing for him to do; the department was already overcrowded. However, there could be no such thing as the deputy minister turning down the recommendation of the minister, so this fellow was given a position. "What shall I do?" he said. "Oh well, we have nothing for you to do, but you can carry some books from this room to that room and carry them back; keep moving around from day to day and possibly something will turn up." After a few days this young man, who, having come from the country, was more or less conscientious and unused to such trickery, said to the deputy minister: "There must be something wrong; I find a fellow following me around all the time; no matter where I go this fellow dogs me continually; when I go to one place, he is there; when I come back, he is after me. I am not going to stay here." "Oh," said the deputy, "don't be surprised at that; you are all right; that fellow is your helper." When things are carried on in that way is it any wonder that it is difficult to grade the civil servants and to determine what wages such a man as I have spoken about should get, and what his helper should get?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Would my hon. friend give names and dates?

Mr. McKENZIE: It is entirely unnecessary to give names and dates.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If you do not, you spoil the story.

Mr. McKENZIE: This has been going on every day for the last eleven years—at least since this Government came into power—and to give such a string of figures as this would involve would be confusing even to the astute and analytical mind of my right hon. friend (Sir George Foster). I mention only this instance; it will be sufficient to make my right hon. friend see that the difficulty has been that we have too many men and not enough places for all. When you have ten men whom you must dispose of in some way without dismissing them but have only one position to fill, the situation becomes a difficult one.

I can see no reason, unless it be timidity, why the Civil Service Commissioners should not have themselves determined the remuneration and avoided the expenditure of hundreds of thousands of dollars involved in bringing people from a foreign country

to tell them what they should do and what wages the men should get. I think that is a remarkable display of weakness on the part of the Commission. The President of the Privy Council told us—he will correct me if I am wrong—that the gentlemen who compose this Commission came to the Government, said that they were overwhelmed with demands for higher salaries, and asked: "What shall we do? Shall we meet these demands by giving higher salaries than we think is right, or shall we stand by our own judgment?" Surely a Commission whose duty it is to select men for the public service and to designate proper salaries for them should stand their ground, do their work, serve the country, or resign. But evidently the Government consented that the Commission should not discharge their duty and that they should, at the expense of the ratepayers of this country, send to the United States for a most expensive commission and have it sit here for months to tell them what they should do. That is, in effect, the declaration that was made by the President of the Council here to-day; there is no denying it. I cannot find any justification for the Government standing by an institution of that kind. Why, Sir, what can you expect from an institution of that kind? What decision, what judgment, what organization can be expected from this Civil Service Commission, when they had not the sagacity or the backbone to decide how much salary this man, that man, or the other man in the public service should get? It is an evidence of frightful weakness; it is an indication that there should be some improvement along that line or that some other course should be taken by which civil servants may be protected and the treasury of the country looked after better than it is. There should not be more civil servants than are necessary properly to carry on the business of the country. There is plenty of room for men and women in other walks of life throughout Canada; there is sufficient demand for employment outside to let the Civil Service be relieved of the overwhelming burden which it now seems to carry, with unsatisfactory results to the Government and to the country. I again remind the member for Ottawa and the Government that the difficulties which they meet to-day in connection with the Civil Service are due to the wonderful promises that were made before and during the election of 1917. Civil servants were told that wonderful things were to come to them by reason of this re-classification; and as a result, in the city of Ottawa itself there was an overwhelming majority for the Government, a much greater majority than had been the case in previous years. Civil servants were made to believe that the Government was to be returned to power, and that when it came back to power this re-classification measure was to be introduced and wonderful things would come to them. The Government was returned to power, the re-classification took place; but the wonderful things have not come to the civil servants. Consequently, the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Fripp) and the Government find these chickens coming home to roost and these difficulties that now overwhelm them. But let me say that I hope a proper classification will be made and that the classification will be kept in order from year to year, from month to month and from day to day as men are coming into the service. If you go into any first class academy in any of the counties of Ontario or anywhere else, you will find that the principal of that academy has no difficulty in grading his pupils; he puts them into the proper places, because the grading is looked after systematically and properly from time to time, and the authorities have some conception of how that grading should be done. But if you take the whole ten or fifteen departments of any high school of this country and dump them together, the kindergarten with the high school pupil and ask a man to go in amongst them and grade them, you are asking him something that no human being can do. When, however, things are done properly, systematically and from day to day and as they ought to be done, there will be no trouble, and I would bring to the notice of my right hon. friend that if he will get out of this frightful muddle and get those departments into proper shape once for all, henceforth this Government or whatever Government may be in power in this country should see to it that no one is taken into the Civil Service who is not required; that if any one's services are required, he should be properly graded and put into the proper place, and that the country receives proper service for proper salaries paid.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Quebec East): Mr. Speaker, I rise only for the purpose of asking a question. Is it the intention of the Government to see that a classification is made of the employees of the House of Commons? I understand that the Civil Service Commission takes the position that it has no jurisdiction over the employees of either the Senate or the House of Com-

mons, and that the House of Commons should look after the classification of its own employees. If that be so, I would suggest the advisability of having a committee of this House appointed for the purpose of making that classification. It would not be fair to the members of this House and it would not be proper that such classification should be made by any officer or set of officers and then submitted to the House for approval at the end of the session. Such a course would not be treating this House fairly, and I would, therefore, suggest that a committee be appointed for the purpose.

Mr. ROWELL: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is only by the unanimous consent of the House that the hon. minister can answer the question as he has already exercised his right to speak on this motion.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Perhaps the leader of the Government might answer.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I should much prefer that my colleague do so.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I take it for granted that the House gives its unanimous consent that the hon. minister may answer the question.

Mr. ROWELL: My information is not quite that of the hon. member. While I speak subject to correction, because I am not as familiar with this classification as I should like to be, my impression is that, under the Act of last session, the Civil Service Commission classifies the positions of the staffs of the Senate and the House of Commons. Then the classification is submitted to the Speaker for submission to and approval by the House. When that is approved, the classification will be applied to the Senate and House of Commons' staffs. But I shall be glad to look into the matter further and give my hon. friend fuller information, and it may be that it will be desirable, if not necessary, to have a committee appointed to deal with the matter.

Mr. ALFRED ERNEST FRIPP (Ottawa): Mr. Speaker, I just wish to make one or two observations in reply to the President of the Council (Mr. Rowell) who is not as well equipped with the facts pertaining to the matter as he usually is when he addresses the House. If I understood him correctly, he stated that the deputy ministers approved this classification. He must have forgotten that last session a deputation from the deputy ministers appeared before a committee of the Senate and protested vigorously against the classification as rendering the Civil Service inefficient. Amongst them was Mr. Boville, a most efficient servant in the Finance Department, who has since left the service, and one of his reasons for leaving the service—I do not think I am breaking any promise that I made to him when he told me—was that he found that under the classification of these so-called experts he had not the control over his department that he ought to have and, therefore, he could not remain in the public service. Another deputy minister is Mr. Newcombe, also a very efficient servant, and I think another is Dr. Coulter of the Post Office Department, and all these gentlemen protested vigorously against this classification as rendering the Civil Service absolutely inefficient instead of efficient as we all desire it to be.

Mr. ROWELL: The hon. member evidently did not hear me——

Mr. FRIPP: Very likely I did not.

Mr. ROWELL: What I said was that the deputy ministers were consulted with reference to the classification and so on. I did not say that they had approved it, because I do not know whether they did or not.

Mr. FRIPP: The deputy ministers were consulted as to the form of the index cards. They approved the information which each clerk gave; they simply gave their approval as to his correctly stating his name, age, work and salary; but they have never approved, and I do not think they approve the classification as prepared for their staffs. If I understood the President of the Privy Council correctly, he said there was promotion provided for. I should like to inform him that if this classification goes into effect, there will be practically no promotion for civil servants. You might as well write above the doors of our departmental buildings "Abandon hope all ye who enter here," because these classifications are absolutely fixed. A man is put into a certain grade and his duties are defined, and the deputy finds that when he says to a clerk: "I have work for you to do in another room," the clerk replies: "Oh, I do not work there; my duties are so and so and my salary is so and so." You have absolutely lost control of your staff.

Mr. STEELE: When a vacancy occurs, is there any opportunity for promotion?

Mr. FRIPP: I was going to give an example of what happens when a vacancy occurs. A deputy minister informed me that he had a messenger in his department

and in another branch of the department, the Weights and Measures Branch, he desired a man to clean scales. He wrote to the Civil Service Commission recommending that the messenger be promoted to that position which meant a promotion of $50 a year in his salary. What do you suppose was the reply he got from the Civil Service Commission? They replied that there could be no promotion; that the job of cleaning scales was a new one, and that they would have to advertise for a new man. Thus under the system prepared by these experts, a new man has to be appointed whereas under the old system the services of a man already in the employ of the department could have been utilized.

With regard to the point mentioned by the hon. member for Cape Breton North (Mr. McKenzie) and the reference I made to the Printing Bureau, I have it from the head of the Bureau, and from the Assistant King's Printer that as to the men who were laid off by this so-called expert, their approval was not given, and that they did not give their opinion that the men who were dismissed from that service were efficient or inefficient. Surely that is a state of affairs that ought not to be allowed to prevail in the Civil Service of Canada. If there is to be a lay-off the deputy minister, or in the case of the Printing Bureau, the King's Printer, is surely the best man to decide who should go and who should remain. That is the point I endeavoured to make. Action was taken in this very high-handed way by this servant of Arthur Young and Company and approved of by the Civil Service Commission.

In conclusion, my desire in bringing this matter to the attention of the House was simply to promote efficiency in the Civil Service of Canada. I know, as I said at the outset of my remarks, that ninety per cent of the civil servants are dissatisfied, and there is unrest manifested in each department by reason of the re-classification. I therefore beg the Government to dispense with the services of these gentlemen from the United States, and ask the deputy ministers to make a report and clean up the re-classification in order that we may have an efficient Civil Service not only in Ottawa but throughout the whole Dominion.

Motion of Mr. Fripp agreed to.

WATER SUPPLY TO GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS IN OTTAWA.

AGREEMENT WITH OTTAWA CITY.

On the motion of Hon. N. W. ROWELL (President of the Privy Council) for the Minister of Public Works, it was ordered that the House do to-morrow go into Committee of the Whole to consider a proposed resolution respecting an agreement between the Government and the city of Ottawa concerning the water supply to Government buildings in Ottawa.

Hon. MACKENZIE KING: Who is the Minister of Public Works?

Hon. N. W. ROWELL: Hon. J. D. Reid.

THE OPIUM AND DRUG ACT AMENDMENT.

On the motion of Hon. N. W. Rowell (Minister of Health), the House went into Committee on the following proposed resolution, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

1. That the Minister presiding over the Department of Health shall have power to issue licenses for the import, export, sale, manufacture and distribution of any drug; to name the ports or places in Canada where any drug may be exported or imported; to prescribe the manner in which any raw opium, prepared opium or any drug is packed and marked for export; to prescribe the record that shall be kept by any licensee in connection with the export, import, receipt, sale, disposal and distribution of the drug or drugs mentioned in such license, and to make all convenient and necessary regulations with respect to the issue, duration, terms and forms of the several licenses that may be issued and the payment of fees for such licenses, not exceeding the sum of twenty-five dollars for any license, and no such license shall continue in force for a longer period than one year.

2. That penalties may be imposed for the violation of the provisions of the proposed legislation.

3. That a duly authorized and practising physician, veterinary surgeon or dentist, or a druggist carrying on a bona fide business in a shop or store may be excepted from penalties imposed for manufacturing, selling or distributing drugs without license, but every druggist shall keep such records of the amount of any drug received or sold by him as the Minister may by regulation prescribe.

4. That the penalties imposed for manufacturing, selling or distributing drugs without license, and for not keeping records, shall not apply to any liniments, ointments or other preparations which are prepared for external skin use only, which do not contain cocaine, or any of its salts or preparations; provided, however, that the Governor in Council may by regulation apply the proposed provisions to any preparation named and prescribed in such regulation.

Mr. BELAND: Will the minister explain the resolution.

Mr. ROWELL: The object of the proposed resolution is to put into legislative form the conclusions embodied in the International Opium Convention signed at The Hague on the 23rd of January, 1912. The

members of the House will recall that by Article 295 of the Treaty of Peace between the Allied and Associated Powers and Germany, provision was made that this International Opium Convention should be brought into force.

5 p.m.

A similar provision was inserted in the Treaty of Peace with Austria and in the Treaty of Peace with Bulgaria. In order that the Committee may have the matter before them I shall read the provision in the Treaty of Peace which relates to this matter. It is Article 295 in the Treaty of Peace with Germany, and Article 174 in the Treaty of Peace with Bulgaria, and reads as follows:

> Those of the High Contracting Parties who have not yet signed, or who have signed but not yet ratified, the Opium Convention signed at The Hague on January 23, 1912, agree to bring the said Convention into force, and for this purpose to enact the necessary legislation without delay and in any case within a period of twelve months from the coming into force of the present Treaty.
>
> Furthermore, they agree that ratification of the present Treaty should in the case of Powers which have not yet ratified the Opium Convention be deemed in all respects equivalent to the ratification of that convention and to the signature of the Special Protocol which was opened at The Hague in accordance with the resolutions adopted by the Third Opium Conference in 1914 for bringing the said Convention into force.
>
> For this purpose the Government of the French Republic will communicate to the Government of the Netherlands a certified copy of the protocol of the deposit of ratifications of the present Treaty, and will invite the Government of the Netherlands to accept and deposit the said certified copy as if it were a deposit of ratifications of the Opium Convention and a signature of the Additional Protocol of 1914.

The inclusion in the Treaties of Peace with enemy countries of this provision has made possible the bringing into operation of the International Opium Convention which was formulated and signed by some of the Powers at the Hague in December 1911 and January 1912.

While the Convention had been signed by a majority of the Powers who took part in the Conference at the Hague, there were still certain important Powers which, up to the meeting of the Peace Conference, had either declined to sign, failed to ratify, or been unwilling to agree that the Treaty should be brought into force. Therefore in view of the great international importance of this Convention which embodied the conclusions of the great Powers of the world as to the measures which were essential to not only restrict but to as far as practicable put an end to the trade in opium, morphia and cocaine, it was desirable that it should be brought into force. And the Peace Conference had made enforcement possible.

Perhaps it will be interesting to recall the fact that this Convention really had its inspiration at the International Conference held in Shanghai in the year 1908 and the early part of 1909. At this Conference some twelve nations were represented, and it is an interesting coincidence that my hon. friend the present leader of the Opposition (Mr. King) was the Canadian representative at that Conference which initiated the movement that culminated in the preparation of this Convention and in the agreement at Paris that it should be put into operation.

The Conference at Shanghai agreed to four resolutions; I do not wish to trouble the House with them but I shall give their effect as indicating the basis of this Convention. The first was a recognition of the sincerity of China in its desire to eradicate the production and consumption of opium. Members of the House will realize what the opium trade and traffic has meant to China. Information was given at this Conference at Shanghai that there were more than twenty million addicts to the opium habit in China, and every one knows how serious a menace to the moral, economic and physical welfare of the people of China the opium traffic has been. The second resolution was to the effect that each delegate would request his own Government to formulate laws for the gradual suppression of the opium traffic. By the third it was declared that the trade in opium, other than in legitimate ways, was held by nearly all the participants in the Conference to be a matter for prohibition or careful regulation. The fourth declares that as each country finds it feasible to restrict the importation of opium the Conference is of opinion that the export also should be prevented to any country which prohibits its entry. The fifth resolution declares that the manufacture, distribution and sale in each country, except for legitimate purposes, should be drastically dealt with.

As far as Canada is concerned, I think that within a year—or perhaps a little more than a year—after the Conference was held, the existence of the tariff was brought forcibly to the attention of the people by certain riots that occurred on the Pacific coast. In connection with these riots damage was done to the property of Chinese residents in coast cities and the claims they presented to the Government for compensation included

claims for the destruction of important quantities of opium indicating the extent of the trade on the Pacific coast in that deleterious article. The result of the Conference at Shanghai plus the discovery of the conditions existing in Canada, led to the passing of the Act of 1911.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: For the sake of recording the order of events accurately, I might say that the situation on the Pacific coast had arisen before the Conference was held. The Canadian Government had the situation on the Pacific coast investigated, a report was made, and an Act was passed by this Parliament prior to the time at which the Shanghai Conference was held. In consequence of this country having taken action in the matter of the opium traffic, Canada was asked to be represented at the Shanghai Conference.

Mr. ROWELL: I thank my hon. friend for the correction as to the dates. My hon. friend recalls the facts to my mind. It was the Act of 1908 to which I referred.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is further interesting in this connection to state that the United States' government took cognizance of the Act which this Parliament passed, and at the Shanghai Conference admitted that Canada had really led the way in helping to control the opium traffic in so far as this continent was concerned.

Mr. ROWELL: I was in error. The riots preceded the Act of 1908 not the Act of 1911. The riots first, then the Act of 1908, the International Conference at Shanghai in 1909 and the legislation following that Conference by this House in 1911—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The further legislation.

Mr. ROWELL: The further legislation of 1911—that is the chronological order. The Conference at Shanghai recommended the calling of an international conference to consider the framing of an international convention which might result in the suppression, in very large measure, of improper use of opium, morphia and cocaine. That Conference met at The Hague in December, 1911 and January, 1912 and agreed upon the Convention which is now to be put into force. This legislation is to enable Canada to carry out fully the provisions of the Convention.. It is not as necessary for Canada to enact legislation as it is for some other countries because the Acts of 1908, of 1911 and of last session went a long way towards complying with the provisions of the Convention, but they did not fully carry out the Convention. As we are obligated to pass the necessary legislation within a year after the Convention goes into force, this resolution is introduced upon which will be founded a Bill to carry out the Convention.

So that the members of the House may appreciate just the reasons for the proposed legislation, may I draw attention to the terms of this Convention. By the way, it is of passing interest to note that the Convention to which we are now to give effect by legislation contains among the names of the parties to it those of several who have passed from the scene as rulers among the nations of the world. It indicates the remarkable changes politically which have taken place since this Convention was signed. Among the parties either to the Convention or who signed it are the Emperor of Germany, the Czar of all the Russias, and the Emperor of China, while one of the parties who proposed to adhere to it but did not sign it was the Emperor of Austria. All these four emperors have gone. The Hohenzollern, Romanoff, Hapsburg and Manchu dynasties have all passed away and republics have taken the places of their empires between the dates when this Convention was prepared and signed by some of the parties and the date when it actually comes into operation. The Treaty deals with raw opium, prepared opium, medicinal opium, morphine and cocaine, and special provisions are made with reference to each one. With reference to raw opium, the contracting parties agree to enact effective laws or regulations for the control of the production and distribution of raw opium unless laws or regulations on the subject are already in existance.

In article 2 they provide:

> Due regard being had to the differences in their commercial conditions, the contracting Powers shall limit the number of towns, ports or other localities through which the export or import of raw opium shall be permitted.

That is the reason of the provision in the resolution authorizing regulations to be made covering this point. Then by article 3 it is provided:

> The contracting Powers shall take measures— (a) To prevent the export of raw opium to countries which shall have prohibited its entry, and (b) To control the export of raw opium to countries which restrict its import.

Therefore the provision in the resolution, and in our Bill, controlling export. Article 4 declares:

> The contracting Powers shall make regulations requiring that every package containing raw opium intended for export shall be marked

in such a way as to indicate its contents, provided that the consignment exceeds 5 kilo.

That explains the provision in the resolution and in the Bill to be founded upon it, which requires the marking of these packages.

Now, article 5:

The contracting Powers shall not allow the import and export of raw opium except by duly authorized persons.

That explains the reason for the provision that licenses shall be taken out by those who are to import or to export. Then we come to the prepared opium.

Mr. McKENZIE: Before the minister leaves that point, might I ask whether there is anything on our statute books to prevent the shipment into this country, or through this country, of raw or prepared opium?

Mr. ROWELL: Yes, there is at the present time. In addition to the legislation of 1911 we passed in the early part of 1919 two Orders in Council requiring that licenses should be taken out for the import or export of opium into or from Canada. We did that as a result of certain communications received from other countries which indicated that an illicit trade in these articles was developing and the available supplies were needed for medicinal and army purposes, and it was necessary to control the handling of it. Last session we put those Orders in Council into legislative form and under that statute we have been regulating the import and export of opium. Perhaps it will be of interest to the House to learn the result of that legislation. I am glad to say one result has been a very important diminution in the amount of opium imported into Canada. I cannot at the moment lay my hand upon the figures, but it indicates a great reduction in the amount. However, I will give the House the figures a little later.

Then, dealing with prepared opium, almost identical provisions are made for controlling its import, export or manufacture, as follows:

Article 6. The contracting Powers shall take measures for the gradual and effective suppression of the manufacture of, internal trade in, and use of prepared opium, with due regard to the varying circumstances of each country concerned, unless regulations on the subject are already in existence.

Article 7. The contracting Powers shall prohibit the import and export of prepared opium; those Powers, however, which are not yet ready to prohibit immediately the export of prepared opium shall prohibit it as soon as possible.

[Mr. Rowell.]

Article 8. The contracting Powers which are not yet ready to prohibit immediately the export of prepared opium—(a) shall restrict the number of towns, ports, or other localities through which prepared opium may be exported;

(b) Shall prohibit the export of prepared opium to countries which now forbid, or which may hereafter forbid the import thereof;

(c) Shall, in the meanwhile, prohibit the consignment of prepared opium to a country which desires to restrict its entry, unless the exporter complies with the regulations of the importing country.

The result will be that when concurrent legislation has been passed by the different countries which are parties to this Convention, no opium can be exported, say, from England or the United States to Canada, except in conformity with the regulations passed pursuant to our legislation which permits the importation into Canada by certain permitted persons for certain specific purposes.

Mr. BELAND: When was the first Opium and Drug Act passed by this Parliament?

Mr. ROWELL: The Act of 1908 was the first one we had; the next was the Act of 1911; and the third, the Act of 1919. (Reading):

(d) Shall take measures to ensure that every package exported, containing prepared opium, bears a special mark indicating the nature of its contents;

(e) Shall not permit the export of prepared opium except by specially authorized persons.

Chapter 3 of the Treaty deals with what is described as medicinal opium, morphine and cocaine. I shall not take up the time of the House by reading those provisions. I shall only point out that in principle they are similar to the provisions I have already read with reference to raw opium and manufactured opium. Then Article 15 provides:

The contracting Powers having treaties with China (Treaty Powers), shall, in conjunction with the Chinese Government, take the necessary measures to prevent the smuggling into Chinese territory, as well as into their Far-Eastern colonies and into the leased territories which they occupy in China, of raw and prepared opium, morphine, cocaine, and their respective salts, as also of the substances referred to in Article 14 of the present convention. The Chinese Government shall, on their part, take similar measures for the suppression of the smuggling of opium and of the other substances above referred to from China to the foreign colonies and leased territories.

In other words, as hon. members will see, the object of this article was on the one hand to protect China, if she honestly undertook to suppress the trade in opium, from having other countries profit by her suppression and smuggle opium into China.

On the other hand, the provisions inserted require China to act in a bona fide manner and suppress the opium traffic in her own country if the countries manufacturing or producing opium and exporting it to China curtailed it in their own country. The basis of it is a reciprocal arrangement governing China and the other countries as well. This is dealt with in three articles that follow:

Article 16: The Chinese Government shall promulgate pharmacy laws for their subjects, regulating the sale and distribution of morphine, cocaine, and their respective salts, and of the substances referred to in Article 14 of the present Convention, and shall communicate these laws to the Government having treaties with China, through their diplomatic representatives at Peking. The contracting Powers having treaties with China shall examine these laws and, if they find them acceptable, shall take the necessary measures to apply them to their nationals residing in China.

I do not think it necessary, Mr. Chairman, to go further into the terms of this Convention. I have given a general outline of these provisions so far as they have a bearing upon the resolution now before the House.

The Convention was agreed to by the twelve Powers represented at the Hague in January, 1912, and an effort was made to secure the adhesion of the other Powers who might be interested either in permitting or suppressing this traffic. There were thirty-six other Powers named in the schedule to the Convention who were to be asked to adhere to its terms, and the Government of the Netherlands was commissioned to communicate with those Powers with a view to securing their adhesion.

Let me say in passing that it was agreed that the Convention should come into force only in case all those Powers adhered to it. The object was absolutely to regulate, in so far as they did not completely suppress, the trade in these habit-forming drugs. Therefore the dissent of countries that either produced opium or might be responsible for dealing with it would interfere with the whole arrangement, and originally the operation of the Convention was predicated upon all the Powers named in the schedule adhering to it, it being provided that in case they did not adhere before a time specified, a new conference should be called at the Hague with a view to dealing further with the matter.

While a very large number of the Powers did adhere, the terms of the Convention were not complied with, and a new Conference was called at the Hague in July, 1913. At that Conference it was decided that the objects which the Convention sought to obtain were so important in the interests of humanity as a whole that the operation of the Convention should not be nullified by reason of some few Powers having failed to sign it, and that therefore the Conference should proceed and endeavour to secure the signature as well as the ratification of the other Powers; it being understood that the Treaty might go into effect even though it was not signed or ratified by all the Powers named in the schedule. An effort was made to carry out this resolution, and it was provided that in case of failure, a further conference might be held to decide whether the Powers that had ratified the Convention should be called upon to put it into legislative effect before all the Powers had signed it.

At the Conference of 1913 it was agreed that the Convention should be signed and ratified by the Powers who were willing to do so, but the action then taken at that Conference did not go to the extent of agreeing that it should be put into legislative operation, and another effort was made to get all the Powers in. That effort failed and a third conference was called in June, 1914.

Up to the time of this conference the consent of all the Powers had been secured in one form or another, except that of Turkey and Serbia, a qualified consent from Greece, a promise of consent from Austria-Hungary, and a qualified promise from Germany. With the information before the Conference, however, it was decided to proceed and a resolution was passed that the Convention should be put ito effect, and that the Powers prepared to sign and ratify should be asked to adopt the necessary legislation.

The war intervened and it was not posible to make further progress. The United States and Great Britain took the initiative at the Peace Conference and by inserting the provision I have mentioned in the Peace Treaties with Germany, with Austria and with Bulgaria,—and undoubtedly it will be inserted in the Treaty of Peace with Turkey, —they secured the assent of all the Powers which up to that time had refused and were thereby blicking the carrying out of this very important international undertaking. So that the combined action of the Shanghai Conference and the three conferences at The Hague, plus the Treaty of Peace, should be to bring into effect this international agreement for the suppression of the opium traffic in all the countries vitally concerned in it.

I am sure the House will agree that that consummation marks a most important ad-

vance in international co-operation for human welfare the world over. This resolution now submitted to the House is to put the Government in a position to carry out fully its obligations under the terms of the Convention. I do not know that there is anything more I can add by way of explanation, but if any further information is desired by hon. members I shall be glad to give it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Might I ask my hon. friend if he has any information as to whether there has been any increase of the habit-forming drugs in consequence of the prohibitive enactments of recent years?

Mr. ROWELL: That question came up when we had the Bill before the House last session and I inquired of the officers of the department in reference to it. Their reply was that from the best information they could gather there was no evidence to justify the conclusion that prohibition had produced that result.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I should like to say that I think the House is indebted to the Miniser of Health (Mr. Rowell) for having gone so exhaustively into the historical and international significance of this important legislation. He has given reasons which, I am sure, will appeal to all of us, and I think there is no good ground for delaying the passing of this resolution.

Resolution reported.

Mr. Rowell moved for leave to introduce a Bill founded on the resolution.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Ballantyne (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) that the House do go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to repeal sections eighty-five to eighty-nine, both inclusive, and section ninety-one of the Canada Shipping Act, chapter one hundred and thirteen of the Revised Statues of Canada, 1906, and to re-enact in lieu thereof:—

(1) That every British subject who,—

(a) served as a master or mate of a sea-going or coasting vessel of over seventy-five tons, gross tonnage, before the first day of January, one thousand nine hundred and twenty, for a full period of twelve months within ten years immediately next preceding the date of his application for a certificate of service,

(b) produces satisfactory evidence of his sobriety, experience, ability and general good conduct on board ship, and

(c) passes the sight test and the prescribed examination in signalling, shall be entitled, on payment of the prescribed fee, to a certificate of service as a master or mate of a square rigged or fore-and-aft rigged sea-going or coasting sailing vessel not exceeding seven hundred and fifty tons, registered tonnage, according as his service has been (a) as master or as mate, (b) on a sea-going or on a coasting sailing vessel, (c) on a square rigged sailing ship or on a fore-and-aft rigged sailing vessel.

(2) That in every such certificate of service the name, place and date of birth of the person to whom the same is issued shall be stated, and each certificate shall specify whether the holder is entitled to act as master or mate, whether the certificate is for sea-going vessels or for vessels in the coasting trade, and whether for square-rigged sailing vessels or for fore-and-aft sailin vessels, and that it is not for any vessel exceeding seven hundred and fifty tons, registered tonnage.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North and Victoria): When this resolution was before the House last week I tried to get some information from the minister as to why we are departing from the old law pertaining to the handling and sending to sea of our ships. It is an offence against the Criminal Code to send an unseaworthy ship to sea; one who is convicted of that offence may be sent to penitentiary. What is the difference between sending an unseaworthy ship to sea and sending an unqualified master to sea in charge of a ship? The proposal now before us is to carry forward the old idea that prevailed at the time of the first introduction into this country of a Shipping Act. The doctrine that was held to on that occasion has been asserted also in connection with mining laws. There was a time when it was not necessary for a man to have a certificate to take charge of a coal mine; if he had had the experience and was capable of doing the work, no law required that he should have a certificate. All at once a law was enacted that a mining manager should have a certificate, and that was regarded as a very great hardship to a man who was competent to do the work and who had had the experience but who had not the technical education to enable him to write a proper examination or to answer satisfactorily the questions put as the basis for the granting of a certificate. It was provided in that Act, therefore—and there was a similar provision in the old Shipping Act—that a man who had had the experience and who was qualified to do the work should be permitted to carry on as he had done before and should be given a certificate of service. But everybody knows what the present provisions of

our Shipping Act are, and a law should not now be enacted giving to any one who has not obtained a proper certificate the right to handle ships. Such legislation as is here proposed would have a tendency to put us away behind other countries in respect to ships, masters, and mates. We have been going into shipbuilding to the extent of millions of dollars; and so long as the minister keeps within proper bounds and gets full value for the money that he expends on this account, I fully approve of the action taken in that regard. But while we are going ahead in the matter of shipbuilding, we are going behind in proposing to give a license as master or mate to any person who may choose to serve a year on some schooner. If this proposal is adopted the tendency will be to discourage our young men from going into this profession, and the ships that we are building will have to be put in charge of men from other countries. The schools for the education of seamen and for the granting to certificates to captains should be encouraged; higher qualifications should be required of masters and mates. In practically every other profession the tendency is to go forward, to be more scientific, to be more progressive, to know more about the subject in hand than ever before, and to keep pace with the world. But the minister asks us to turn back the hands of the clock, to go back sixty years so far as the education of master mariners and mates is concerned. I live in a seaport at which thousands of vessels call every summer, and I have some conception of the importance of sending men out to sea in charge of crews of twenty or thirty and thousands of dollars' worth of property. Those men should be properly qualified. I would have as much right to pass a law permitting a man who is not a doctor, who is not a surgeon, to go into a hospital and operate on patients as I would to pass a law cutting down the safeguards and qualifications which have been found to be necessary in connection with the operation of ships. As I said the other day, I have not any personal interest in this matter, not even to the extent of one-half cent's worth. But I fought the legislation when it was proposed last fall; I regarded it as a danger to the community, and the then Acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. A. K. Maclean), who had the matter in charge, withdrew the proposals as a result of my protest. I suppose those who are behind this proposal think that where the then acting minister failed, a bigger and stronger man, and the head of the department, will succeed. If the minister wishes to display his prowess to those who are in favour of this retrograde movement, he is entitled to all the glory that attaches to it, but he shall not have that glory without my making the most vigorous protest against the proposed legislation.

Hon. C. C. BALLANTYNE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): It is the hon. member himself (Mr. McKenzie), not the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who wishes to go back fifty years. As a rule, the hon. member is a very progressive gentleman; he is usually ready to be abreast of the times or even ahead of them. In this particular instance, however, he has an unusually strong desire to remain fifty years behind. I pointed out to the hon. member the other day that the Shipping Act now enables a man who wishes to qualify as master or as mate of a sailing vessel of one hundred or one hundred and fifty tons to get a service certificate. But that man's age would have to be 70 or 75, because no master or mate can obtain a service certificate under the present Shipping Act unless he served on a sailing vessel prior to the year 1870; nor can a mate get a service certificate unless he served on a sailing vessel prior to 1883.

I refer now to sea-going craft. This resolution also asks that section 86 be repealed in order that men, if they so desire, may obtain certificates of service as mates. But there again, they would have to have served on a sailing vessel prior to 1883 for inland waters, and that year applies to both masters and mates. The object of this resolution and the Bill that is to be based on it is merely to move the hands of time, as the hon. member has stated, from 1870 and 1883 up to ten years prior to 1920. Surely hon. members will have no objection to the Government bringing the Shipping Act up to date. We are not changing the statute so far as the law is concerned, as the hon. member has, I think, incorrectly stated; we are merely bringing the Shipping Act up to date.

We are also changing the tonnage of the vessel so that it shall not exceed 750 tons. I should like to point out to hon. members that our great neighbour to the south allows masters and mates to navigate sailing vessels up to 750 tons without any certificate at all. But before any one can get a service certificate as this resolution, and the Bill that will be based on it, set forth, he will have to have served on a sailing vessel

twelve months any time within ten years prior to 1920; and in addition to that he must produce satisfactory evidence of his sobriety, experience, ability and general good conduct on board ship and must pass the sight test and the prescribed examination in signalling. I do not think that in the passing of this resolution and of the Bill later on we are jeopardizing the shipping industry. I pointed out the other day—there may be present some hon. members who were not in the House when this matter was under discussion before—that this country is so much in need of masters and mates for small sailing vessels that I had to take the necessary authority under the War Measures Act, and now that the War Measures Act no longer holds good, it is necessary for me to bring forward this resolution.

The hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) states again that a similar Bill was introduced by the acting minister at the last session of Parliament. May I be permitted to correct the hon. member and to say that if he will be good enough to compare the Bill that the acting minister introduced last session, with the resolution that is now before the House, he will find that they are entirely different. I will not take up the time of the committee by reading the Bill that the acting minister introduced last session.

Mr. McKENZIE: It was along the same pernicious lines.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The Bill that the acting minister desired to have passed at the last session of Parliament was for sailing vessels propelled by steam as an auxiliary power. The present resolution—

Mr. McKENZIE: That is a much safer method.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: There again I am sorry that I cannot agree with my hon. friend. But to sum up in a few words: The authority is in the Shipping Act today whereby any man can get a service certificate if he is seventy or seventy-five years of age and served on a sailing vessel prior to 1870. A man can also get a service certificate provided he is seventy or seventy-five years of age and has served on a sailing vessel prior to 1883. Surely, the hon. member is not going to find any fault with me or this Government for being progressive enough to bring the Shipping Act up to date in order that these men when they are in the full vigour of their youth may get the necessary service certificates as captains or mates.

Mr. McKENZIE: The minister could not have followed me or he would not say that I am refusing to bring this Act up to date. When the English law was brought into force in this country, it was found that there were numbers of men who were navigating sailing vessels and doing it very well, who had no certificates, because the law did not demand them. It was found that to compel those men to get certificates would be a great hardship upon them and they were given service certificates because they could do the work at that time, a provision being put into the law that on account of their services they could get certificates. But that does not apply since the law came into force, because every man who puts his foot on board a ship with the hope of promotion knows that he must comply with the law, and he cannot come here and say: I have served so and so and because of my service I must get a certificate. Because when he started his seamanship and his services the law was on the statute book and he must be understood to know it and to expect to comply with it if he looks for any promotion. That is my position; that is the law; that is what the intention was; and there must be no misunderstanding as to my position.

Mr. DUFF: As my remarks will be rather lengthy, I should be glad, Mr. Chairman, if you would call it six o'clock.

Progress reported.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We have gone through the whole of the list of private member's resolutions and exhausted them. There is, therefore, no private members' business to come on if we return to-night. There is this resolution and that finishes the Government business which is ready, and under those circumstances, I think it is scarcely worth while for us to come back to-night. I, therefore, move that the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 5.55 p.m.

Friday, March 19, 1920.

The House met at Three o'clock.

REPORTS TABLED.

Annual Report of the Board of Railway Commissioners.—Hon. J. D. Reid.

Auditor General's Report, Vol. 1.—Sir Henry Drayton.

BANKING AND COMMERCE COMMITTEE.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford) presented the first report of the Select Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce.

OTTAWA BRANCH OF ROYAL MINT—INCREASE IN COST OF MAINTENANCE.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (Minister of Finance) gave notice that on Monday next he would move the House into Committee of the Whole to consider a resolution standing on the Order Paper to amend the Ottawa Mint Act by providing that the yearly payment for defraying the salaries, contingencies, retiring and other allowances and expenses connected with the maintenance of the Ottawa Branch of the Royal Mint and the refinery forming part thereof, be increased from one hundred and ten thousand dollars to two hundred thousand dollars.

LOADINGS OUT OF ELEVATORS AT FORT WILLIAM.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. A. ROBB (Chateauguay-Huntingdon): I desire to draw the attention of the Minister of Railways to a matter of urgent public importance. I hold in my hand a letter from a grain shipping firm in Winnipeg dated March 13, wherein there is a statement made to which I would like to know if it is a fact that there has been no coarse grain shipped out of Fort William for domestic purposes since January 5.

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways): The hon. gentleman very kindly advised me that he intended to bring this matter before the House to-day and thus gave me the opportunity of getting information with respect to it. As I was coming into the House I received a letter addressed to Major Bell, deputy minister, and having instructed him to get information on this subject, I take it for granted that it contains that information. I shall be glad to read the letter in order that it may go on Hansard. It is from the Chief Commissioner of the Board of Railway Commissioners, and reads as follows:

OTTAWA March 19, 1920.

Dear Major BELL,—In reply to yours of yesterday re the shipment of oats from the head of the lakes, I beg to state that the whole story of what the board has done since the close of navigation would be a rather lengthy one.

Early in the season we attempted to regulate loadings out of elevators in an equitable manner to all parties concerned, and, on the 26th of December, we received a telegram from Mr. Stewart, Chairman of the Wheat Board, copy of which is as follows:—

"The Canadian Pacific Railway Company through Mr. Grant Hall have assured us an all rail movement of grain from Fort William east of a minimum of one hundred and twenty-five cars per day. We would like this apportioned as follows, twenty cars for coarse grains domestic and export, forty cars for domestic wheat, sixty-five cars for export wheat to Atlantic seaboard ports including Portland and St. John. Canadian National road through Mr. Hays have assured us of minimum movement of fifty cars per day which we would like apportioned as follows, fifteen cars for coarse grains domestic and export, ten cars for domestic wheat, twenty-five cars for export wheat to Atlantic seaboard ports including Portland and Halifax. Undoubtedly roads can improve this movement and haul more domestic wheat and export and domestic coarse grains than the total of eighty-five cars per day and until further advised we would like these interests benefit to the full extent of the increased movement but the sixty-five cars on Canadian Pacific and twenty-five cars on Canadian National for export wheat are irreducible daily average minimums and should take precedence over other grains. Will you be kind enough to confirm this to the railway companies accordingly."

Some discussion took place with the railways and with Mr. Stewart about issuing an order, but all parties agreed that, in so far as it was possible, 175 cars per day would be shipped out. The Wheat Board asked for a priority order for the 85 cars per day for export wheat. This we declined to grant until satisfactory evidence was furnished as to dates of sailings, tonnage, etc., and, as this data has never been furnished the board, we have, therefore, refused to give a priority order; but there was a general understanding, as we understood it, between the railways, the Wheat Board, the Lake Shippers' Association, and ourselves that the percentage of different grains, both export and domestic, as set forth in Mr. Stewart's telegram would be adhered to as closely as possible. Unfortunately, the weather conditions during January and February made it impossible for the railways to furnish 175 cars per day for this particular movement, and it very soon became apparent that some interests would not be able to receive the amount of grain required.

In the course of a few weeks, this board became convinced that course grains were not receiving their due percentage of shipments, and, therefore, in order to see that our intentions were carried into effect, on the 30th day of January last, this board issued an order the operating portion of which is as follows:—

"That on Monday, the 2nd day of February, 1920, and on each succeeding Monday until otherwise ordered by the board, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company provide at least one hundred and twenty-five (125) cars and the Canadian National railways at least fifty (50) cars at the elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur, in the Province of Ontario, for the receipt, handling, and carriage of grain, other than wheat, also flaxseed, for domestic use in Canada; the said cars to be allocated in proportion to the cars ordered for which the necessary documents have been surrendered."

During the next three Mondays, including February the 16th, 545 cars of domestic coarse grains, mostly oats, were shipped out, and, on

account of severe weather conditions, we then concluded that coarse grains were receiving more than their fair percentage, the result being that, on the 19th of February, this order was suspended. Since that date up to the 13th instant, 211 cars of domestic coarse grains have been shipped, more than 90% of which would be oats. In addition to the above statement, according to information furnished us by the Lake Shippers' Association on the 16th instant, for the fortnight ending March 13, 420 cars of coarse grain have been shipped from western points direct to the east. During the same period, the Lake Shippers' Association inform us that a total of 153 cars of domestic grains of all kinds have been furnished the local mills, and 819 cars of export wheat.

This board receives daily from the Lake Shippers' Association, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and the Canadian National Railway Company statements of the number of cars loaded and handled, and at the present time we are subdividing the coarse grains under different headings, so that we are in a position to know exactly how much of each kind of grain is moving out daily, and, early in this present week, we came to the conclusion that coarse grains were not receiving their fair proportion. Telegraphic correspondence was entered into with the Lake Shippers' Association on Monday, and, after the exchange of a number of telegrams, yesterday morning the following order was issued by wire:—

"Your telegram yesterday received re coarse grain movement from head of lakes. This board requires that beginning to-morrow and until further orders twenty per cent of all cars loaded from all elevators at head of lakes be assigned to coarse grains for domestic consumption which is practically the percentage set forth in Mr. Stewart's telegram to me of December twenty-sixth last. Please confirm."

Yesterday afternoon confirmation was received as follows:—

"Your wire that twenty per cent on all cars from all elevators at head of lakes be assigned to coarse grains for domestic consumption until further orders is received and instructions have been given accordingly to our Fort William office."

If the daily returns require a change in these directions, the board will not hesitate to take whatever action may be necessary.

I think, however, I should point out to you the very serious conditions under which grain has been handled during the past two months, and I am satisfied that the railway companies have handled every car which it was humanly possible to get over their roads. Their first great difficulty has been weather conditions, not only around the head of the lakes but at the terminals, where hundreds of cars have been frozen in from Halifax to Portland, Me., and probably never in the history of railroading in this country have as many cars been held up at ocean terminals owing to weather conditions as have been in that condition since the first day of February. Added to this have been the most abnormal weather conditions from the operating standpoint, but probably even beyond both these difficulties has been the shortage of cars, due very largely to the fact that there are about 20,000 more Canadian cars on American lines than there are American cars on Canadian lines, and without cars it is impossible to handle freight.

I again wish to emphasize the splendid manner in which the railway companies have worked with this board in order to produce the maximum of result and have ever been ready to carry out any wish which we have expressed.

Sincerely yours,

F. B. CARVELL
Chief Commissioner.

Major G. A. BELL, C.M.G.,
Deputy Minister,
Dept. of Railways and Canals,
Ottawa.

I hope this answer covers what the hon. gentleman asked me.

SPIRIT RIVER WHEAT SHIPMENTS.

On the Orders of the Day.

Mr. WILLIAM H. WHITE (Victoria, Alta.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Reid) a somewhat similar matter to that brought up by the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Robb). I am sorry that I have not been able to give the Minister notice of this matter, but, as a matter of fact, I only got the information a few minutes ago. The subject is referred to in a local paper under the heading, "Wheat rotting at Spirit River for lack of transportation," and it is also dealt with in a letter addressed home by the Board of Trade at that point, stating that since the beginning of the year they had made appeals to the Department of Railways as well as to the Board of Railway Commissioners for assistance in getting out the grain—

Hon. Mr. REID: On what railway is Spirit River might I ask?

Mr. W. H. WHITE: It is on the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway. I might point out further that it is very necessary that this grain should be moved before the frost gets out of the ground in the spring, as there is only one line of railway running through the district and the settlers have to haul their grain in many cases fifty or sixty miles, and if they do not get it out this spring they will have to hold it over for another year. Many of the settlers have no storage facilities, and the chances are that they will lose their grain unless they get immediate help in the way of railway facilities. I might also point out that a great many soldiers have recently settled in the district, and, naturally they are depending on the returns from their first crop. Any assistance should be given at once or it will be of no avail.

Mr. J. D. REID: Mr. Speaker, I am thoroughly seized of the facts of the situation which the hon. member has mentioned. The member for Edmonton (Mr. Griesbach)

has been bringing the matter to my attention every day—I had almost said he was worrying me—at any rate he has "put it up" to me to do something. In addition to the action taken by him, I have had telegrams from almost every settlement in that particular section. As the hon. member knows, we have a railway organization in the City of Montreal which formerly functioned as the Canadian Railway War Board, but is now known as the Railway Association of Canada. Whenever I receive notice of any transportation difficulties I immediately notify this organization, and it at once takes charge of the situation. In this particular case I took action some weeks ago, and the Railway Association in turn communicated with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and I am informed by Mr. Grant Hall, the General Manager of that company, that every effort is being put forward to remedy the trouble complained of, that duty having been assigned to his company,—although of course the Canadian National Railway would go to the assistance of the Canadian Pacific Railway if required. I might just read a telegram that I received this morning dealing with the subject. It is from Montreal, and states:—

Exchanged wired re situation on E.D. & B.C. Railway. General Manager that line states difficulty due to snow blockade which tied up portions of line for three to four weeks. With arrangements now made for additional power and cars from connecting lines and with improved weather conditions now being experienced situation rapidly returning to normal and line in better position to move traffic than any time in its history. Congestion of traffic will be relieved by extra power now available. Conditions improving daily.

(Signed) RAILWAY ASSOCIATION OF CANADA.

Had I known that the hon. member (Mr. White) was going to bring this matter up I could have read him a dozen telegrams to show the people of the Spirit River district that we have been giving their difficulties every attention, and that the railways outside of the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway have been doing their part to relieve the situation.

ESTIMATES FOR 1920-21.

On the Orders of the Day.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING: May I ask my right hon. friend, the Acting Prime Minister, when the House may expect the estimates to be brought down?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: On Monday next.

HOUSE OF COMMONS OFFICIALS—ORGANIZATION.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. E. B. DEVLIN (Wright): I wish to direct attention to the fact that according to the minutes of the Proceedings of the Senate of Canada, of March 11, 1920, His Honour the Speaker of the Senate has placed upon the Table of the Senate the organization of the staff of the Senate. I understand that the Civil Service Commission has held up the classification of the staff of the House of Commons awaiting the action of this House in passing upon that plan of organization. May I ask you, Mr. Speaker, when it is your intention to place before the members of this House the plan of organization of the staff of the House?

Mr. SPEAKER: I will give the hon. gentleman an answer on Monday.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS—CANADIAN REPRESENTATIVE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Beauce): May I ask the Government whether the appointment has been made of a Canadian representative in the Assembly of the League of Nations? If not, when does the Government contemplate making it, and can the Government give the House any information as to the probable date of the first general meeting of the Assembly?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I will have to ask my hon. friend to defer his question until Monday or Tuesday. I will inquire into the matter and give such information as is available.

CREDIT TO SERBIAN GOVERNMENT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. H. S. BELAND (Beauce): It is reported in the press of this morning that the Serbian Government has asked the Government of Canada to grant to them a credit of $20,000,000, as in the case of Roumania and Greece. Has such a request been received by the Government?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No word of it is in the possession of the Government.

THE BODY OF FINLAY STONEHAM.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac): Has the attention of the Minister of Justice been directed to an article which appeared in

the Daily British Whig on the 16th instant entitled, "Where is the Body of Finlay Stoneham?" An article——

Mr. SPEAKER: So far as the hon. member has proceeded I cannot conceive that this is a question of wide public import. If it is not, the hon. member should proceed by putting a question on the Order Paper in the usual way.

Mr. EDWARDS: Well, Mr. Speaker, it strikes me that it is of considerable importance whether a blunder has been committed and the body of a convict, supposed to be the body of Finlay Stoneham, sent to his parents which was not the body of Finlay Stoneham at all.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is hardly a question of sufficient public importance to engage the attention of the House upon the Orders of the Day. No question of public principle is involved, as I understand it, and if the hon. member will put his question on the Order Paper, he will be more within the Rules of the House.

Mr. EDWARDS: Does the Minister of Justice consider that the blunder that has been made is in any way due to the fact that the wardenship, deputy wardenship, surgeoncy and chief keepership of the penitentiary have been vacant for several months?

Rt. Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): Since the matter has gone so far as to include the statement of an alleged blunder, I prefer, if I may, to answer the question at once. No such blunder was made as is referred to in the correspondence in the Whig. The matter has been carefully enquired into. The body was examined in the presence of the father, who at one time said he could not identify it, and we are in possession of the reports of those who made the identification, showing on their statement not only that it was the body, but also that the father admitted that it was. Among the persons who made the identification of the body was the undertaker employed by the parents to attend to the burial, who was in a position to speak with personal knowledge as to indentification, inasmuch as he had been one of the jurors who sat at the trial of the prisoner whose body was in question. No blunder, therefore, was committed, and therefore no blunder could be attributed to the delay in the appointments referred to. With regard to that, the hon. gentleman will understand that these appointments have to go through the necessary process of submission to the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must point out to the House that this does not come within the class of questions which ought properly to be put upon the Orders of the Day.

DISMISSAL OF ARTHUR S. PORTER.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North and Victoria): I wish to read a brief despatch which appeared in yesterday evening's issue of the Ottawa Journal, and to put a question with regard to it. The despatch is neaded: "Man who started Inquiry is Fired: Man responsible for Investigation into Combine loses Position," and reads:

> Hamilton, Ont., March 17—Arthur S. Porter, local manager of the Canadian General Electric Company, who was instrumental in starting the investigation by the Board of Commerce into the alleged Wholesale Grocers' Combine, has lost his position with the General Electric Company, according to a statement made today by Mr. Porter. Porter was called as a witness at the hearing in this city last week, though the Crown Counsel, A. W. Roebuck, told the board that he had not intended this.
>
> Attorney General W. E. Raney, in a letter to the board following the board's sitting at Hamilton, sharply criticized Chairman W. F. O'Connor for having brought the Crown's informant into light at the inquiry.

I wish to direct the attention of the leader of the Government to this embarrassing and unfortunate situation. If this witness was so dismissed, the Department of Labour or some other department of the Government should see to it that witnesses who are called by the Government are not subjected to treatment of that kind.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have no knowledge of the circumstances. I think that my hon. friend will, on reflection, come to the conclusion that it is very difficult for the Government to keep tab on all the transactions that take place between employers and employees in their several establishments.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT AMENDMENT.

The House resumed consideration in committee of the following proposed resolution—Hon. C. C. Ballantyne, Minister of Marine and Fisheries—Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

> Resolved, that it is expedient to repeal sections eighty-five to eighty-nine, both inclusive, and section ninety-one of the Canada Shipping Act, chapter one hundred and thirteen of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, and to re-enact in lieu thereof:—

(1) That every British subject who,—

(a) served as a master or mate of a sea-going or coasting sailing vessel of over seventy-five tons, gross tonnage, before the first day of January, one thousand nine hundred and twenty, for a full period of twelve months within ten years immediately next preceding the date of his application for a certificate of service,

(b) produces satisfactory evidence of his sobriety, experience, ability and general good conduct on board ship, and

(c) passes the sight test and the prescribed examination in signalling, shall be entitled, on payment of the prescribed fee, to a certificate of service as a master or mate of a square rigged or fore-and-aft rigged sea-going or coasting sailing vessel not exceeding seven hundred and fifty tons, registered tonnage, according as his service has been, (a) as master or as mate, (b) on a sea-going or on a coasting sailing vessel, (c) on a square rigged sailing ship or on a fore-and-aft rigged sailing vessel.

(2) That in every such certificate of service the name, place and date of birth of the person to whom the same is issued shall be stated, and each certificate shall specify whether the holder is entitled to act as master or mate, whether the certificate is for sea-going vessels or for vessels in the coasting trade, and whether for square rigged sailing vessels or for fore-and-aft sailing vessels, and that it is not for any vessel exceeding seven hundred and fifty tons, registered tonnage.

The CHAIRMAN: When the committee rose last night the resolution had been read and was under consideration. The member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) had the floor.

Mr. DUFF: I have two objections to this resolution: First, that the deparment has been so long in bringing it before the House; second, that it does not go quite far enough. Outside of that, however, I intend to support the resolution, and I will proceed to give my reasons for doing so.

Before the House adjourned yesterday afternoon, the hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) took exception to this resolution, and he gave reasons why he felt that this House should not pass the resolution nor the Bill to be founded on it. I do not think it is necessary for me to say that I have the greatest respect for the hon. member and also for his ability, and I am sorry that I have to disagree with him. If this were a matter of jurisprudence or concerning some legal point, I would certainly not dare to controvert anything he might say. On this matter, however, I do not feel that I need apologise for taking a different point of view from that which he took yesterday afternoon. The hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria was afraid that if this resolution passed, the standard that had so far been maintained in the appointment of masters and mates for the Canadian mercantile marine would suffer, and that we would not have as good men manning our ships as we have at the present time. I should like to go into the history of Canadian shipping for a little while in order to prove to my hon. friend that his fears are groundless.

What is known as the Canada Shipping Act to-day is practically an Act which was copied from the old English Act, and from the time that Act was put into force by the English Government and the Board of Trade, there has been no question as to the merits of that Act. After Confederation, when Canada was formed into a nation, the then Canadian Government practically adopted the English Shipping Act. Since that time, it is quite true, a few unimportant changes in the shape of amendments have been made, but those amendments do not cover all the ground necessary to make the Canada Shipping Act a first-class piece of legislation for doing the work necessary in regard to Canadian shipping. It is also true that two or three years ago the then Minister of Marine or the Marine Department retained the services of a lawyer at Halifax to revise the Shipping Act, and I hold in my hand the revision which this gentleman made and which has not gone into force. I have looked over it very carefully, and I cannot find many changes in it; and before the proposed new Bill goes into effect, I would suggest to the Government and, in particular, to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne), that a new revision be made, and that a practical ship-owner should be appointed along with a lawyer so that they could together make a proper revision. Under the old Shipping Act, sections 95, 96 and 97 set forth exactly the qualifications necessary and what it is necessary for a sailor to do before he can become either a mate or a captain of a Canadian ship. Under the old Act no captain could sail a ship over 100 tons unless he had a certificate, but that was amended, and the limit is now 150 tons. That was all very well a few years ago; but during the last few years the Government and, in particular, the Minister of Marine, realized that it was impossible to work under that Act, one reason being that the examinations which the sailors are subjected to would puzzle a Philadelphia lawyer. In order to be able to pass those examinations, a man would need to be a scholar and to have a university education, and there are in Canada to-day very few men who could pass the

examinations necessary under the clauses which I have just quoted. Just for a few minutes, if the House will bear with me, I will give one or two instances of what sailors have to do in order to get one of those certificates. To take the examination for a first mate, a candidate must be not less than nineteen years of age and have served five years at sea. That is to say, he must go to sea when he is fourteen years of age and serve five years. Before I go any further, the committee will, I am sure, admit that a man who leaves his home at fourteen years of age and goes to sea for five years, cannot be very far advanced with his education. Of the five years which he must serve at sea,

(a) One year must have been in a capacity not lower than fourth mate of a sea-going vessel whilst holding a second mate's certificate for sea-going vessels;

(b) or one year and a half must have been in a capacity not lower than first mate in a coasting vessel whilst holding a second mate's certificate for sea-going vessels;

(c) or one year must have been as pilot with a first-class pilot's certificate.

In addition to that, he must answer certain questions, some of which are:

To answer questions on right angled spherical trigonometry.

To compute the time at which a given star will be on the observer's meridian.

To determine what bright stars will be within a certain hour-angle from the observer's meridian, above the pole and above the horizon, at any given time; also the hour-angle, east or west, of each of the stars, and whether they are to the north or south of the observer's zenith when passing the meridian.

And so on. What do we find that a candidate for a master's certificate has to do?

A candidate must be not less than twenty-one years of age, and—

(a) he must have served six years at sea, of which one year must have been in a capacity not lower than first mate of a sea-going vessel, whilst holding a certificate not lower than a first mate's certificate for sea-going vessels,

(b) or, he must have served six years at sea, of which one year and a half must have been in a capacity not lower than first mate of a coasting vessel whilst holding a certificate not lower than a first mate's certificate for sea-going vessels, ...

(c) or, he must have served six and a half years at sea, one year of which must have been in a capacity not lower than second mate of a sea-going vessel, whilst holding a first mate's certificate for sea-going vessels.

These are some of the things which the candidate has to do. He must have gone to sea when he was about fourteen years of age. He is required:

To write an essay on some technical subject.

[Mr. Duff.]

Just imagine a man who went to sea when he was fourteen years of age sitting down in a room and writing an essay on a technical subject. He is also required:

To find the latitude by the altitude of the Polar star at any time. To find the latitude by the meridian altitude of the moon.

The candidate will be required to give a figure and explanation for each problem worked, and give a written explanation of any of the terms used in navigation or nautical astronomy that may be asked.

It is almost impossible to get men who are able to pass such examinations, and I have proved from personal experience that the ordinary sailor or seaman cannot pass such examinations. The examination is a written one, and I have known a number of cases where the candidate, as soon as he came into the room and the questions on the paper were put before him, went all to pieces and had to leave the room. I have come across men who went up for an examination three times, men who had sailed vessels to practically all parts of the world and yet who could not pass that examination.

I cut from the Yarmouth Herald a few days ago a short article which is worth reading to the committee. It reads:

At the marine school last week two candidates were before examiner Capt. J. E. Murphy and passed successful examinations. The first was J. MacDonald Barkhouse, of Westport, who was granted a master's certificate for foreign going ships, steam or sail.

The following is the matter to which I wished particularly to refer:

Capt. Barkhouse was the first candidate to undertake in Yarmouth a master mariner's studies under the new and difficult system which has been recently established and he is to be congratulated on the excellence of his examination. The second was R. L. Lohnes, of Lunenburg, who was granted a mate's certificate for the coastwise trade.

It is almost impossible to get men who will go before the examiner and submit themselves to the examination which is put before them. If we are going to encourage the Canadian mercantile marine and shipbuilding, we must certainly put on the statute book something different from what the law is at the present time.

Let us see what our neighbour to the south is doing in regard to masters and mates. The United States, during the last few years, has been rather successful in building up a mercantile marine, and we could not do much better than follow the example of that country. I hold in my hands the navigation laws of the United

States. With regard to the qualifications of masters, I might say that under the American navigation law there is no necessity whatever for a man to pass an examination to sail a ship under 700 tons. If the owners of the vessel and the underwriters are satisfied with his experience and ability, any man can sail a vessel up to 700 tons without license or certificate. The examination required above that limit of 700 tons is very simple, and is different altogether from the Canadian examination at the present time. Clause 69 of the American navigation laws reads as follows:

> The board of local inspectors shall license and classify the masters, chief mates, and second and third mates, if in charge of a watch, engineers, and pilots of all steam vessels, and the masters of sail vessels of over seven hundred gross tons, and all other vessels of over one hundred gross tons carrying passengers for hire. It shall be unlawful to employ any person, or for any person to serve, as a master, chief mate, engineer, or pilot of any steamer, or as master of any sail vessel of over seven hundred gross tons, or of any other vessel of over one hundred gross tons carrying passengers for hire, who is not licensed by the inspectors; and any one violating this section shall be liable to a penalty of one hundred dollars for each offence.
>
> Clause 70.—Whenever any person applies to be licensed as master of any steam vessel, or of a sail vessel of over seven hundred tons, the inspectors shall make diligent inquiry as to his character, and shall carefully examine the applicant as well as the proofs which he presents in support of his claim, and if they are satisfied that his capacity, experience, habits of life, and character are such as warrant the belief that he can safely be intrusted with the duties and responsibilities of the station for which he makes application, they shall grant him a license authorizing him to discharge such duties on any such vessel for the term of five years.

In view of these regulations I think it is certainly high time for some change to be made in our Canadian laws. Up to the outbreak of war in 1914, owners of vessels in Canada had a way of getting around the present Canada Shipping Act. I think the Minister of Marine (Mr. Ballantyne) will agree with me when I say that perhaps 75 per cent of the Canadian tonnage on the Atlantic coast, instead of being registered in Canada, as it should have been, was registered at the town of Bridgeton, Barbadoes, in the West Indies, simply because under the Canada Shipping Act an uncertificated master could not sail a vessel over 150 tons. Vessels over that tonnage were registered at Bridgeton so that our men could sail them. After the war started, practically all the nations of the world, or at all events the Allied nations, passed a regulation or Order in Council prohibiting the transfer of registry of vessels from the country in which they were owned. After 1914 the Canadian Government refused to allow vessels built in Canada to be registered at Bridgeton. As a result, shipowners came to the Minister of Marine and to the Government and represented that it was impossible for them to get certificated masters to sail their vessels, and that something would have to be done to relieve the situation. The situation was relieved by the Government passing an Order in Council giving power to the Minister of Marine to grant, on application, permission for uncertificated masters to sail vessels over 150 tons. That, in my opinion, was the proper thing to do, and I certainly have no fault to find with it. So much tonnage of the Allies was being sunk every day in the week that we were told that if we could not fight we could help our country by building ships, and shipping men and monied men all over Canada decided to help in that way. The result was that in the Maritime Provinces and other parts of Canada new shipyards were opened and more ships were built during the war than had been built for many years past. Then we were faced with the condition that it was impossible to get masters to sail these vessels, so the Government passed this Order in Council. I think under the circumstances the Government should be congratulated on its action at that time, which allowed good men without certificates to sail our vessels.

The hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) in his speech yesterday afternoon said that insurance companies would object to these men sailing vessels. Well, Sir, I have had a little experience myself with insurance companies, and I have always been told by the underwriters that they look at the morals of a man far more than at anything else, and if they and the owners are satisfied that the man in charge of a vessel is a good, safe, reliable man in whom the owners have confidence, the underwriters never object. They say they are satisfied that these men are just as capable as certificated masters, and are quite satisfied to allow them to sail the ships, and are willing to insure vessel and cargo.

To show the ridiculousness of the law as it stands, let me cite one case only. Two vessels leave the port of Lunenburg, Nova Scotia, for North Sydney to load coal for St. Johns, Newfoundland. One is registered 149 tons, and the other 153 tons. These vessels go to North Sydney, load their cargo of coal, and when the captain of the 149-

ton vessel goes to the custom officer for his clearance he is asked, "Where are you going?" The man replies "To St. Johns, Newfoundland, and then to Greece." The customs officer then writes out a clearance for that vessel and the captain goes out. He then turns to the captain of the 153-ton vessel and asks "Where are you going?" The answer is "To St. John, Newfoundland, and from there to Oporto, Portugal with a load of codfish for a merchant in St. Johns." "Where is your certificate?" he is at once asked. "I have none" is the reply. "I am sorry," says the customs officer, "but under the Canada Shipping Act I cannot clear you." There is a difference of only four tons between these two vessels, and why, if you can clear the 149-ton vessel cannot you clear the 153-ton vessel, if both captains have the same experience and ability? The thing is ridiculous on the face of it, and it is high time the minister remedied the situation by bringing down such a resolution as appears on the Order Paper to-day. I am quite sure that if this resolution does not pass this House, it will discourage shipbuilding in Nova Scotia and perhaps in other parts of Canada. I know that one or two yards have closed up already and that several contracts were cancelled last fall because there was an impression that after the Treaty of Peace was signed the Minister of Marine might not continue to grant the permission he had done in the past.

The hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria referred yesterday afternoon to the Bill introduced by the Acting Minister of Marine (Mr. A. K. Maclean) last year, and I understood him to say that that legislation was on practically the same lines as this resolution. I do not like to disagree with my hon. friend, but the legislation introduced by the hon. member (Mr. Maclean) last year was altogether different from this resolution. If I remember correctly, and I think I do, because before the legislation was introduced into the House I had spoken to the acting minister and the deputy minister with regard to the matter, the idea was to get Parliament to approve the action of the Minister of Marine in granting permission to uncertificated masters to sail vessels over 150 tons. I think that legislation should have been passed by this House, and I am rather surprised that the Bill was withdrawn after being introduced. No captain to-day who has a certificate has the slightest trouble in securing a ship, for there are more ships than there are masters available. So that this resolution will not, in my opinion, affect the standing of any captain who in the judgment of the shipowner is capable of taking charge of a vessel. If, therefore, there are any certificated masters who encounter any great difficulty in getting ships there must be some other reason than any alleged dearth of ships. Clause 1 (a) relates to every British subject who:

> Served as a master or mate of a sea-going or coasting vessel of over seventy-five tons, gross tonnage, before the 1st day of January, one thousand nine hundred and twenty, for a full period of twelve months within ten years immediately next preceding the date of his application for his certificate of service.

And sub-section (b) provides that he must produce

> Satisfactory evidence of his sobriety, experience, ability and general good conduct on board ship.

It seems to me that if any man complies with the provisions contained in sub-section (a) and sub-section (b), being able to give unquestionable evidence of his sobriety, good conduct and capability, and if the owners of the vessel and the underwriters, both of the hull and the cargo, are satisfied with his qualifications, the matter rests practically with these people, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries would be doing nothing but right in granting him his certificate. I would direct the attention of the Minister to the last sub-section which I quoted requiring satisfactory evidence of sobriety, experience, ability, and general good conduct "on board ship". I think it would be better if these last three words were eliminated, for it is equally as necessary for a captain to be sober and well-behaved on shore as on board ship. I suggest to the Minister that this slight change would strengthen the resolution. Sub-section (c) requires that the applicant must pass the sight test and the prescribed examination in signalling. The Minister might add to this provision the words "and rules of the road." Possibly sub-section (b) embraces this qualification, but I can see no harm in the addition of the words I have suggested, which would certainly remove any possibility of doubt or equivocation. I am anxious to see every captain thoroughly qualified for his position, and if these words are deemed superfluous, still I should like to have an expression of assurance from the Minister that the "rules of the road" are beyond doubt included in the qualification of sobriety, experience, etc. There is a slight typographical error in sub-section (c) to which I might, in passing, call atten-

tion. The word "fore-in-aft" should be "fore-and-aft". In the same sub-section the following words appear:

According as his service has been (a) as master or as mate, etc.

As these words stand, I think they might be constructed to mean that a man who has served twelve months on a seventy-five ton ship can get a mate's certificate but before he can obtain a master's certificate he must go back again on the seventy-five ton vessel and serve as master for twelve months. These words may be explicit to a legal or technical mind, but it appears to me that the clause might be made somewhat clearer. Can the minister give us any assurance that there will be no necessity for a man who receives his mate's certificate to go back and sail as master on a seventy-five ton ship for another year? Under all the circumstances, Mr. Chairman, I see no reason for objection to this resolution. In my own county there are about two hundred sailing vessels, ranging in tonnage from a hundred and twenty-five to six hundred tons, and if this resolution were not carried eighty per cent of the shipping in Nova Scotia will be hung up, which would be, I think every one will agree, nothing short of a calamity so far as that province is concerned. I trust that in view of the explanations that have been given in this discussion the resolution will pass unanimously.

Mr. FOURNIER: I have listened very attentively to the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Duff), whose knowledge and experience of the subject under discussion have enabled him to cover the ground so thoroughly as to leave little for me to add. I would support his suggestion with regard to the inclusion of the "rules of the road" qualification, and would also suggest to the minister in regard to the tonnage of vessels, the desirability of adding to the resolution some such words as the following: "Vessels propelled by sail and partly by power, up to a tonnage of a hundred and seventy-five tons." Last year when this subject was introduced the hon. member for Matane, who unfortunately, has been called away, did not quite concur in the resolution. Since this resolution appeared on the Order Paper, however, we have discussed the matter and made diligent inquiry, and I believe that if the minister would accept the suggestions that have been offered, every interest would be served and the resolution would go far enough. I think that both sailing vessels and vessels propelled partly by power, up to a hundred and seventy-five tons, should certainly be included.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am very much gratified at the approval of the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff), as well as the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Fournier). With regard to the alterations suggested by my hon. friend from Lunenburg, I have no objection to adding to Clause (C) the words "rules of the road," but I submit that this is fully covered by Clause (B) which demands ability and experience. With regard to the other suggestions of the hon. member, I do not think it will be necessary for any man to serve a second year on a seventy-five ton ship in order to secure his master's certificate. The hon. member also suggested the elimination from Clause (B) of the words "on board ship," where the applicant's sobriety, experience, etc., shall have been evidenced. I think the hon. member will agree with me that the man's conduct while on board ship should be just such as is described in this sub-section, and the change is therefore not advisable. On the whole, with the approval both of the hon. member for Lunenburg and of the member for Bellechasse, I should like to have the resolution stand as it is. There is a great deal in what has been said by the hon. member for Bellechasse in regard to the inclusion in the regulation of vessels propelled by gasoline engines. But that is a matter that I would ask the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Fournier) to kindly not press for the moment. I will be very glad to give the matter my careful consideration and to learn what the hon. member's views are upon it.

Mr. McKENZIE: Nothwithstanding the very able address of my good friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) I still stand obdurate and unconvinced, and determined to see to it as far as I can, that every man in this country who professes to be a professional navigator shall have some technical qualifications, and that a man who may have served on a schooner ten years ago for the period of one year and has not seen salt water since until the present time shall not be qualified to receive the certificate of a first class seaman and the master of a ship. We might have very good knowledge ten years ago of some things and yet to-day have forgotten all about such matters. More than ten years ago I was a school teacher and regarded myself as a good one; but if I were sent back to-day to the same scholars and the same class, and had the same duties to

do, I would find myself very much behind and unable to carry out the work I could do in those days. We have had the example of medical men who went overseas and remained there for three or four years. Upon coming back to this country they have had to take post graduate courses thus admitting that the time they spent away from their practice had altogether disqualified them from resuming the work they formally were accustomed to do. This is because in the intervening time they had forgotten the things that were absolutely essential for them to know, and therefore deemed it necessary for them to again go over the old ground, briefly, of course, in order to regain their old proficiency as practitioners. I submit to you, Sir, that one year of training as a sailor ten years ago is not going to give any one a knowledge of Marsden's rules of the road. I have read those rules as a lawyer perhaps one hundred times but I would not undertake to stand an examination to-day with respect to them. Still I profess to be as well up in these matters as an ordinary seaman who might, ten years ago, have put in twelve months on board a vessel. I think it requires special training, special care, and a special amount of education before a man should be admitted to be master of a ship and guardian of the lives of whatever crew there may be in the vessel. I do not think that the British Board of Trade is ignorant of the requirements of a seaman in this country. I do not think we are making any mistakes when we follow the rules that have been established in Great Britain for the last one hundred or two hundred years and that have been consistently maintained and adhered to up to the present day as sea-going requirements. Britannia rules the waves, and Britannia has followed the rules which are enforced to-day and which the Minister of Marine is prepared to lay unholy hands on under this resolution—break them up, and say that Great Britain, with all its knowledge of seamanship, and with its reputation for carrying trade and for leading the world as far as seamanship and shipping are concerned that has always been wrong, and that it is wrong now; that we in this country know more than do the British authorities about shipping and that we must depart from the practice which has been followed by them with such success for the last two hundred years.

As I have already pointed out to the minister, and I believe he knows it we have not in this Parliament absolute control of this question, and never had. The minister can pass his Bill, and he can give his man a certificate, but until it receives the approval of the Board of Trade and of the King in Council, and is gazetted in England, the certificated captain might as well be carrying a yellow covered almanac in his pocket as any certificate the minister may award. Section 95 of the Canada Shipping Act says:

> No ship registered in Canada, over one hundred tons registered tonnage, shall go to sea from any port or place in Canada on any voyage, not being a coasting voyage, unless the master and first mate, or only mate thereof have obtained and possess valid certificates either,—
> (a) of competency or service for sea-going ships, appropriate to their several stations in such ship, or of a higher grade, from the minister; or, (b) of competency or service for sea-going ships, appropriate to their several stations in such ship, or of a higher grade, from the Board of Trade in the United Kingdom; or, (c) of competency appropriate to their several stations in such ship, or of a higher grade, granted in any British possession, and declared by order of His Majesty in Council, published in the London Gazette, under the provisions of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, or of any Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom containing such provisions, to be of the same force as certificates of competency for foreign sea-going ships granted under the Acts of the Parliament of the United Kingdom relating to merchant shipping.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The hon. gentleman is now referring to the competency certificate. This resolution, and the Bill that is based on it, very clearly sets forth that the certificate in question is not a competency certificate but a service certificate, and there is a vast difference between the two. The Shipping Act provides for a service certificate only in the case of a man who shall have served on a sailing vessel prior to 1870. What I am trying to do is simply to advance the legislation fifty years.

Mr. McKENZIE: I have heard of a certain boy who said to the school teacher "I am not as stupid as you thought I was." "No," said the teacher, "You are very much more stupid." I find that it is much more difficult to bring correction home to the minister than I thought it would be at first. I pointed out to him half a dozen times that this provision of service was adopted at the time the first Act came into force some sixty years ago so that no hardship would be suffered, but that any person who enters upon seamanship after the enactment of the Shipping Act must be understood to comply with the law. I point out to the minister also that any man who

goes to sea now and is looking for a certificate or promotion is doing so and working with a full knowledge of what the law is. But to say that the old condition is to be brought up forever and that education, seamanship and knowledge, is to be cast to one side was never the intention. The minister says I am wrong about this but the first two or three lines in section 95 sets forth that no ship registered in Canada of over one hundred tons registered tons shall go to sea from any port or any place in the Dominion on any voyage not being a coasting voyage unless the master and first mate or only mate has obtained a certificate of the class that I mentioned. That is the law. My hon. friend (Mr. Ballantyne) may shake his head, but he cannot change the law and the practice of this country. The Act must receive the sanction of the King in Council and it must be published in the Royal Gazette to give our certificates the same force and effect as certificates obtained in Great Britain, and if my hon. friend is going to turn out masters and mates without any qualification, except that perhaps ten years ago they had been at school for twelve months, he will be disappointed if he expects their certificates to be recognized when they come before the British Board of Trade.

I have nothing further to say about the matter, Mr. Chairman. If the hon. minister is going to be absolutely blind to what has been the law and practice since the inception of our Parliamentary institutions, and as a result of that blindness stumbles, it is no fault of mine; I have warned him.

Mr. ROBERT H. BUTTS (Cape Breton South and Richmond): Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the remarks of the hon. members who have spoken on this question.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Louder.

Mr. BUTTS: Do you want me to scream? There is some merit in those remarks, and I agree very largely with the position taken by my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Duff). There are also a few points in the remarks of my hon. friend from North Cape Breton (Mr. D. D. McKenzie) that I can still agree with. I may almost quote the words of my hon. friend from Lunenburg to the effect that the only difficulty he had with the resolution was that it did not go quite far enough. My hon. friend from North Cape Breton yesterday afternoon drew comparisons between the examinations set for master mariners and those set for miners. In those comparisons he was not quite correct, because in nine cases out of ten miner's examinations are oral, for the simple reason that miners get their education in the coal-mines and not in the schools or colleges, and it is therefore somewhat embarrassing for them to submit to a written examination. Exactly the same thing applies to the little boy who leaves school and ships in a fore-and-after at fourteen years of age. He cannot become a master mariner until he is nineteen, but having spent five years at sea he is not likely to have any opportunity of studying mathematics. Therefore I feel inclined to agree with my hon. friend from Lunenburg that the examination should be oral, particularly in connection with small vessels, because I think he will agree with me that out of his old port of Lunenburg, or out of Liverpool or St. John many a man has taken a sailing ship to Oporto or to the Mediterranean when, as they used to say in the olden days, "he had to smell his way." The science of navigation did not count for very much in those times.

I believe that the entire argument of my hon. friend from North Cape Breton must fall to the ground. We have the Canada Shipping Act, and surely if this Parliament had jurisdiction to pass that Act, they have from time to time jurisdiction to amend it as in their wisdom they may deem necessary. I think that follows as the night follows the day. Then if they have jurisdiction, why question it in such very pronounced terms as those used by my hon. friend? On the contrary, may we not even question his interpretation of the law?

I am of opinion, Mr. Chairman, that this resolution is perfectly within the jurisdiction of this House, and I am surprised that any hon. member should venture to question it. As I said before, we have the Canada Shipping Act, and if from time to time shipping conditions vary, should we not have the same power to amend that measure as we had to enact it some years ago? We have not been stripped of any of our jurisdiction. Indeed, if any attempt had been made to abridge that jurisdiction there would have been a storm of protest throughout the whole Dominion. The Canada Shipping Act is the law to-day; but it may not be the law to-morrow if this House says so.

But, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, the resolution in my opinion does not go far enough. I think there should be an entire reconstruction of the Canada Shipping Act. On different occasions yesterday

afternoon and this afternoon the British Board of Trade has been referred to. They have R.N.'s,—those are the Royal Navy men, the highest order of shipping masters, then they have the R.N.R.'s. Now, if we inquire what those two classes of men are, we shall find that the R.N.R.'s are those who have failed to make a success of shipping. In other words, the title means. Go back and sit down, and when we cannot get any one else we may call on you. We have many ships sailing out of Canadian ports under the command of R.N.R.'s. Notwithstanding the decision of Lord Mersey, I assert that it was an R.N.R. who was responsible for the disaster in the St. Lawrence River when the "Empress of Ireland" was rammed by the "Storstad" and some eleven hundred or twelve hundred souls were lost. There are too many R.N.R.'s sailing ships out of our ports, and the Canada Shipping Act should be so amended as to make it compulsory for every man taking a ship out of a Canadian port to have a Canadian certificate.

I am inclined to qualify my agreement with my hon. friend from Lunenburg in this way: That the examinations for the masters of small sailing vessels should not be so strict as are the examinations for masters of ships of 11,000, 12,000 and 15,000 tons. The former examinations should not be so exacting as in the case of the examinations for the masters of ships who may have under them perhaps ninety or one hundred of a crew, and whose knowledge must cover marine and engineering subjects and in fact almost all the different trades that enter into the completed mechanism of the modern steamer. These men should be educated men. But as to these little 90, 100, and 150-ton schooners,—why, I have sailed one of them myself, and I would always manage to keep clear of the rocks. While I offer these few little suggestions, I believe that the resolution should be unanimously adopted, because it is a step in advance. Numerous disasters have occurred on our maritime coasts and on the Newfoundland coast; there was the case of the "Florizel," which was lost off cape Grace about a year ago. I agree, therefore, with my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) when he says that if these men are to carry on the duties of professional master mariners, then they should have the education of professional master mariners. But a line should be drawn between the big ship which carries hundreds of passengers and a large crew and the little ship that merely goes on lobster courses along our shores and is hardly ever out of sight of land. On one occasion I made the trip from Halifax to the strait of Canso on one of our government ships, and standing on the bridge with the captain throughout the whole of the night I was never for more than then consecutive minutes out of sight of three lights: That was the smallest number of lights that I saw at any one time. The coasts of the Maritime Provinces and Newfoundland and the shores of the St. Lawrence are well lighted. But here is another point in connection with which I made a suggestion to the minister a year ago. The pilotage system of this country is bad, as was proved by the Halifax disaster, and as is proved by the number of ships that are being run on the rocks. I know men who have gone from Sydney Harbour as far as St. John to bring over a ship and who had never in their lives been out of sight of land. It was brought out during the investigation into the Halifax explosion that men were piloting ships into Halifax harbour at that time who had never been out of sight of land. Some of the men who would be wiped out by the requirement of certificates are men who, if you sent them from here to China, would keep a vessel afloat so long as there was a cup of water under it. I suggest that the minister take counsel with some of the marine men in the different departments and that the Canada Shipping Act be amended, revised and improved. Even though my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) for whose legal acumen I have the very greatest respect, says that we have no jurisdiction, I suggest that the minister take a chance.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

Mr. BALLANTYNE thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 21, to amend the Canada Shipping Act,—(Certificate of Service).

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT AND THE CORPORATION OF OTTAWA.

On motion of Hon. J. D. Reid (Acting Minister of Public Works), the House went into Committee to consider the following proposed resolution, Mr. Boivin in the Chair:

Resolved, that it is expedient to bring in a measure to ratify and confirm the agreement made between His Majesty the King, as represented by the Minister of Public Works of Canada, hereinafter referred to as "the Government," and the Corporation of the City of

Ottawa, hereinafter referred to as "the Corporation," whereby amongst other provisions, it is agreed,—

1. That the Government will pay to the Corporation the sum of $75,000 annually for a period of five years from the first day of July, 1919; the said payments to be in full satisfaction and discharge of all claims and demands on the Government by the Corporation except as otherwise provided in the said agreement.

2. That the Government will pay to the Corporation for water supply, for use in and on buildings, and parts of buildings, lands and premises in the City of Ottawa, now or hereafter owned or occupied by the Government at any time during the period of five years from the first day of July, 1919 (except buildings, lands and premises leased by the Government and subject to the general water rates established by by-law of the Corporation) and also for use in and on the Rideau Hall grounds and the Central Experimental Farm, and the buildings thereon, at the price or rate of thirteen cents per thousand gallons for such quantity of water as it may use in any year up to 200,000,000 gallons and for water used in excess of 200,000,000 gallons in any year at the price or rate of ten cents per thousand gallons; and that water rates for buildings and parts of buildings, and premises leased by the Government, as to which the Government is under obligation by the terms of their lease to make payment of water rates, shall be at the general rates established by the Water-works By-Law of the Corporation.

3. That the Corporation will install and maintain water meters at all convenient places where a supply of water is taken from its water-works for the use of the Government, and the Government will pay the Corporation annually a sum equal to ten per cent of the cost of such meters; the amount payable by the Government in each year to be determined by quarterly readings from said meters, and to be paid quarterly.

4. That in consideration of the said annual payments of $75,000 and of the grant to the Ottawa Improvement Commission of $150,000 a year for ten years, the Corporation agrees that said payment of $75,000 shall be in full discharge of all claims in respect of water supply for street sprinkling, for fire protection, and for use in Major's Hill Park, and in such other parks and driveways as may be owned or maintained by the Ottawa Improvement Commission.

5. That the Government shall maintain, repair and keep in repair the Connaught Place Bridge over the Rideau Canal, the Laurier Avenue Bridge, the bridges over the Chaudière Slides, and the sidewalks on the east side of Elgin street and on the south side of Laurier Avenue on front of and along the side of Cartier Square.

6. That the Government shall maintain and repair the sidewalks on the north side of Wellington street between Connaught Place and the western boundary of the Perley Home property, and on so much of the southern side of the said street as is in front of property owned by the Government, and the roadway, as it now exists, of Wellington street between Connaught Place and Bank street; and shall maintain and repair, and renew and replace, the existing asphalt pavement on that part of the said street which lies between Bank street and the westerly boundary of the Perley Home property; and if a new pavement be hereafter placed on that part of Wellington street which lies east of Bank street, such work shall be done by the Corporation, and property holders thereon shall not be released from any obligations imposed on them by law as regards payment of any taxes or local improvement rates in respect of their property on the said street, and the provisions of the contract between the same parties hereto, dated 7th August, 1916, with regard to Wellington street, are made a part of this agreement.

7. That the Government undertakes to indemnify and keep indemnified the Corporation from all manner of damage or injury, suits, claims, and demands on account of the said works or incurred by reason or in consequence of the execution thereof, or the supply of material therefor; and will pay to the Corporation on demand any expense sustained by it in consequence of such claims or any money reasonably and properly paid by the Corporation in settlement thereof, save and except suits, claims and demands arising by reason of anything done or omitted to be done by the Corporation, its agents, servants and workmen.

8. That all statutes of Canada, Orders in Council, by-laws and agreements, whereby the Corporation agreed to exempt from income taxes the incomes of officers and servants of the Government, resident in the City of Ottawa, derived from the Government, shall be abrogated and cancelled; and all former agreements between the Government and the Corporation with respect to these subject matters, inconsistent with the provisions of this agreement, shall be cancelled.

Hon. Mr. REID: Perhaps I had better give a few words of explanation in regard to the resolution, although, of course, when the Bill has been introduced and gets into committee, I can give further explanations as the various clauses are taken up. The situation is this: There has always been an agreement between the city of Ottawa and the Dominion for a certain annual payment for services given to the Government public buildings by the city. If my memory serves me aright, the amount paid annually for a certain number of years was $15,000. At the termination of the first agreement, the matter was taken up with the Government, and instead of increasing the amount, the Government made an annual grant of $100,000 to the Improvement Commission of the City of Ottawa. The city council have always claimed that the Dominion Government should pay taxes, and their requests, when made, were for an amount equal to the taxes they thought the Government should pay on property owned by the Government. This agreement expired some time during last year, and the city council again approached the Government for a new agreement requesting a very much larger amount than what had been paid during the term of the previous agreement, namely the last ten years. A sub-committee of Council was appointed, and a number of meetings were held with representatives of the city coun-

cil. The demands made by the city council were very much larger than the terms covered by this resolution. After a number of meetings and negotiations, the suggestion which was made by the Government and which is contained in this resolution, was accepted by the city council, so that now, instead of paying $15,000 a year, the Government will, as will be seen by the resolution just read, pay for the term of this agreement an annual amount of $75,000 and increase the grant to the Improvement Commission from $100,000 to $150,000 per annum. This really means that from now on for the new term we shall pay $225,000 per annum to the city of Ottawa and to the Improvement Commission, instead of $15,000 and $100,000 as previously.

Mr. FIELDING: How much will you pay for water?

Mr. REID: I was just coming to that. In addition to the sums mentioned, we shall pay an extra amount for water. I have not the memorandum before me, but I shall have it when the Bill is brought before the House. In addition to what I have mentioned, there was in the previous agreement a clause whereby the salaries of the civil servants were exempted from any taxation. That clause will not appear in this Bill, and civil servants will be in the same position in that respect as any other citizen of the city of Ottawa. While the increase in the annual payment is very great, the sub-committee of Council who took the matter up with the city council realized that the Government are getting many more advantages than we did under the previous agreement. Our properties have increased and the city has had to make many improvements on account of Government properties. I did not intend to go fully into this matter today; I have not the papers with me; but I thought that by introducing the Bill, I would get the matter in such a position before the House that I could later give fuller details.

Mr. McKENZIE: I understand that last year an agreement was reached between the then Minister of Public Works, Hon. Mr. Carvell, and the city. I should like to know from the Acting Minister of Public Works if the resolution which is now introduced is based upon the agreement that was negotiated then between the hon. Mr. Carvell and the city. I understood that the city officials were not altogether satisfied with the terms of that agreement, but the then minister stated in the House that he thought it was perfectly satisfactory. I should like to know whether that draft agreement is followed in this resolution, or whether this is a new agreement altogether, not following the opinion expressed by the then Minister of Public Works. The amount that we are to pay for water for the different public buildings appears to be very large. There are a great many ways of arriving at a proper estimate. Water can be purchased on the meter basis, just the same as electric light, and every gallon of water that goes into the Government buildings can be measured, and a reasonable rate arrived at. I do not know whether a proper investigation has been made along that line. Many corporations in this country are supplying water to different institutions. The cities of Toronto and Quebec no doubt supply water to the Provincial Government buildings in those cities, and the city of Montreal also furnishes water to different public buildings. I should like to know how our bargain compares with those that other cities have made with Provincial Governments, for instance. The town from which I come supplies water to a neighbouring town on a meter basis. The charge is 1/6 or 1/8 of a cent per gallon, I believe. At all events, it is a very small amount, and the town that is receiving the water is satisfied that it has made a fair bargain. I am sure the House would like to be advised that we are making a provident bargain with the city of Ottawa, and acting in a business-like manner.

As to the grant to the Ottawa Improvement Commission, I have no criticism to make, because I have no knowledge of the matter, but I do know something about the supply of water. I was mayor of our town at the time we made the arrangement with Sydney Mines and the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company, and I should like to be assured that the country, which will have to pay this money, is getting a square deal.

Mr. REID: Answering my hon. friend's first question, whether this is the agreement that was discussed by the ex-Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell), I might say that it is. It was entered into on June 30, 1919. I was on the committee with Mr. Carvell when we made this agreement, and since he left the department it has not been taken up again with the city.

With reference to the supply of water, the city claimed that they were losing a very large amount of money on the large quantity of water consumed in the Government buildings, and the committee thought

it was not fair that the people of the city of Ottawa should have to make good this amount. The committee agreed that the Government should pay what was fair and right. The arrangement we have made is, in part, as follows:

> The Government will pay to the corporation for water supply, for use in and on buildings, and parts of buildings, lands and premises in the city of Ottawa, now or hereafter owned or occupied by the Government at any time during the period of five years from the first day of July, 1919, except buildings, lands, and premises leased by the Government and subject to the general water rates established by by-law of the corparation, and also for use in and on the Rideau Hall grounds and the Central Experimental Farm, and the buildings thereon, at the price or rate of thirteen cents per thousand gallons for such quantity of water as it may use in any year up to 200,000,000 gallons, and for water used in excess of 200,000,000 gallons in any year, at the price or rate of ten cents per thousand gallons.
>
> That in consideration of the said annual payments of $75,000 and of the grant to the Ottawa Improvement Commission of $150,000 a year for ten years, the corporation agrees that said payment of $75,000 shall be in full discharge of all claims in respect of water supply for street sprinkling, for fire protection, and for use in Major's Hill park, and in such other parks and driveways as may be owned or maintained by the Ottawa Improvement Commission.

I think that answers my hon. friend's other question as to the supply of water.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Has the minister any estimate of what the city of Ottawa lost through the exemption of civil servants from taxation by the city?

Mr. REID: I will give full details when the Bill is under discussion. I have not the information here, but I know it is quite a large amount.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: In view of the fact that the amount is considerable, and that we are going to pay practically double what we have paid to the city in the past, would the minister be prepared when the Bill is under discussion to say what increase there has been in the service rendered by the city to the Government?

Mr. REID: I shall have all the details, and shall have the deputy minister here when the Bill is under discussion.

Mr. FRIPP: I have not been able to hear the explanation made by the minister (Mr. Reid), nor have I been able to hear the requests made by the leader of the Opposition. I rise simply to draw the Government's attention to the fact that clause 8 which proposes to abrogate the agreement which has existed between the civil servants and the Governments of Canada ever since we have had a Government here, so that the city may exact income tax from the servants of the Government, seems to me to be a great hardship upon the civil servants residing in the city of Ottawa. There can be no question but that the Government has made a very hard bargain with the city of Ottawa under the proposals now before the House. The material advantages that are given to the Government by the corporation of the city of Ottawa are worth far above and beyond the amount of $75,000 a year which is to be granted under this agreement. I think that the further charge now to be levied on the civil servants of Ottawa of paying an income tax into the coffers of the corporation is really enforcing too hard a bargain, and one that will result in the Government, who are the employers of the civil servants, being under the necessity of increasing their salaries. I trust the minister will reconsider Clause 8 with a view to retaining the present condition of things. I should like to know whether the mayor and corporation, who appeared for the city, were willing that this clause should form part of the agreement.

Mr. REID: A copy of the agreement is attached to the Bill and is supposed to be signed not only by the Minister of Public Works, but by the mayor and city clerk. Otherwise I would not be here moving this resolution, which is the result of the unanimous agreement of both sides. The agreement provides that all former agreements between the Government and the corporation with respect to these subject matters shall be cancelled; and this includes provisions of former order in council by which the salaries of civil servants were exempt from income taxation by the corporation.

I have had nothing to do with the negotiations further than attending meetings of the sub-committee of council and the corporation last year. Any negotiations from that time on have been carried on by Mr. Carvell, and I am informed that the corporation and Mr. Carvell decided on this agreement, as a result of which I am now submitting this legislation.

Hon. Mr. FIELDING: Whatever may be the merits of other features of the resolution, there ought to be no objection, I should think, to that clause which abolishes exemption from taxation. There never was any good reason why the civil servants of Ottawa should be exempt, while the civil

servants of Hull were obliged to pay income taxes. I am aware that it was a privilege granted the civil servants of Ottawa many years ago, and sometimes these ancient rights and privileges continue in existence for a long time. My hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Fripp) may be right in saying that the abolition of this exemption should be a reason why the Government should consider the question of better salaries for the civil service. But I am one of those who never could see any reason in days gone by why we should give exemption to the civil servants of Ottawa in regard to income taxation while others were denied the privilege. The civil servants of Ottawa should be on the same footing as other civil servants in this respect and pay their taxes like any other citizens.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Did I understand the hon. member for Ottawa to say that he regarded the withdrawal of this right of exemption from taxation as constituting the bargain between the Government and the city harder as respects the city?

Mr. FRIPP: I say that the city is evidently taking the position that they will exact their rights from the civil servants in the matter of income taxation because they are forced to do so. That, I assume, is the contention. But what I say is that if the Government of Canada, instead of paying the city $75,000 a year, paid them $100,000, probably the city would not be anxious to insist on exacting income taxes from the civil servants, and the matter would really be evened up.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would point out that the Government, as a matter of fact, is increasing the annual payment to the city from $15,000 to $75,000, and is also increasing the annual payment to the Ottawa Improvement Commission from $100,000 to $150,000, besides permitting the city to exact income taxation from the civil servants. If there is any hard bargain anywhere, it would appear to be so far as the civil servants in Ottawa are concerned.

Mr. REID: I cannot agree with the hon. member that there is any hard bargain on the civil servants, who are being classified to-day so that they may receive salaries on a fair proportion to other workers throughout the city who are filling positions of a similar character. If other citizens who are doing similar work to that of the civil servants are made to pay income taxes, there can be no reason why the civil servants should not also pay taxes. I do not see why in the city of Ottawa the Government should virtually pay the income taxes of civil servants and not do the same in Toronto, Montreal, Halifax and every other city throughout the Dominion. To be logical we should bring in a Bill providing for the payment of the income taxes of all other civil servants in the country, if there is any reason in the civil servants of Ottawa being exempt from taxation. I agree with the hon. member (Mr. Fielding) that the civil servants should pay their taxes the same as any other class of citizens.

Mr. McKENZIE: Can the minister inform us as to what the law is in Ontario in regard to exemption from income taxation? I believe a man is entitled to vote on his salary, and when the assessor comes around he exempts eight hundred dollars, taxing the rest.

Mr. REID: I cannot give the information offhand. The municipalities are entitled to collect on income tax. In some provinces there are provincial but not municipal taxes on income, while in others there are provincial, municipal and Dominion taxes. When the Bill is introduced I will endeavour to have a statement submitted showing the law as it stands in each of the nine provinces.

Mr. FIELDING: There is a phase of this question which we shall soon have to face. I am not taking any exception to liberal treatment of the Ottawa Improvement Commission. I had the pleasure of introducing the first legislation under which it was created, and as it has done excellent work I should like to see it continued and liberally aided. After all, Ottawa is the capital of Canada, by reason of which position it has some claims which perhaps do not correspond with the claims of other cities. Unfortunately, however—I suppose this is inevitable—the very fact that we have been recently considering Ottawa's claim and proposing to give larger allowances to this city has attracted notice throughout the country, and many of our cities and towns are beginning to raise the question why they should not get something out of the Dominion Treasury. I think there was a deputation waited upon the minister a short time ago from an eastern city on the subject. The railway companies own property on which taxation is paid to the municipalities. When that property is acquired by the Government

of Canada—we are dodging the issue just for the moment by keeping up the idea of a corporation—it ceases to be liable for taxation and out of that condition there has arisen a very considerable feeling amongst the cities and towns that the Government should do something for them, and the fact of this arrangement with Ottawa is used for an argument. I entirely concur in the desire of the Government to treat the city of Ottawa generously in the matter, but we need not ignore the fact that we have got to face this demand along with the other question.

Mr. McKENZIE: I notice that in the agreement we are charged for the sprinkling of the Government parks and part of Wellington street. We are furnishing a large amount of money wherewith to beautify the city and provide it with fine parks and I think it is a small thing to charge us for the water used in sprinkling those parks. It is a great advantage to the city of Ottawa to have the officials and members of Parliament come here from year to year. I think that any city in Canada would be glad to make concessions to the Government providing the capital were established within its precincts, but the city of Ottawa seems to consider we should pay a license for coming here at all. It charges us with the small things which it does and which it might very easily itself contribute towards the comfort of Members of Parliament. The city should be a little more generous and not charge the Government for sprinkling these parks.

Mr. REID: I would not like it to go uncorrected that the city of Ottawa is charging us for the sprinkling of the streets as the hon. member suggests. The municipal council claims that the sum of $75,000 is not sufficient to pay for the fire protection, and the other services outside of that which the city performs, but we took the precaution to include in the agreement the sprinkling of water and any other work that might be done by the city. When I get a detailed statement I will be very glad to give further information.

Mr. McKENZIE: If the fire protection which the city is prepared to give is as capable, as efficient and as effective as was rendered when the Parliament Buildings were destroyed by fire we certainly should not pay a high rate for it.

Resolution reported.

Mr. REID thereupon introduced Bill No. 22 to Confirm an Agreement between His Majesty the King and the City of Ottawa which was read a first time.

CIVIL SERVICE SUPERANNUATION AND RETIREMENT ACT AMENDMENT.

On the motion of Sir Henry Drayton, Bill No. 17 to amend the Civil Service Superannuation and Retirement Act was read a second time, considered in committee, reported, read a third time, and passed.

On the motion of Sir George Foster the House proceeded to the consideration of the Order of Notices of Motion.

UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PAPERS.

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

For a copy of all correspondence between the Prime Minister of Canada and the Prime Minister of Great Britain under authority of a resolution of the Imperial War Cabinet of July 30, 1918.

PRIVATE BILL.

SECOND READING.

Bill No. 18 to incorporate the Canada Security Assurance Company.—Mr. Mowat.

On motion of Sir George Foster the House adjourned at 5.15 p.m.

Monday, March 22, 1920.

The House met at three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST READING.

Bill No. 23, to incorporate Canadian American Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Griesbach.

Bill No. 24, to incorporate The Pabos, Amqui and Edmundston Railway Company.—Mr. Pelletier.

Bill No. 25, respecting The Pacific Coast Fire Insurance Company. —Mr. Stevens.

Bill No. 26, respecting The Pacific Marine Insurance Company.—Mr. Stevens.

ESTIMATES FOR 1920-21.

A message from His Excellency the Administrator of the Government, transmitting estimates for the year ending March 31, 1921, was presented by Sir Henry Drayton (Minister of Finance), read by Mr. Speaker to the House, and referred to the Committee of Supply.

REPORTS AND PAPERS TABLED.

Annual report of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police for the year ended September 30, 1919.—Hon. Mr. Rowell.

Copy of all correspondence and agreements between the Government and any banks touching any payments to officers and men of the Canadian Expeditionary Force.—Rt. Hon. Mr. Sifton.

Cancellations of Orders in Council authorizing the payment of Separation Allowances.—Hon. Mr. Ballantyne.

FOOD AND DRUGS ACT.

Hon. NEWTON W. ROWELL (Minister of Health) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 27, respecting Food and Drugs.

An hon. MEMBER: Explain.

Mr. ROWELL: This is a revision and consolidation of the present Act relating to the adulteration of food and of the various amending Acts of the past ten years. One of the principal differences between the present Bill and the Acts already on the statute book is the distinction now sought to be drawn between the adulteration of food and misbranding which is not very clear in the present Act, the new Bill excludes fertilizers and cattle feeds. At present we have an Act respecting commercial feedings stuffs which deals with cattle feeds, but we also have certain provisions in the Adulteration Act relating to the same matter. These are eliminated from the Food and Drugs Bill and will be included in the new Commercial Feeding Stuffs Bill. The present Act contains certain special provisions relating to honey and maple syrup which gives a monopoly in the use of these words; these are eliminated from the present Bill and will be dealt with separately. This Bill also includes quite a number of changes in detail, the result of the experience gained in the administration of the law during the last twenty years. These will be explained when the Bill is in committee.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

MAPLE PRODUCTS ADULTERATION.

Hon. Mr. ROWELL (Minister of Health) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 28, respecting Maple Products.

An hon. MEMBER: Explain.

Mr. ROWELL: It is simply the re-enactment in a separate Bill of the clauses relating to maple products which are eliminated from the present Adulteration Act not being properly germane to such an Act.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

[The Speaker.]

HONEY ADULTERATION.

Hon. Mr. ROWELL (Minister of Health) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 29, respecting honey.

He said: This is simply the re-enactment of clauses relating to this matter which have been eliminated from the present Adulteration Act.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

THE FRANCHISE BILL.

On the Orders of the Day.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Leader of the Opposition): Before the Orders of the Day are called, Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Rt. Hon. the leader of the Government whether the Government contemplates bringing down any legislation respecting the franchise, other than that which is contained in the Bill before the House at the present time, and in particular whether the Government contemplates introducing either at this or at any subsequent session a Disfranchising Act.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am not prepared to say at the moment what may be added to the Bill that has been brought down.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Do I understand my right hon. friend to say that the Government is not contemplating any disfranchising Act?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am saying that at the present time we are not contemplating any. But I have not any right to pledge the Government that they will not introduce any additions to the present Franchise Bill.

CREDIT TO THE BELGIAN GOVERNMENT—THE P. BURNS COMPANY.

On the Orders of the Day.

Mr. WILLIAM D. EULER (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Government a question based on an article sent from Ottawa and published in the Toronto Globe on Saturday which states:

> Mr. P. Burns of Calgary is in Ottawa to see if a ten-million-dollar credit can be established for the Belgian Government, which desires to get that quantity of meat from him. On account of the situation in the West last year, as regards feed and grazing, many animals were sold by their owners, and the P. Burns Company has an exceptionally large stock of meat, the surplus of which Mr. Burns desires to export. As the Belgian Government is in a

better position than most of the European countries, there is a possibility that an exception may be made in this case to the decision of the Government that it is better to withdraw from the credit business as soon as possible.

I should like to ask whether any such application has been received from the Burns Company and whether the Government is considering the granting of such application.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, proposals have been made—I do not know whether they are proposals of the P. Burns Company, as a company, or of the Belgian Government—but proposals have been made which look towards assistance from the Canadian Government in the marketing of cattle. The matter has not been advanced in any degree at all one way or the other; the proposal not having yet gone far enough to determine exactly what it is.

FISCAL POLICY OF THE GOVERNMENT.

On the Orders of the Day.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): I should like to ask my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) a question based on a report appearing in the morning papers. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine (Mr. Ballantyne) is alleged to have stated that the fiscal policy of the Government will be brought down on the first of May—information which would usually be conveyed across the floor. I should like to ask the Minister of Finance whether my hon. friend the Minister of Marine gave the people of Montreal accurate information?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE (Minister of Marine): Probably it will be agreeable to the hon. member for Red Deer if I reply to his question. What appeared briefly in one of the Ottawa papers, and more fully in the Montreal Gazette, reports correctly a speech that I made, with this slight difference—not only slight, but it is also an important difference—I was speaking about the new general policy of the Government that the Prime Minister will bring down when he returns to his place in the House; but I did not refer to any new fiscal policy, although I had something to say on fiscal policy.

Mr. M. CLARK: Perhaps it is the old fiscal policy.

ROYAL CANADIAN NAVY—REPORTED DEMOBILIZATION.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Leader of the Opposition): The papers make mention of despatches from Esquimalt and Halifax indicating that the Minister of the Naval Service (Hon. Mr. Ballantyne) has issued orders having in view the demobilization of the Naval Forces of Canada. Has the minister any statement to make to the House on the subject? Have any orders been issued, and if so, what was the nature of them?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE (Minister of Naval Affairs): The article that appeared in the press this morning was wholly unauthorized. I will make a full statement to the House on Thursday next.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SCOTTISH CANADIAN ASSURANCE CORPORATION.

The House in Committee on Bill No. 9, to incorporate Scottish Canadian Assurance Corporation—Mr. Mowat—Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 3—Capital stock:

Mr. McKENZIE: The business of insurance is a very important one and the rights of policyholders should be safeguarded in every possible way. Insurance companies operating in Canada have been known to fail and to be unable to meet the claims made under policies which they had issued. I hope the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) will see that any companies empowered to carry on the business of insurance in Canada are sufficiently strong, and that those who take out policies with them are sufficiently protected.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: All the provisions of the law relating to these companies will be strictly enforced. Under those provisions security has to be placed in the hands of the department before license to carry on business is issued, and after those securities are so deposited the companies are subjected to strict inspection.

Section agreed to.

On section 4—amount to be subscribed:

Mr. CAHILL: What proportion of the subscription must be paid in cash before the company may start business?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am not in charge of the Bill, but if the hon. member will look at paragraph 7 he will see a provision that the company shall not commence the business of fire insurance until not less than $250,000 of the capital stock has been bona fide subscribed and not less than $100,000 paid thereon. There are other provisions setting forth the amount that has to be paid up before the business is undertaken.

Mr. CAHILL: That $250,000 is the amount which must be subscribed before the business of fire insurance may be undertaken. What is the proportion applicable to the carrying on of other kinds of insurance?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Section 7 goes on to provide the amounts for the other classes of business: accident insurance, $40,000; sickness insurance, $10,000; automobile insurance, $20,000; burglary insurance, $20,000; hail insurance, $50,000.

Mr. CAHILL: Then, what is the purpose of clause 4 providing that not less than $200,000 must be subscribed? What business can be undertaken by the company when that amount is subscribed, and what proportion of that amount must be paid in cash before any business can be undertaken?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Looking offhand at the section as drawn, I would say that apparently the fire insurance business is looked upon as the main business of the company, and that that business is not to be entered upon until $250,000 has been actually subscribed. Of course, it might be that the company would commence to carry on these other classes of insurance, and to provide for that the exact amounts of capital to be paid up in each case are specifically set out. The amount of $200,000 would be sufficient to cover any of these classes of insurance, excluding fire insurance.

Section agreed to.

On section 7—Commencing business:

Mr. BUREAU: Read the section, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: This is a Private Bill which has already been considered by a Committee. Is it the desire of this Committee that the clause be read?

Mr. BUREAU: Is it not the privilege of a member to ask the Chairman to read a clause of a Bill?

[Mr. Cahill.]

The CHAIRMAN: It is not the privilege of an hon. member. This can only be demanded by the Committee. The Chairman calls the number of each clause and reads the marginal note. He should read the clause at length only when it is demanded by the Committee. Bourinot at page 522 is very clear upon this point, and many such rulings have been given. Having stated the rule, the Chairman has no objection to read the clause if the hon. member insists.

Mr. BUREAU: I do insist, and I say that the privileges of members ought to be extended if they have not the right to ask that a clause in a Bill under consideration in Committee of the Whole be read by the Chairman, simply because the Bill has already been considered by another committee. If that is the case, it is high time the rules of the House were amended.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chairman has no objection.

The Chairman thereupon read section 7 of the Bill.

Mr. BUREAU: Do I understand that the basis of the business to be carried on under clause 6 is fire insurance? The company must raise so much money to be able to carry on fire insurance, and the fire insurance business must amount to so much before they can carry on sickness, burglary, automobile or other insurance; but the basic foundation is fire insurance.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think so. When I was asked a question by the hon. gentleman who first drew my attention to it, I think, perhaps, he did not read section 4 aright and I had not read it. Section 4, the hon. gentleman will see, refers to the amount of capital stock to be subscribed before the general meeting for the election of the directors is called. That is the initial step in the formation of the company. That general meeting having been called and the stock having been subscribed, before the company commences to carry on the business of fire insurance, capital stock to the extent of $250,000 has to be subscribed and not less than $100,000 must be paid in cash thereon. That having been done, that being the first step, as the hon. member very properly points out, these other activities will be carried on provided that the financial status of the company is increased in the manner indicated in this clause.

Mr. BUREAU: The capital with the surplus?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The available assets of the company, its strength.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

THE TRUST AND LOAN COMPANY OF CANADA.

The House in committee on Bill No. 10, respecting the Trust and Loan Company of Canada.

On section 1—short title.

Mr. BUREAU: Has the Bill been before the Committee on Banking and Commerce?

Mr. SHEARD: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: Then we might get a synopsis of it from the chairman of that committee, so that we may see what changes, if any, have been made.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The hon. memmer for London is in charge of the Bill and is, I think, familiar with it.

Mr. CRONYN: This Bill stands in my name, although I have no personal interest in the company in question; in fact, it is a rival of the company of which I am manager. That, however, makes no difference to my attitude to the Bill, and as what the company is asking seems to be perfectly reasonable and within its proper competence, I am glad to support the Bill. The Trust and Loan Company of Canada, the oldest mortgage company in Canada, chartered originally in 1843, has three classes of stocks, one class on which £5 have been paid on a £20 share; that is the main body of the stock; a second class on which £3 have been paid on each £20 share, and a third class on which £1 has been paid. Hon. members will at once see that this makes three classes of stockholders because the liability of the unpaid stock varies in each of the three classes. That results in a difference in price and the various classes of stocks sell on the market at different prices. This also results in this anomaly, that the shareholder who has paid only £1 per share has the same voting right as the man who has paid £5 per share.

Mr. BUREAU: He has a larger liability.

Mr. CRONYN: He certainly has. The company makes these proposals. The directors are first calling up enough on the two lower classes of stocks to make all the stocks £5 paid. They have now £600,000 of paid up capital; they call up another £150,000 making their paid up capital £750,000. They have £600,000 of reserve, a reserve which equals their present paid up capital of £600,000. They purpose converting that reserve into paid up capital; giving each of their shareholders, who will then all stand on the same basis of their stock being £5 paid, for each £5 share, 12 shares with 15 shillings paid on each, or £9 in all. All shareholders will then be on an equality as to unpaid calls because the new shares will be £2 each and will have 15 shillings paid on each with an uncalled liability of 25 shillings. One curious feature of this company is that under its charter the directors are compelled to set aside out of the profits over 6 per cent, one-half of the surplus towards building up a reserve fund until that reserve fund reaches 100 per cent of the capital. As I pointed out, the present paid up capital is £600,000 and the reserve fund is also £600,000, so that the directors are free to-day to distribute all the profits among the shareholders. Once this Bill goes through, the reserve fund will be reduced to a very small fraction, and the company will thereafter be compelled to set aside out of the profits over 6 per cent, one-half of the surplus towards building up another reserve fund until it in turn equals the paid up capital. That is, I think, as far as I need go in explanation. If there are any questions which hon. members wish to ask and it is within my competence to answer them, I shall be only too glad to do so.

Mr. BUREAU: I never looked at the charter of the Trust and Loan Company. Did I understand my hon. friend to say that when the reserve fund is equal to or exceeds the amount of the paid up stock, this same reserve fund may be distributed amongst the stockholders?

Mr. CRONYN: No. Perhaps I expressed myself wrongly. Until the reserve fund reached 100 per cent of the paid up capital or, as the hon. member puts it, equals the paid up capital, the company must set aside one-half of its profits over 6 per cent, towards building up the reserve fund. Once the reserve fund is built up, the company can distribute its entire profits amongst the shareholders.

Mr. BUREAU: The reserve remains?

Mr. CRONYN: Yes in the form of paid up capital.

Mr. CAHILL: I understand that instead of distributing in dividends a portion of the

surplus which may have been earned in the last two or three years, the Bill purposes distributing paid up stock. In what way does that affect the income tax of Canada?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am afraid it does not affect the income tax much, one way or the other. In Canada we tax Canadian incomes; we tax the incomes of those people who are ordinarily resident in Canada or who carry on business in Canada. I think that practically all the shareholders in this company are people who reside in the Mother Country, and as such are not taxable.

Mr. CAHILL: That is, the business being carried on is taxable only so far as the people who own the funds are resident in Canada.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Their personal taxes will not be changed at all one way or the other. As to whether this company is liable for any excess business profits' tax, I am not in a position to inform the hon. member, because that has not been looked into.

Mr. CAHILL: If the company were liable under the Excess Business Profits' Tax Act, would the fact of the company distributing paid-up stock instead of distributing the earnings in cash, affect the Government's power to collect the excess business profits' tax.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I don't think it would affect it at all. The transfer of reserve to capital stock would not affect the amount of capital upon which the business tax would be computed.

Mr. CAHILL: No matter how the profits were distributed?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No. Otherwise the hon. gentleman will see that the profits could easily be dissipated and the tax evaded?

Mr. MORPHY: Has this matter been before the shareholders, and if so, have they unanimously assented to the legislation? Secondly, if this becomes law, will any of the poorer classes of shareholders suffer by being what is commonly called "frozen out."

Mr. CRONYN: There were meetings called of the shareholders and debenture holders, which were very largely attended. There is an affidavit on file which was produced before the Banking and Commerce Committee proving that the necessary resolutions confirming what this Bill seeks to carry out, were unanimously agreed to without any objection, so I am informed.

Mr. GOULD: With respect to the Income tax, I understand that the Imperial Government requires all residents in this country who are in receipt of revenue from the Old Country, to make a return. Could not this legislation be made retroactive, empowering the Government to demand a return from residents of other countries who are recipients of funds from Canada?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That whole question is under consideration. We are not satisfied with the present position. Whether we shall be able to remedy it or not is another question.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—REPORTED.

Bill No. 7, to incorporate The T. Eaton General Insurance Company.—Mr. Mowat.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

MR. GEORGE CARVILL.

Mr. COPP:

1. Is Mr. George Carvill in the employ of the Canadian National Railways?
2. If not, was he dismissed from the service?
3. If dismissed, what was the cause and date of such dismissal and who ordered same?
4. Did said Mr. Carvill ask for an investigation into the cause of his dismissal?
5. If so, was such request granted? If not, why?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. No.
2. Yes.
3. Mr. Carvill was dismissed April 30, 1917, for general incompetency by the management.
4. Yes.
5. Request for investigation was received. The management investigated the case and from evidence submitted it was not considered necessary to re-open it.

TRENT CANAL WHARVES.

Mr. BURNHAM:

What will the Government do regarding the superintendence and upkeep of the Trent canal wharves between lock seven and Rice lake, in view of the statement by the then Minister of Railways and Canals recorded on page 759 of Hansard, Vol. 1, 1917?

Hon. Mr. REID: Wharves situated on road allowances where these intersect the

navigable channel have, when considered of sufficient public importance, been repaired by the Department of Railways and Canals. No repairs have been made to those wharves which are situated on privately owned lands.

COST OF GENERAL ELECTIONS.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

What was the total cost of the general election of 1896, and of each general election subsequently held in the Dominion of Canada?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: 1896, $197,103.35; 1900, $232,911.20; 1904, $307,995.60; 1908, $391,960.32; 1911, $507,353.55; 1917, $1,678,-139.99. The latter amount includes expenses of taking the soldiers' vote and the cost of enumeration of voters' lists.

STEAMER A. J. McKEE.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. On what date was the steamer A. J. McKee purchased by the Government?
2. From whom was the steamer purchased, and at what price?
3. What is her net and D.W. tonnage?
4. How much has been expended on repairs and refitting of this vessel since the date of her purchase?
5. What trade is she engaged in at present?
6. What is her net earnings from the date of purchase up to the date of last voyage in which the accounts have been adjusted?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. April 18, 1917.
2. Purchased from Algoma Steel Corporation. Purchase price, $500,000.
3. Net, 1,373 tons; dead weight, 3,000 tons (approx.)
4. $342,660.
5. St. John-West Indies.
6. There has been a deficit of $269,354 to 31st December, 1919, on account of serious damage sustained through the Halifax explosion, and also on account of vessel running aground at New York. The vessel being uninsured at that time, repairs were largely charged to operating expenses.

GASPE STEAMSHIP SERVICE.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure):

1. Has the Government given any thought to putting in some of its own steamers on the Montreal-Quebec-Gaspé route and on the Campbellton-Gaspé route in lieu of the steamers subsidized in the past?
2. Is the Government aware that the residents of Matane, Gaspé and Bonaventure counties have to rely on sailing craft to transact their business as in the old days?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1. No.
2. The Government has no special information. There may be some cases of the kind.

MATAPEDIA FREIGHT TRAFFIC.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure):

What has been the amount of freight business done at the railway station of Matapedia, Quebec, in dollars and tons during the last five years as compared with the previous five year period?

Hon. Mr. REID:

For the five year period ending December 31, 1914, the freight business was as follows:

Outward freight	119,990 tons
Earnings	$274,294.04
Inward freight	119,319 tons
Earnings	$334,570.67

For the five year period ending December 31, 1919, the freight business was as follows:

Outward freight	392,939 tons
Earnings	$951,022.61
Inward freight	365,600 tons
Earnings	$1,030,916.36

BONAVENTURE AND GASPE COUNTIES DAIRY AND FISH SHIPMENTS.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure):

1. Are any arrangements contemplated for the coming season to assist in the shipping of fresh fish, butter and cheese in cold storage cars from the counties of Bonaventure and Gaspé?
2. If so, what are they?

Hon. Mr. TOLMIE:

1. and 2.—The Dairy and Cold Storage Branch of the Department of Agriculture has arranged for several years for a weekly iced butter car service to operate over the Qubec Oriental Railway from Bonaventure to Matapedia, where it is transferred to the Canadian National Railway. It is intended to continue this service during the season of 1920.

The Department of Agriculture has never arranged for iced cars for the shipping of fresh fish and does not know of any proposal that it should be done this year.

PUBLIC WORKS EMPLOYEES.

Mr. MACKIE (Edmonton):

1. Could any of the employees in the Architectural and Engineering Branches of the Public Works Department be dispensed with?
2. If so, how many?
3. Could the services of any of the said employees have been dispensed with some time ago without hampering the work of said branches?

4. If so, from what date?
5. What is the annual cost of keeping said employees in the service?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Yes.
2. The number of employees who could be dispensed with depends entirely on the amount of work which the Department of Public Works is authorized to carry out during the year 1920, and this again is directly related to the extent of the appropriations granted to the department at this session of Parliament, as the volume of work varies from year to year.
3. Yes.
4. From the beginning of the year 1917.
5. Answered by No. 2.

MILITARY HOSPITAL, ST. ANNE, QUEBEC.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. Has the Government a large soldiers' hospital at St. Anne, Quebec?
2. If so, how much land in connection with said hospital cost and what has been the cost of erecting the buildings and equipment?
3. Does the Government own the land upon which the said hospital is erected?
4. If not, for how long has the land been leased and on what terms?
5. In what condition has the land to be returned to its owners?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Yes.
2. Cost of buildings and equipment to 31st December, 1919, is $1,581,682.40.
3, 4 and 5. The hospital buildings are erected on land leased by the Royal Institution for the Advancement of Learning (Macdonald College), for a period of two years after the war, not to exceed seven years in all. At the expiration of that time, the owners have the right to acquire the buildings and equipment, or portions thereof, at a valuation to be agreed upon, otherwise the buildings are to be removed by the Government and the site restored to its original condition.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAY.

*Mr. SEXSMITH:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to operate the Canadian National railways on standard time during the next summer?
2. If so, will they compel the private owned railways to use the same time?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. It has not yet been decided whether or not the Canadian National railways will operate under standard time this summer.
2. All railways will of necessity use the same time.

[Mr. H. A. Mackie.]

REDEMPTION OF DOMINION NOTES.

*Mr. TOBIN:

1. Are Dominion notes redeemable in gold?
2. If not, in virtue of what law can the Government refuse to carry out the obligation which it assumed when the notes were issued?
3. When will the Government be in a position to pay gold for the notes which are tendered for redemption?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1 and 2. Under the Finance Act the redemption of Dominion notes in gold has been suspended.
3. Dominion notes are issued under statutory authority which requires a certain percentage of gold to be held as security. The gold held has been at all times considerably in excess of the required amount. The redemption of Dominion notes in gold will be resumed at the first practical opportunity, due regard being had to the interests of the country.

CAMPBELLTON-GASPE STEAMER SERVICE.

Mr. Marcil (Bonaventure):

Owing to the refusal of the Government to grant a subsidy for a steamship service between Campbellton, N.B., and Gaspé, Quebec, is the Government prepared to offer a subsidy of $3,000 for a steamship service between Dalhousie, N.B., St. Omer and Carleton, Quebec?

Rt. Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The answer is in the negative.

CHARLEVOIX-MONTMORENCY CUSTOMS COLLECTIONS.

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. What amount has been collected each year by the Customs Department through its offices in the County of Charlevoix-Montmorency, within the last five years?
2. What was the amount collected through the same offices for the five years immediately preceding the war?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. 1914-15, $1,595.24; 1915-16, $2,392.44; 1916-17, $1,947.89; 1917-18, $4,956.24; 1918-19, $5,419.24.
2. 1909-10, $814.83; 1910-11, $1,001.72; 1911-12, $2,027.56; 1912-13, $1,876.24; 1913-14, $1,724.90.

NEWSPRINT CONTROL.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to introduce at this session an Act in regard to the control of papers and newsprint?
2. If so, has the Government engaged one Mr. Biggar, K.C., to prepare such legislation?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The question of newsprint control is now before the

Supreme Court, and the Government cannot very well consider what action it should take until a decision has been rendered by that court.

RESIGNATION OF MR. R. A. PRINGLE, K.C.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Why has Mr. R. A. Pringle, K.C., resigned as Commissioner and Paper Controller?
2. Why has Mr. R. W. Breadner also resigned as Paper Controller?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. Mr. Pringle in his letter of resignation made the following statement:—

"I am afraid I will have to ask you to relieve me from the distribution of newsprint. I may say that for the last two or three months the matter has been most troublesome and has been taking my whole time. Some of the manufacturers, as you are aware, are refusing to comply with my orders, which will necessitate drastic action being taken. My staff is limited and the work is becoming very burdensome. You have other departments of the Government under which this distribution could probably be better carried on, and orders enforced."

2. Mr. Breadner was appointed controller only temporarily pending other arrangements and particularly to deal with the Fort Frances Pulp and Paper Company question.

CANADA'S CONTRIBUTION TO LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

Out of what appropriation was the sum of $64,043.15 paid on February 13 as Canada's contribution to the expense of the League of Nations?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL: It was paid out of the Demobilization Vote.

RURAL CREDITS IN CANADA.

Mr. ROSS:

1. Has the Government considered, since the signing of the armistice, the introduction of legislation to permit of the organization of a system of rural credits in Canada?
2. If so, when does it intend to introduce such legislation?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: 1 and 2. The subject is under consideration; due notice will be given if any such legislation contemplated.

QUEBEC-SAGUENAY RAILWAY FREIGHT RATES.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Is the Government aware that the freight rates prevailing on the Quebec and Saguenay railway by far exceed those in force upon other railways in Canada?
2. If so, what is the reason for this condition of affairs?
3. By whom were these rates made and authorized to be put in force?
4. Is it the intention of the Government to reduce said rates to conform with rates on other roads?
5. If so, when? If not, why?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Local class rates on the Quebec and Saguenay railway are not higher than those on other roads. These rates were fixed by traffic officials of the Canadian National railways.

2, 3, 4 and 5. Answered by No. 1.

WHARF REPAIRS IN CHARLEVOIX-MONTMORENCY.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Are urgent repairs necessary to the following wharves in the county of Charlevoix-Montmorency, in the province of Quebec: Baie St. Paul, Ile au Coudres, Les Eboulements, St. Irenee, Murray Bay, Cap a l'Aigle, St. Fidele, St. Simeon and Ste. Anne de Beaupre?
2. If so, has the Government made any provision in the Estimates to be submitted this session to cover these repairs?
3. What are the amounts appropriated for each of these wharves?
4. When will the said repairs be commenced?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Repairs are required at all wharfs mentioned except St. Fidele.

2, 3 and 4. Information will be given when the Estimates are laid before Parliament.

RAILWAY CHARTER FOR TEMISCOUATA.

Mr. FAFARD:

1. Has the Government, within the last few years, granted a charter for the construction of a railway between St. Camille, county of Bellechasse, and Cabano, county of Temiscouata? If so, on what date?
2. Has the Government granted any subsidies in this connection?
3. Have all the sudsidies been granted or part of them only?
4. If not, why?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. No.
2. Yes.
3. Part only.
4. Subsidies have lapsed.

SUPERANNUATED RAILWAY EMPLOYEES.

*Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Is the Government aware that the old superannuated employees of the I.C.R. are receiving inadequate pension and not at all in relation with the cost of living?

2. If so, is the Department of Railways ready to grant them an annual bonus similar to the one granted to civil servants?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. The matter of increased pensions for employees of the Intercolonial Railway cannot be dealt with until a final scheme is decided upon, which will be uniform on the whole Canadian National Railway system.

2. No.

JOSEPH DUPONT.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Is Joseph Dumont (should read Dupont), of St. Roch des-Aulnaies, county of l'Islet, still employed by the Government as customs or excise officer or in any other capacity?

2. If so, why has he been appointed and what are the duties he performed at that place?

3. What is his salary?

4. What amount has he collected during the past five years?

5. What is the date of his appointment?

6. Does he make reports. If so, how many?

7. Does the Government consider that in the public interest it is necessary to maintain this employee?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. Not now employed.

2. As Preventive Officer, Excise Service.

3. Was $200 per annum.

4. Nil.

5. Was appointed on August 15, 1912, and services dispensed with on February 1, 1918.

6. Has made reports. Four.

7. Answered by No. 1.

IMPORTATION OF WHEAT IN 1919.

Mr. MICHAUD:

1. How many bushels of wheat were imported to Canada from the United States during the year 1919?

2. How much duty was collected on wheat imported from the United States during the year 1919?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. 69,714 bushels.

2. Nil.

NECESSARY PUBLIC WORKS IN QUEBEC.

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Has the Government received any communication regarding certain public works needed at the following places in the province of Quebec: Petite Rivière St. François, Murray Bay (St. Etiennne de la Malbaie), St. Fidele, St. Siméon, Ile-au-Coudres, Point-au-Pic, Port-au-Persil, Baie des Rochers, in the county of Charlevoix; and Ste. Anne de Beaupré, in the county of Montmorency?

2. If so, what is the decision of the Government regarding the advisability of proceeding with the said works?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Yes, for Petite Rivière St. François, St. Etienne de la Malbaie, St. Fidèle, St. Siméon, Ile au Coudres, Pointe au Pic and Ste. Anne de Beaupré; no for port au Persil and Baie des Rochers.

2. Information will be given when Estimates are laid before Parliament.

HOUSE OF COMMONS STAFF: REORGANIZATION.

Mr. VERVILLE:

1. Has the re-classification or re-organization of the House of Commons staff been proceeded with since the last session?

2. If so, is it complete or at what stage is it now?

3. Is it the intention to submit said re-classification to the House for its approval during the present Session?

4. Is is the intention to provide at the same time for the placing on the retiring list of officials of the House who have passed a certain age and who, for that reason may not be able to fulfil their duties as effectively as required?

Mr. SPEAKER: The answer to the first question is "yes;" to the second, "nearing completion." To the third question, "yes;" to the fourth question, "under consideration."

GRAND TRUNK STOCK.

Mr. CALDWELL:

1. What were the different classes of the Grand Trunk Railway Company's stock quoted at in January, 1918, as regards, First Preference Stock five per cent; Second Preference Stock five per cent; Third Preference Stock four per cent; Ordinary or Common Stock; Five per cent Grand Trunk Debenture Stocks; Five per cent Great Western Debenture Stocks; Four per cent Grand Trunk Debenture Stocks; Four per cent Northern Debenture Stock?

2. What were the same stocks quoted at in January, 1919, and January, 1920?

3. Has any of the stock of the Grand Trunk Railway Company been sold or changed hands since January, 1918?

4. If so, who were the purchasers of it, what was the date of purchase or transfer, and what was the price paid?

5. Has any member of the present Government ever held any of the stock of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, either personally or by proxy through any other person?

6. If so, what are the names of said members, what amount of stock was so acquired, on what date and on what terms?

Rt. Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER: In regard to numbers 5 and 6 of this question, Mr. Speaker, I may say promptly that no present member of the Government ever held any of the stock of the Grand Trunk Railway Company either personally or by proxy, or through any other medium.

LOTBINIERE AND MEGANTIC RAILWAY.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Has the Government any knowledge of a railway called the Lotbiniere and Megantic?

2. If so, where is the said railway located?

3. Who now owns and operates the said road?
4. Has the Government any interest therein?
5. If so, to what extent?
6. When was the said interest acquired?
7. By what legislation or Order in Council, if any?
8. What was the date of said legislation or Order in Council?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Yes.
2. From Lyster to St. Jean des Chaillons, P.Q.
3. The company.
4, 5, 6, 7 and 8. An Order in Council dated December 1, 1919, gives authority for the purchase of this railway, but the transfer has not yet been made.

PURCHASE OF GOVERNMENT SUPPLIES.

Mr. STEVENS:

1. In what manner is the purchasing of supplies for the various Governmental departments now carried out?
2. Is the War Purchasing Commission still operating?
3. If so, who are the members of the said Commission?
4. Is it the intention of the Government to introduce a Bill this session to organize the Purchasing Commission on a permanent basis?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The purchasing of supplies for the various governmental departments has been carried out by the War Purchasing Commission which is still in operation. The members of the commission are Sir Hormisdas Laporte, Mr. Brown and Mr. Lecky. The Government will make known its intention when it has come to a conclusion on the matter.

RURAL MAIL CARRIERS.

Mr. DEMERS:

1. Has the Government received petitions, or have any representations been made to, concerning the rural mail carriers employed by contracts previous to 1918?
2. Has the Government realized that, owing to the abnormal increase of prices on all things since the awarding of these contracts, the services of these mail carriers are not sufficiently remunerated?
3. Does the Government intend to take into account these exceptional conditions created since the awarding of these contracts, and act accordingly?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. Yes.
2. and 3. In dealing with applications from rural mail carriers for increased remuneration or for release from their contractual obligations full consideration is invariably given to the increase in operating expenses, and whenever it can be shown that a mail carrier entered into his contract at a time when it was impossible to foresee the abnormal rise in the cost of necessities and that he is consequently fulfilling the terms of his contract at a financial loss through no fault of his own, steps are taken to invite public tenders for a new contract which when completed leads to the release of the old contractor.

This is the full extent to which the Government can go as under the terms of the Post Office Act no additional remuneration may be given to a mail contractor in excess of his contract rate unless it can be shown that additional equipment and carriers are necessary to properly perform the work or unless there has been an increase in the frequency of the service, or distance travelled.

CITY MAIL DELIVERIES IN QUEBEC.

Mr. DEMERS:

What are the cities and towns of the Province of Quebec in which the city mail delivery has been established?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL: Montreal, Quebec, Three Rivers, Sherbrooke, St. Hyacinthe, Shawenegan Falls, Hull.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. Fafard:

For a copy of all documents, letters, telegrams and other correspondence in the hands of the Government concerning the proposed railway between St. Camille, County of Bellechasse, and Cabano, County of Temiscouata.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. ROSS:

1. How many chartered banks were there in Canada in 1880?
2. How many chartered banks are there in Canada at the present time?
3. What profits, as shown by their annual statements, were made by each of the chartered banks in the years 1911, 1912, 1913, 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917, 1918 and 1919?
4. What taxes did each pay to the Federal Treasury in each of the above years?
5. What amount, not being interest on money borrowed, did the Federal Government pay to each chartered bank in each of the years 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917, 1918 and 1919, for service rendered?
6. What is the paid-up capital of each bank, and what is its reserve?

Mr. ROSS:

1. What number of automobiles valued under $1,000 were imported into Canada in each of the years 1918 and 1919?
2. What number valued at between $1,000 and $2,000?
3. What number at a greater valuation than $2,000?
4. What was the duty collected on these automobiles?

5. What was the duty collected on parts of automobiles imported during the years 1918 and 1919?

6. On what number of automobiles valued at less than $1,000 was excise duty paid in the years 1918 and 1919?

7. On what number of automobiles valued at between $1,000 and $2,000 was excise duty paid in the same years?

8. On what number of automobiles valued at over $2,000 was excise duty paid in the same years?

9. What was the amount of such excise duty?

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. How many investigations were held by the Board of Commerce since its formation?

2. Where were they held?

3. How many orders or decisions were given by the said board?

4. What affect did these decisions or orders have on the high cost of living?

5. How many sentences and fines were imposed and what are the names of the parties so sentenced or fined?

6. What has been the cost of the investigations and proceedings of the board to date?

7. Did the board retain the services of experts to help it in the discharge of its duties?

8. If so, what are the names of said experts and where do they reside?

9. How much has been paid to each of them?

10. Are they still in the employ of the board?

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. What are the names of the tenderers for the works to be done at the following places in the county of Montmorency, Quebec: Ste. Anne de Beaupre, Ste. Famille-Ile d'Orleans, St. Francois du Sud-Ile-d'Orleans, St. Jean-Isle d'Orleans, Ile de la Quarantine, Pointe aux Trembles?

2. Where do they reside?

3. What was the amount of each tender?

4. Who were the successful tenderers?

5. Have the said works been started?

6. When will they be completed?

Mr. KENNEDY:

What was the number of persons or corporations paying and the aggregate amount paid by each group by way of Dominion income tax in the city of Toronto during the fiscal years 1917 and 1918, whose assessed income was over $1,500, $6,000, $10,000, $20,000, $30,000, $50,000, $100.000?

*Mr. PARENT:

1. What was the total amount of the gross consolidated debt of Canada on the 28th of February, 1920?.

2. What was the total amount of the net consolidated debt of Canada on the same date?

3. What was the total amount of the assets of the consolidated debt of Canada on the said date?

4. What was the total amount of the yearly interest payable on the gross consolidated debt of Canada on the said date?

5. What was the total amount of yearly interest or revenue received or collected by Canada in respect to the property or securities constituting the assets of the public debt?

6. What was the total amount of the floating debt of Canada on the 28th of February, 1920?

7. What was the total amount of yearly interest payable on the floating debt of Canada on the said date?

[Mr. Ross.]

*Mr. TOBIN:

1. How many employees are there in the Inside Service of the Finance Department including the Insurance Branch?

2. How many are males?

3. How many are females?

4. How many males are French?

5. How many females are French?

6. How many males are Protestants?

7. How many females are Protestants?

CIVIL SERVICE RE-CLASSIFICATION.

Mr. J. A. C. ETHIER (Laval-Two Mountains) moved:

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams and reports relating to the re-classification of the Civil Service by American efficiency experts in the employ of the Arthur Young Company; also all documents relating thereto, which have been submitted to, and received by the Civil Service Commission and comprising: (a) a list of names who, in consequence of such re-classification and subsequently thereto, resigned from the service; (b) the reasons given in support of such resignations, and (c) the nature of the duties of each person who resigned.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There would be no objection to the passage of that with this observation, that the call made in the first part of the resolution would necessitate the employment of an army of clerks—I do not know how large. What the purpose of gathering that vast, desultory correspondence from all parts of the Dominion would be I cannot say. To the main parts of the motion (a), (b) and (c), the Government has no objection and with this observation I have no objection to the motion passing.

Mr. BUREAU: Are these the same people who made the classification for the state of New York?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think they are the same company.

Mr. SPEAKER: Motion stands.

EXPORT BUTTER AND CHEESE.

MOTION BY MR. EDWARDS FOR STANDARDIZATION AND GRADING.

Mr. JOHN W. EDWARDS (Frontenac) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the dairy farmers of Canada are annually suffering great loss through the lack of systematic grading of their products, and whereas it is desirable that a system of grading of butter and cheese should be established to the end that Canada may successfully compete in foreign markets, the Government of Canada, should, as soon as possible, take whatever steps are necessary to standardize and grade Canadian butter and cheese intended for export.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I might preface my remarks or argument in connection with

this resolution by stating that from the standpoint of the value of dairy products the banner county of the Dominion of Canada is the county of Oxford. From the standpoint of the value of the cheese products of Canada, the county which I have the honour to represent stands fourth in the list, being beaten in the order named by Leeds, Hastings and Dundas. I want to place some figures before this House this afternoon with the view of trying to impress upon it, and especially upon those members who come from city constituencies, the importance of the dairy industry to the future well being of this Dominion. If any hon. member were presenting an argument in favour of some manufacturing establishment in one of our large centres of population, he would no doubt call attention to the amount of capital invested in Canada, the wages paid, the time spent in the production of the article, and so on.

May I invite the attention of hon. members—and again I say particularly members from city constituencies—to a few figures which I shall place on Hansard with a view to impressing on the members of this House the importance of the dairy industry. The number of milch cows in the Dominion of Canada in 1917, as estimated in a report which I have here, is 3,564,075. The value of these milch cows, at an average of $100 each, which I think is a very low estimate to place upon them, would be $356,407,500. I say I consider a value of $100 is low because I have noticed in any sales which have taken place in my county for the last two or three years that the average amount paid for cows is more nearly $125 or $150 than $100, but putting it at $100, we have for the value of the cows alone the figure which I have given. Mr. Speaker, I ask your consideration to these further facts. If we allow seven and a half minutes for the milking of a cow—and if I may be permitted the expression I think that is going some—there would be an average of fifteen minutes a day spent in the operation of milking each cow, which amounts to 891,018 hours employed eve.y day in Canada in that operation. If we place a value on the time of those engaged at only 20 cents an hour, or at a rate of $2 a day for a 10 hour day—and I am surely placing the rate very low—it would represent an outlay of $178,203 for each day for that operation alone. If we take 30 days to the month for 8 months only—the factory season—the cost of milking would amount to $42,768,720. If we assign to each milker the task of milking eight cows, it means that an army of 445,509 persons performed this work twice a day for at least 8 months of the year. I have given those figures—and I do not think they can be challenged—with the view of impressing upon hon. members the importance of this industry. I need not argue that if any gentleman could come before this House representing any industry with a capital of over $300,000,000 and an outlay of over $42,000,000 for only a part of the operation of producing that one article, and giving employment to over 400,000 people he would have a right to the attention and consideration of every hon. member.

4 p.m.

But many other things besides those I have mentioned are fairly chargeable to the cost of producing butter and cheese. A portion of the value of the land and buildings should be charged to capital investment. Then there is the cutting and the storing of feed, the care of the animals, and the conveying of the milk to the factories and creameries—all of which represent an enormous investment and a very considerable expenditure of time, labour and skill.

We had in 1917—and I suppose the figures are about the same now—949 creameries patronized by 139,032 patrons; 1,900 cheese factories with 67,030 patrons; 549 combined butter and cheese factories with 38,344 patrons; or in all 3,398 of these establishments with 244,406 patrons. The capital invested amounted to $19,628,000; the number of persons employed 10,391; the amount paid in salaries and wages $5,447,346. The total amount paid to patrons in one year, 1917, was $73,863,845; the amount expended for fuel $834,036; for wages $5,447,346; for materials $3,844,699, and for miscellaneous expenditure $2,498,334, or a total expenditure of $86,488,260.

In 1917 these factories produced 87,526,939 pounds of butter, valued at $34,274,218; 194,904,336 pounds of cheese valued at $41,180,623; and other products worth $18,424,485, or a total value of $93,879,326.

The dairy industry has been developed in all parts of the country, especially the butter-making branch of it. In 1900 the amount of butter produced was 36,066,739 pounds, valued at $7,240,972; in 1917, it amounted to 87,526,939 pounds, valued at $34,274,218. The quantity of cheese made in 1900 amounted to 220,833,269 pounds, valued at $22,221,430; in 1917, 194,904,336 pounds was manufactured, valued at $41,180,623. So although the quantity of cheese in 1917 was

less than in 1900, the value was practically double.

I wish now to draw the attention of the House to the graded cheese made in 1917, and I refer particularly to the cheese produced by the three principal provinces, Ontario, Quebec and Prince Edward Island. Ontario produced 1,087,000 boxes; Quebec 755,000 boxes; Prince Edward Island over 17,000 boxes. What I wish to particularly call attention to, Mr. Speaker, is that 93.38 per cent of the cheese made in Ontario graded No. 1, 6.42 per cent graded No. 2, and .20 per cent graded No. 3. In the province of Quebec, 70.88 per cent of the cheese graded No. 1, 27.13 per cent graded No. 2, and 1.99 per cent graded No. 3. In Prince Edward Island 90.85 per cent graded No. 1, 9 per cent graded No. 2, and .15 per cent graded No. 3. For the whole of Canada 84.22 per cent graded No. 1, 14.85 per cent graded No. 2, and .93 graded No. 3.

I might say in this connection that 98 per cent of the cheese from central Ontario—the district from Kingston westward—graded No. 1, which I venture to say is a record that cannot be beaten by any country.

But I would like to point out that producers of cheese suffered a very great loss on account of the low grading of a part of their product. There is no reason in the world why 6.62 per cent of the cheese from Ontario should grade below No. 1. The cut on No. 2 cheese as against No. 1 is one-half a cent a pound at Montreal. We will assume that all cheese below No. 1 is No. 2 and we will estimate the loss on the basis of one-half a cent a pound. On that basis the loss to Ontario in 1917 on account of this cheese not being graded No. 1 was $39,987. A larger percentage of Quebec cheese was graded under No. 1; their loss amounted to $98,360. Prince Edward Island lost $1,028, making a total loss due to low grade of the product amounting to $139,375 in one year.

Now, let me follow that up by a reference to butter. A classification was made of butter commandeered by the Canada Food Board covering the period from October 1 to November 9, 1918. This butter was taken from Ontario, Quebec, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, and well qualified men expressed their opinion with regard to its quality. I shall not give you the number of boxes obtained from each province, but what I wish to impress upon hon. members is this: They graded that butter as No. 1, No. 2 and No. 3, and "No grade." Of the butter which was examined, the percentages graded No. 1 were as follows: Ontario, 70.73; Quebec, 94.48; Alberta, 90.26; Saskatchewan, 71.66; Manitoba, 81.10. In 1917—and I assume that the conditions are very much the same now—Quebec was far in advance of all the other provinces not only in the production and value of creamery butter, but in the quality as well. I regret to see the Ontario producers at the foot of the list in the matter of quality. That 94.48 per cent of Quebec butter should grade No. 1 is, I say, highly creditable to the producers of that province. That only 70.73 per cent of Ontario butter should grade No. 1 is not creditable to the producers of Ontario, nor is it, in my opinion, excusable.

I do not know what reduction is made for the grades of butter which are below No. 1, but suppose we allow a cut of 2 cents a pound. Possibly there would not be that much difference between No. 2 butter and No. 1; it is my personal opinion that the difference would be greater. However, if we allow only 2 cents a pound off all the grades below No. 1, let us see what it meant to Ontario and to the other provinces to have these inferior grades of butter. Ontario would lose in that year, on the basis of the butter produced in the creamery, of which we have a record, $167,979. Quebec would lose $37,831; Alberta, $17,440; Saskatchewan, $24,917; Manitoba, $20,870, a total of $269,037. On the total production of butter in the Canadian creameries in 1917, the loss due to poor quality would amount to $311,596. But this does not represent the total loss because I have referred only to the butter produced in the creameries. What of the enormous quantities of butter which are made by the people on the farms, and so on? In view of the fact that only 70 per cent of Ontario butter graded No. 1, I am safe in taking that as a criterion for all the butter produced in the province; consequently the loss on account of poor quality must have been very great indeed.

Mr. Speaker, the figures that I have given indicate very clearly the necessity of doing something to standardize or to bring up the quality of this article. But while my resolution does state as a fact that the producers are losing thousands of dollars yearly because of lack of systematic grading, it goes on to say that we should have a uniform standard of the butter for export. The various provinces may deal with the quality of the butter produced for consumption in those provinces, but it is the duty of this Government and of this Parliament to look after the butter which

is exported. I want to deal particularly with the export of our surplus butter which goes overseas. Canada is the best market for Canadian butter, but in order to maintain the home market as our best market we must find buyers in other countries for our surplus production, and in order to be sure of obtaining buyers in other countries we must produce butter which is equal to the best offered by any other country.

Now, let me give you a few figures of our exports of butter and cheese from the port of Montreal for the years 1916, 1917, 1918, and 1919. First, butter:

Year	Quantity (Packages).	Value.
1916..	177,189	$3,426,741
1917..	48,356	1,188,251
1918..	143,573	3,778,841
1919..	79,155	2,612,115

Then, here are the figures with regard to cheese:

Year.	Quantity. (Boxes).	Value.
1916..	2,142,699	$33,822,503
1917..	1,660,675	29,618,134
1918..	1,619,321	31,078,892
1919..	1,172,460	26,718,896

This represents a total export of butter from Montreal in four years of 25,103,288 pounds, valued at $11,005,948, and of cheese of over 545,000,000 pounds, worth $121,238,425. An industry in which so much money is involved, and the export of the product of which runs into millions, is certainly deserving of the sympathetic consideration of every member of this House.

Conditions in regard to dairying, especially in regard to the marketing of our cheese, have, for many years, not been as good as they might have been. Resolutions have been passed in this House from time to time calling attention to injustices to and grievances of dairymen, and they have received, not from this Government, but from former governments, very little consideration. In 1908, 600 dairymen met in the city of Ottawa in convention and placed their grievances before the Government. In 1911, a delegation of over 800 waited on the Government and asked for redress of their grievances. Nothing, however, was done in a practical way to accede to their requests, although, I suppose, something was done when the Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce, Mr. W. G. Parmelee, was appointed as a Royal Commission to investigate the matter; but the investigation was held behind closed doors, and the then Minister of Agriculture, the Hon. Sydney Fisher, instructed him, to use his own words: "Don't go into too many details; I count on you to do everything you can to prevent any party capital being made from this." Mr. Parmelee occupied two years in this investigation, examining forty-eight witnesses in that time, or an average of two witnesses a month, so that he did not overwork himself. The matter hung on in that way, and nothing was done until 1912. I brought the matter up in this House in the session of 1912 asking for the appointment of a commission to investigate the whole subject of the weighing in Montreal. A commission was appointed, and following a report of that commission, a referee was appointed in the city of Montreal to whom the producer of cheese might apply in case he felt he was not getting a fair deal in the matter of weights. But for all that, I maintain that at the present time and under present conditions, producers of cheese—here I speak particularly for the people of Eastern Ontario and Western Quebec, because those are the two sections where cheese production is carried on to the greatest extent—are suffering very extensive losses in the way their cheese is being marketed. A man ships 500 cheese to Montreal, those cheese having been sold as No. 1 cheese. All cheese, of course, are sold as No. 1; the price paid on the cheese sold is for No. 1 cheese, and the cheese-maker is employed on the understanding that he is to make No. 1 cheese. 500 cheese are sold from a certain factory and they go to Montreal. The price to be paid for those cheese, was, let us say, 21 cents, that being the price that the buyer agreed to pay for No. 1 cheese. If there is a good stiff demand for cheese, I venture to say that that deal will go through without any trouble at all; but if the big exporters of Montreal get cables from overseas to the effect that the cheese market has fallen off about half a cent, then there is trouble; the wires get busy, and the man in Montreal wires back to his buyer in Kingston, for instance: "Those 500 cheese you bought for me is off flavour; something is wrong with them." The maker of the cheese is several hundred miles away from Montreal, and although he does not think that he is being used squarely, what is he to do? Will he get on the train, go down to Montreal in order to look the thing over, and put up a fight? If he does that, he must employ somebody to take his place in the factory, and may be while he is away there will be cheese produced that will be off flavour. He simply has to submit to his loss, and the result is that under those conditions we have in Ontario to-day some of the very best cheese-

makers going out of business. The cheese-maker does not know from day to day where he stands; there may be such a cut made on his cheese that all his profits for the summer will be swept away, and he feels that he is in the hands of the men who are carrying on the export business; that they are going to protect themselves, if necessary, at his expense. I maintain that that could not happen if our cheese was graded at the port of Montreal. In that case, all that the big exporter could get out of the deal would be his commission, and he is entitled to that; but the cheese would be graded and sold as No. 1 or No. 2 as the case might be, and the same thing will apply, of course, to butter.

But there is another reason why our cheese and butter should be graded. I maintain that a proper systematic grading of butter and cheese is the only possible way by which Canada can hope successfully to compete in the markets of the world for our surplus production of those two articles. Let us for a moment take into consideration what has been done by certain other countries. Denmark aims to export only one grade of butter, and that the best. The grading in Denmark is under State control, three judges being appointed by the Government to judge and grade the butter. One of those judges is a State inspector; one is a butter dealer, and one is a butter maker, and they do the grading. In Holland, all export butter must bear the Government mark "Netherlands Butter Control". In New Zealand, all export butter must be inspected by a Government official and have the grade marked on the package; not only that, the Government of New Zealand also thinks it worth while to send an experienced man to London and to keep him there to examine each cargo of butter on arrival and to check the quality of each lot carrying a distinctive brand. The grading of Irish butter is in the hands of the Irish Butter Export Committee, and there is a special and four ordinary grades. In Canada there have been some slight attempts at grading in some of the provinces; but as regards grading for export, the only semblance of systematic grading we ever had was that carried on at Montreal by Mr. Burgess, of the Dairy and Cold Storage Branch during 1917, 1918 and part of 1919, when the cheese exported were graded as first, second and third. If Canada is to compete successfully in the markets of the world, we must adopt a uniform and systematic method of grading for both butter and cheese.

[Mr. Edwards.]

I should like to quote to this House a statement made in this House by Mr. Girard, formerly member for Chicoutimi-Saguenay in the province of Quebec, Mr. Girard was for many years very closely connected with the dairy interests of this province and took a deep interest in anything relating to the dairy interest. Speaking in this House on March 21, 1912, he said (Hansard p. 5733):

> The Cheese Exporters' Association of Montreal insists that, whenever one-third of a lot of cheese is found to be No. 2 or No. 3, the whole shipment, even should the remainder be of the very first quality, be rated as No. 2 or No. 3, according to the case . . . . . Of course, the buyer who has succeeded in putting through such a deal is very careful to classify in his store the products so bought and to sell in England No. 1 cheese as such, and No. 2 cheese as such also.

You can easily see where the producer gets off at in a deal like that. Further on he says:

> The Quebec Dairymen's Association . . . . . has suggested as the only remedy for such an evil, the grading of dairy products.

Still further on he says:

> I appeal to this House, I appeal more especially to my fellow members from the province of Quebec: Is it not urgent that a movement should be set on foot at once so that dairy products may be sold under their true designation on the British market, in the same way that in every country on all markets, products of various kinds, are sold under the designation of the maker and of the country of origin?

With these expressions of opinion I am heartily in accord. A meeting was held at the Chateau Laurier in Ottawa last week which was attended, I understand, by deputy ministers of Agriculture from all the provinces of the Dominion. At that meeting a resolution was proposed by the Deputy Minister of Agriculture for the province of Saskatchewan, and seconded, I believe, by the Deputy Minister of Agriculture for the province of Manitoba, asking this Government to do practically what I am asking it to do in this resolution. I have not their resolution before me, but I think I am right in my statement; if not, the minister will correct me.

The other day I received a circular from the Retail Merchants' Association, of Canada, and without going very extensively into its subject matter, I may say that it had to do with oleomargarine. I do not think very much of oleomargarine myself. I never eat it if I know beforehand what is put before me, but I want to say this: The dairying interests of this country should receive some

protection from the Government in regard to that article. I do not think the makers of oleomargarine should be permitted to use the word "butter" in their newspaper advertisements and poster advertising. In order to help their sales, they use the word to give a certain air of respectability to the conglomeration which they ask the public to buy. I do not think they should be allowed to use the word "butter" at all in any of their advertisements.

In this circular the statement is made that unless the importation and manufacture of oleomargarine is permitted to continue, and made part of the policy of this country, a lot of people are going to starve because not enough butter is produced in Canada to supply the home demand. I think I can answer that statement conclusively by placing before this House figures of our imports and exports of butter for the last five or six years. In 1914 we imported 7,317,259 lbs. of butter, and we exported 1,228,753 lbs. These figures, I admit, show conclusively that we did not produce enough butter in 1914 to supply the needs of our people. In 1915 our imports fell to 6,822,540 lbs., and our exports rose to 2,724,913 lbs. Again, the figures show that we did not produce enough in 1915 to supply the home demands. In 1916 our imports dropped to 4,309,831 lbs. and our exports rose to 3,441,183 lbs. Again the same statements holds true. In 1917, our imports amounted to 997,335 lbs., while our exports amounted to 7,990,435. There is only one conclusion to draw from those figures, and that is that in the Dominion of Canada in the year 1917 we produced more than sufficient butter to supply the home market, and we had to look to other countries for a market for our surplus production. In 1918, our imports dropped to 434,049 lbs., while our exports amounted to 4,926,154 lbs. Again, the figures show conclusively that we produced more than enough butter in 1918 to supply the home demand. In 1919 our imports amounted to 1,939,062 lbs. and our exports to 13,659,157 lbs. It will be noticed that from 1914 down to the present time our imports grew less year by year, while our exports gradually increased until they reached the figure of 13,659,157 lbs. in the year 1919. Then for the ten months ending January 31, 1920, our exports amounted to 14,118,541 lbs. These figures can leave no doubt in any one's mind that we produced, and are producing in ever-increasing quantities, more than sufficient butter to meet the home demand, and therefore in years to come we must look more and more to other markets in which to dispose of our surplus production.

It is undoubtedly true that those countries which have undertaken a systematic grading of their butter and cheese have made a world-wide reputation for their dairy products. The mere mention of Danish or New Zealand butter carries with it the assurance that it is No. 1 quality. Butter from Denmark, from Holland, New Zealand and all other countries which have adopted a systematic grading has made a world-wide reputation for itself. If our production keeps on increasing, we must look to foreign countries for a market, and it is the countries I have mentioned that we will have to compete with. We should therefore build up such a reputation for our product that the whole world will know that Canadian butter is just as good as the best produced anywhere on earth.

Might I call attention to this further fact—and I do not think it is fair to the dairying industry in this country. In 1918, for instance, we permitted 2,262,514 pounds of oleomargarine to come into this country, and in 1919, 4,217,916 pounds. I have not the figures for the still later period, but I have no doubt they were greater, to say nothing of the amount that is manufactured in Canada. If we brought in, in the year 1919, 4,217,000 pounds of oleomargarine—we exported that year 13,600,000 pounds of butter—it is obvious that we were obliged to look in various countries all over the face of the globe to find a market for over 4,217,000 pounds of butter which was displaced by this questionable concoction. If I were to tell hon. gentlemen who represent city constituencies, and who perhaps have a personal interest in one manufacturing concern or another, that all protection should be moved from the particular article in which they were interested, and that that article should be made to compete with the same product from all parts of the world, those gentlemen, I fancy, would unhesitatingly denounce this proposal as being eminently unfair, and would straightway begin to tell me how much they had invested in the business, the number of people who were employed in it, and the amount of wages paid. Why, Sir, in regard to industries that are nurtured by a protective tariff, what argument could be advanced with greater force than on behalf of this particular industry? That is the contention that would be submitted. People who dwell in cities are unfortunately ignorant of many important things, notwithstanding the

knowledge which their civic life gives them. They know a great many things, but they are entirely ignorant of conditions as they exist in the country. Indeed, their knowledge of those conditions is often woefully lamentable, and I say this with no offensive intent whatever, but merely as expressing a matter of fact. A very clever and astute hon. gentleman in this House, who has the misfortune to have lived in the city all his life, said to me: "I could not have the face to tell the people in my city, the labouring men with large families, that they could not have their oleomargarine, but must pay the present price of butter." In reply, I asked him this question: "How would it do to take all the duties off the particular article which your firm is making? Probably that might result in a saving in that direction to these labouring men, who would have all the more to spend on Canadian butter." He could not see the proposition just in that light. I want to impress on this House, Mr. Speaker, that we have, in dairying, an industry in which is invested an enormous amount of capital, and in which a great number of people are directly interested. It is an industry which, I venture to say, from the standpoint of capital invested, from the standpoint of wages paid, and from the standpoint of time and skill expended in its development, is the most important in the Dominion of Canada, and one which will have a greater effect upon the future prosperity and well-being of the country than any other industry that can be named. If this be true, then I say that the industry is one which we must foster and push forward in every possible way; and I cannot see how it is possible for our dairy industry to compete in the markets of the world, with countries which are great producers of dairy products and which have paid special attention to the standardizing of all their products, unless we take similar steps. Before resuming my seat, I desire to quote a statement made by J. S. Dunnet, in "Hoard's Dairyman." It is headed: "Striking Results from Uniform Grading in Australia," and is as follows:

> The war exerted one very important effect on the dairying industry in Australia. It developed the system of government control. Though this was in vogue in a limited way the anti-grading faction wielded enough influence to check the best results. But when the British Government bought the whole surplus, grading as it should be practised became one of the conditions. The results were magical. First grade and over rose from 43 per cent to 96.4 per cent. No comment is necessary.

I might call attention to the fact that we had on hand in Canada on F-bruary 1, of this year, over twelve and a half million pounds of butter and over nineteen million pounds of cheese. I believe that, under conditions which have obtained in this country, shrewd speculators bought butter in large quantities and kept it in cold storage until it deteriorated to a great extent, when it was made over and resold to the public or shipped overseas. Surely I am safe in saying that if there are on hand at present over twelve and a half million pounds of butter, and if we are producing enough fresh butter to satisfy the home demand, it is highly probable that those who hold these surplus stocks of butter will be looking to various countries throughout the world to get a sale for them. Quebec produces butter, ninety-four per cent of which grades number one, and if that province is looking to find a market overseas for its surplus high-grade butter, the reputation of its first-class butter which may go abroad will be utterly ruined by the poor article which is made over and held in stock by these interested companies.

Both Quebec and Ontario have a surplus of butter. Ninety-four per cent of Quebec's butter, as I have said, grades number one, and only seventy per cent of Ontario's surplus grades number one. This being the case, am I not right in saying that the surplus which Ontario tries to find a market for overseas, going alongside the butter from the province of Quebec, will damn the reputation of the first-class article which is produced there? Undoubtedly it will, and such a condition of things should not exist. It is not fair to those who produce a first-class article to have its reputation jeopardized in this manner, and the only way in which this unfairness can be prevented is to have what exists in the countries I have mentioned, namely, a system of grading—I am, of course, referring only to the quantity exported—under Government control, a system which will properly standardize the quality of butter and cheese and build up for Canada the reputation which it should enjoy in the markets of the world for these two products, of which we are likely to have an increasing surplus as the years go on. I therefore move the resolution which stands in my name.

Mr. SAMUEL FRANCIS GLASS (Middlesex, E): I have listened with considerable interest to the presentation of this subject by the hon. member for Frontenac, (Mr. Edwards), and having myself on several occasions in this House advocated a system of grading in regard to other commodities, it affords me much pleasure indeed to lend my support to the resolution which my hon.

friend has so ably moved. Surely it must be obvious to the Government, as well as the people of this country, that great benefits have accrued to the wool, wheat and flax industries as a result of the establishment of a system of grading. By establishing standards we have gained a reputation for these products, and in the markets of the world to-day the reputation of an article for which any great sale is sought is of supreme importance. It is an easy matter by carelessness or neglect of standardization to lose in a single shipment a reputation that has been acquired with years of care. I do not intend to elaborate this but in connection with the discussion one matter came to my mind which I would like to present to the House and to the minister for consideration. I shall not attempt to offer any solution for the difficulty which appears to me but no doubt some remedy may be applied. It is this: No doubt many hon. members have felt when they have gone into a store to make a purchase of butter, the product of some standard reputable dairy or creamery, that the name or label on the butter was a sufficient evidence of its quality. I thought that myself but my mind has been thoroughly disabused of the idea that any label or brand represents quality in butter. That, I opine, must happen in connection with shipments of dairy products overseas. The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) has proposed standardization, under Government supervision and examination, of these products. That is perfectly right but that standardization, if I understand his presentation of the subject, requires that the examination shall be prior to shipment to cold storage in Montreal. Is it not evident every day of our lives, as we go into stores to purchase creamery butter, that the butter has so deteriorated in quality from being in cold storage that if you are depending on the brand you will find that the brand is no evidence of quality whatever. Supposing that this butter be shipped to Montreal and that with the guarantee of this Government it is branded or standardized as No. 1 butter. It is standardized at the time it goes into cold storage but later on in six, nine, twelve,—heaven only knows how many months—afterwards, because as long as it is in the interest of the cold storage man to hold it there for a higher profit it is held, it is finally shipped over to the markets of Europe. The product has so deteriorated in value that it must necessarily cause an injury to the dairy interests of this country. How are we going to get over that? That butter is sold in the market of old London with the label of the factory in which it is produced and the Government stamp of standardization and yet, that butter, by reason of its having been held in cold storage has so deteriorated that it is not even a third class butter. If such a thing as this is happening day by day in this country to our dairy products all the effort and trouble we may apply to standardization will not avail unless we are able to correct that evil. I present this view to the consideration of the House and the minister in the hope that there may be some solution for the difficulty.

Mr. A. M. DECHENE (Montmagny) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I wish, with the consent of the House, to add a few words regarding this subject which is of particular interest to the great majority of Canadian farmers. The proposer of this motion for once has spoken admirably of the producers of the province of Quebec. As a matter of fact, the production of butter and cheese has within recent years remarkably developed. Oftentimes, having ascertained certain results, we neglect tracing them back to their cause. It might be rash to conclude that because striking progress has been made along certain lines in some parts of the Dominion such progress is exclusively due to Dominion legislation. We should also take into account the legislation passed by each of the Provincial Legislatures, and especially the enforcement of the law as it stands.

We have incorporated in our Canadian statutes legislation having reference to the dairy industry, which imposes, for instance, restrictions as to the percentage of moisture that butter and cheese should contain; but do we realize that, very often, such provisions are not enforced with sufficient rigour? In the course of my law practice I have had the opportunity more than once of seeing Government inspectors of Quebec enter creameries in order to find out if the Dominion legislation was actually enforced as strictly as that of the province of Quebec, and in very few cases was there any occasion for interference on account of there being an excess of one or two per cent of moisture. If, in some provinces, the results have not been as good as might have been expected; if, as stated by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), only seventy per cent of Ontario's output grades number one, while ninety-four per cent of Quebec's butter is so graded, it might be interesting to inquire whether such result is not due

to the fact that a sufficiently close inspection of the manufacturing processes of butter is not kept up in Ontario. The province of Quebec has enacted very strict laws and follows most closely its buttermakers. Twice, even three times, every month, the Government inspectors visit the creameries in order to find out whether the provisions of the Act are faithfully adhered to, and I do not think, Mr. Speaker, I am revealing a provincial secret nor any creamery's special secret, if I state that therein lies the success of that industry. Let us see to it, that the law as it stands is complied with, and the result will be a superior production throughout the country, without any need of resorting to checks more or less difficult of application, more or less cumbersome, and which always interfere with the manufacture, sale or exchange of our produce.

The manufacturing methods must be looked after. By looking after such methods and at the same time laying down rules as regards the building and management of factories, the handling of products at the factory, the milk and the cream delivered there, we shall surely succeed in obtaining a number one product that will attract world-wide attention.

The British market is already more difficult of access to our Denmark competitors who, according to some official publications, have even had to cross over to England in order that certain restrictions imposed upon their products should be removed.

It is better to try and produce butter which on its face is attractive to the market than to attempt to set instead some official standard which must necessarily result in destroying competition among the various provinces and between the different makers. A big exhibition was held two years ago in the province of Ontario in Toronto, I believe. A competition was opened to all the provinces for their cheese and butter. To the great astonishment of the whole country—the Government inspectors of the Quebec Department of Agriculture excepted—the province of Quebec carried off the first prizes. The fact attracted and aroused general attention. Last winter the Western people held in their turn one of these large conventions and the Western provinces came out first, while Quebec was awarded only the third and fourth prizes; unfortunately, as complained the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), for his province, it was still a little farther behind.

Instead of setting arbitrary standards for export, the question would be, Mr. Speaker, to go directly to the root of the evil and to promote in a practical way the manufacture of our own butter and cheese. While the practice is gradually disappearing as regards the butter manufactured in our province, the making of two kinds of butter is allowed: butter made from ordinary cream and butter made with so-called pasteurized cream. On our markets, in Montreal particularly and almost everywhere, the butter made from pasteurized cream has always fetched a higher price, often one cent or a cent and a half more per pound. That cent and that fraction generally go direct to the butter producer, because in this country, as in New Zealand and in Denmark, the farmers have striven towards joint action and co-operation in order to obtain a product that would be more uniform and more tempting to the consumer. Concerning the pasteurized butter kept in cold storage during winter, Dominion statistics give us striking results as to the possibility of developing it into a thriving business; this butter made from ordinary cream not submitted to a special treatment, after having remained some time in the large cold storage warehouses had lost, if I am well informed, from 4 to 5 per cent, and even much more in some cases, of its original value.

Our farmers look carefully after the manufacture of their butter; they congregate very often to discuss matters, and their tendency, at present, is apparently to have the private concern go out of business and co-operative associations of patrons take their place. This is perhaps a deficiency which might be easily remedied by a close inspection or by a change in the provincial laws, or by means of federal legislation.

In many cases, the individual manufacturer makes butter and cheese mainly with a view to increasing his profits; he buys from the producers their milk or their cream at a certain price, and then disposes of the product at his own sweet will. Things happen differently with respect to the products of a co-operative association. As a general rule, members of such associations bring their milk to their own factory, they make their butter and their cheese, and which is connected with what we call, in our province, "the co-operative association of the butter and cheese makers of the province of Quebec," which now has thousands of shareholders, all farmers and milk producers, belonging to some one or other of those local co-operative industries.

The main co-operative, which has its office at Montreal, receives the butter and the cheese from the local co-operative and sells on the foreign markets, in consideration of a mere commission, the product which is sent to it from every part of the province, with the result that the producer or the farmer himself gets nearly all the possible profit from his own product, whereas, if the private concerns were more and more encouraged, the milk and cream producer would not derive from his own goods all the profit which he might.

This idea is spreading enormously in our midst, as it did in Denmark, and recently in New Zealand, where it caused the farmer-producers who deal with this branch of their industry, to reap profits which were absolutely marvellous. Here is what I find, with respect to the dairy industry, in a concise report from the United States:

"Their is probably no country in the world where the manufacturing of dairy products has developed so quickly and to such an enormous extent as in New Zealand, or where the scientific and mechanical details have made such marvellous strides. New Zealand has perhaps, to-day, the largest and best equipped butter and cheese factories in the world, and her farmers make use of more cream separators and milking machines than those of any other country. But not only did the New Zealanders prove their energy and their ability by this mechanical or scientific development or by the total sum of their dairy production. And it was found, with surprise, that butter pasteurized with cream under special process, had lost a fraction of one per cent, or that this butter, so prepared, was of great value for immediate exportation.

Perhaps should we rather encourage the production of that kind of butter in our country, which would then, export it as a special brand, and to our credit on the different foreign markets. If in many cases, our butter and our cheese happen to lose a great part of their value when they get abroad, it is not due to the methods of manufacture or conservation, but to the manner in which they are received or dealt with, in England. Is it not a fact, and more particularly so during the war, that some four or five hundred thousand pounds of cheese have been at times left strewn at random on the wharves of Liverpool or of London, owing to the fact that we had not the necessary warehouses in which such goods might have been taken care of before they were delivered to the British dealers.

Instead of preaching, as it did last year, that the whole matter should be brought under one principle: "standardization," to use the English expression, our Department of Trade and Commerce should take action and find out how our products are dealt with in England, and whether all the Canadian products from any part of Canada do get all the attention which they are entitled to.

With respect to Canadian cheese and butter, it has often been noticed, for instance, that certain quantities of those products coming from a certain province were the object of close attention and were properly sheltered, so as to retain their quality and therefore, their value, whereas similar products, coming from the province of Quebec especially, were left on the highways or on the wharves, probably to show that they were of an inferior grade, and, of course, with the possible result that they might lose their good name on the market. I think the Minister of Trade and Commerce would be acting the part of a good patriot if he would see that there were no discrimination on the foreign markets, as between the different products.

They have also achieved splendid results along the lines of co-operation and business and organization. Almost all the old butter and cheese factories belonging to private individuals became competitive establishments whose patrons are among the chief and very often the only shareholders. The result is that New Zealand has during these last four years taken a most prominent place in the American as well as the British markets.

It might be a fault to consider only the English market as an outlet for our butter and cheese while we have a large market almost at our own doors. For the United States are importing from New Zealand, Denmark and other countries large quantities of butter and cheese. By attending to the advertising of our products in those quarters we would undoubtedly have reasons for rejoicing and our producers, our farmers, would draw large benefits from their labours.

The Danish produce itself has largely depreciated on the American market. To quote the New York Produce Review of March 3, 1920: "Buyers are now convinced that the official Danish stamp is no more an indication of that high degree of perfection which was expected and they have resolved that every shipment must be carefully inspected upon its arrival. A lot of 500 casks from Denmark arrived here on Friday via Ham-

burg, and the quality is not among the best."

Seeing that periodicals in the United States are already complaining about the quality of the Danish product, why is it that our Department of Trade and Commerce, instead of attending solely to trifles, to the markets of South America, Africa, or India, does not attend to the direct advertising of our products in the United States, making it known that we in the province of Quebec have a produce we could ship abroad. Scarcely a month ago, there were in one warehouse over a million pounds of butter. The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) himself was complaining a moment ago that Quebec had an enormous surplus on hand and Ontario as well. Why then does the Department of Trade and Commerce publish a weekly bulletin if the sole purpose of that bulletin be to acquaint us with the fact that in England, Denmark, France or Norway, as well as in Spain, such and such a product could be bought or sold, when it does not refer to the American market and especially to the large markets of New York, Boston and Chicago.

The quality of our produce could undoubtedly be improved on the whole, but I think, Mr. Speaker, what matters the most is to make it fully known abroad. By advertising it on a large scale in the United States we should reap an immediate benefit and our products would not be in danger of deterioration from the lack of accommodation or for the simple reason that on the docks in England the necessary warehouses to store them are wanting.

I do not see clearly what great use it would be to impose upon our producers a particular brand, a No. 1, requiring such and such a quality. Particularly, let us turn our attention to the processes of manufacture; let us make sure that provincial laws are well inforced everywhere and we shall thus reach our aims; the advantageous disposal of our products, the procuring to the producer of the full value and perhaps the lowering in a small measure of the cost to the consumer by doing away with the middleman, who often enhances prices by stowing large quantities of these products in the cities and compelling the unfortunate consumer to eat oleomargarine, when he could get butter if the large producer, who is to-day the same as he was during the war would not put it in the cold storage warehouses of the cities, because he prefers to let it spoil rather than allow the dropping of prices. I believe that we should thus obtain better results while the tendency, originating in the war, which prompts to legislate and assume general control of things in every particular will not be profitable because competition will largely be done away with, and it is competition which ensures the best results.

Hon. S. F. TOLMIE (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of pleasure to the masterly way in which this resolution was introduced by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) and seconded by the hon. member for East Middlesex (Mr. Glass), and supported by the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Dechene).

I feel that this is a most important matter, particularly when we consider that the value of our dairy products for 1919 is estimated at not less than $247,531,353. Surely under the financial conditions now prevailing in this country this is worthy of our consideration. And I want to say that the Government, as represented by the Department of Agriculture, is particularly anxious to support any movement for increased production of dairy products, and for the placing of those products on the market in such perfect condition that they will be able at least to compete on an even basis with similar products of other countries.

Under the present system most of the grading of dairy products is looked after by the Provincial Governments, that is, products that are for the most part disposed of for local consumption and for interprovincial trade, and this provincial grading is also accepted by United States buyers when purchasing for export to their country. A certain amount of grading was done at Montreal during 1917 and 1918, when large quantities of cheese and butter were being exported to the Old Country, but at the present time I understand there is practically no grading done at that port.

As pointed out by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), when the market is rising and cheese is in very great demand, there is very little trouble about grades; but when we have a falling market there is a considerable scramble to sell, and many producers are disappointed at the returns they receive. However, we cannot hope that grading alone will place our butter in the highest position. A campaign of education must be conducted to improve our dairy methods, so that when the cream or milk reaches the creamery or cheese factory it will be in first-class condition. It will be noted that in those provinces where close inspection is maintained the very best re-

sults are secured. We find that Quebec and Alberta occupy the highest positions for the quality of their butter, and I take this opportunity of complimenting the dairymen of those provinces on their excellent showing. The province of Quebec, I understand, was successful in winning the prizes for butter at the Toronto Exhibition of 1918, and in 1919 its dairymen also won prizes in Manitoba, for which they deserve all praise.

With regard to cheese, we find that Ontario stands very high, indeed,—ninety-three per cent No. 1, while Prince Edward Island is a close second with ninety per cent. The district that the hon. member for Frontenac represents has made almost a world's record in reaching a standard of ninety-eight per cent, and the dairymen there are certainly setting a very excellent example to their confreres in the Dominion.

If we can increase not only the quantity but the quality of our dairy products, I am sure we shall go a long way towards meeting the present financial demands of the Dominion. At the present time grading is conducted in practically the same way all over Canada. The Dominion Government about a year ago inaugurated a plan to instruct the graders of dairy products in the best methods of grading, with the result that in certain tests recently made, only a difference of a fraction of one per cent was found among them; showing the very great uniformity prevalent in the different provinces.

On the whole, I think that the figures furnished by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) make rather a good showing, and I do not know of any other country that to-day could better them, a circumstance that should be particularly gratifying to us when we consider that in many sections of the Dominion dairy farming has been only recently introduced.

In New Zealand there is no grading for home consumption. They grade for export, and when one remembers that they have to ship their butter through very warm areas and for great distances, it is apparent that with them it is simply a matter of self-defence to impose a very close grading system. Denmark, I understand, is not carrying on any grading system at the present time; neither is Holland, another country producing a great deal of butter for the English market.

I may say that the Department of Agriculture maintains four inspectors in Great Britain to inspect our butter on its arrival and to assist generally in seeing that it reaches the consumer in the best possible condition.

With regard to the meeting of Deputy Ministers of Agriculture from the different provinces that has been referred to, I may say that this department has considered the necessity of bringing together the representatives of the Provincial Departments of Agriculture with a view to assisting in the development of agriculture, to facilitate the work of the Federal and the provincial departments, to avoid duplication of work ,and to promote a better understanding all round. With that end in view we called a meeting of deputy ministers last week, and among the matters discussed was that of the grading of dairy products. The following resolution was passed:

> That the Federal Minister of Agriculture is hereby respectfully requested to inauguarate a compulsory system of inspection and grading of Canadian dairy products offered for export for overseas trade, whenever in the judgment of his department officials such action is desirable and necessary.

I heartily approve of the establishment of a system of grading for dairy products, but on account of the unsettled condition of the markets of the world and the fact that control will likely continue in Great Britain for some time to come, we do not consider the present time opportune for putting these graders at work. This course will be followed, however, just as soon as we think the time is ripe for adopting it. If, therefore, the member for Frontenac will be good enough to withdraw his resolution I shall be very glad to do my part in carrying out what I have outlined.

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Beauce): Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to take part in this debate, but representing as I do a district which is reputed for its development of the dairy industry, a few words on my part will not be out of place.

I was much interested in the presentation made to the House by the member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards). The subject is one of national importance, having regard to the large quantities of cheese and butter which are exported from our country. I was particularly interested in what the hon. member said as to the relative positions of the two banner provinces, Ontario and Quebec, in the production of cheese and butter. So far as butter is concerned the figures given by my hon. friend show that the province of Quebec holds the first position in Canada. That is most gratifying indeed. In the case of cheese, however, as the percentages stated by my hon. friend show, the position is completely reversed. I have long since realized that in the matter of cheese-making many cen-

tres in Quebec have not attained the perfection which the importance of the industry would seem to justify. When I was a much younger man than I am to-day I carried on in the province of Quebec a platform campaign for the betterment of conditions affecting the manufacture of cheese in that province.

The grading of these products is certainly a matter of great importance, but I am not far from sharing the opinion expressed by the member for L'Islet (Mr. Dechene) and by the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Tolmie) that though grading is important, it is perhaps not the most important step to take at this time. Suppose a certain quantity of butter has been graded, some of it No. 1 and some No. 2, and that no restriction has been imposed or regulation made governing the limit of time during which these products shall be held in warehouses before they are exported. If such a highly perishable product as butter, graded No. 1 and No. 2, is held in warehouse in Montreal for a number of months, it is likely that even the No. 1 grade will have deteriorated considerably by the time it reaches Liverpool, and the impression will prevail among retailers in England that our butter graded No. 1 is far from attaining the quality that one would expect of a product so graded. This is an objection which I think should be seriously considered by the Minister if he really desires to consider the question carefully.

Hon. Mr. TOLMIE: No grading system would be undertaken by the Government which did not provide for proper cold storage facilities at the point where the butter would be graded. Moreover, the butter would remain under the control of the Government until it was placed on the vessel; and I think it is generally conceded that butter which is in first class condition when taken into cold storage on board ship does not deteriorate during the voyage. Then, as to the handling at the other end, we would take further steps to make sure that the butter reached the consumer in proper condition.

Mr. BELAND: I thank the minister for this further explanation; it is indeed very reassuring. The loss of money sustained by the farmers through the sale of an inferior product is certainly substantial. I do not remember what the loss was in the case of Ontario for butter, or in the case of Quebec for cheese. But whatever that loss is, the loss of reputation is greater. It is with dairy produce as it is with the human being. A carefully built up reputation, characterized by good moral conduct, thrift and honesty, will, through some dishonourable act, disappear in a moment; and whatever may be the virtues and the attainments of the man who has so dishonoured himself, it takes him months and even years to regain his lost reputation. So it is in the case of cheese and butter; if Canada loses her reputation in the English market for the production of high-class dairy products, it will take years to regain it. So I say that loss of reputation is a more serious consideration than the loss of money that we are sustaining.

We have very keen competitors in the English market. My hon. friend has referred to the fact that Denmark is recognized on the English market as the best producer of butter. There are many reasons why that is so. One is that the Danish authorities keep in close touch with the producers of butter in that country. But another reason for the superiority of Danish butter is found in the particularly fine quality of the grass, and in the race to reach first place in the production of high class butter, that is a condition which we in this country cannot overcome. The important point is that our dairy products should be without fault, in colour, aroma, taste, consistence, and also packing. It is really a campaign of national importance that should impress itself upon the mind of every hon. gentleman who has a seat in this House, and all hon members who represent rural constituencies should, during the recess, impress upon the dairy farmers of Ontario and Quebec the imperative necessity of maintaining the reputation they enjoy in the English market. Hundreds of millions of dollars are at stake, and I hope the minister, who appears so well disposed in regard to this matter and who has to-day delivered his maiden speech as a minister, will give his most earnest attention to this great problem, these great staple, necessary articles of food, namely, cheese and butter.

The matter of proscribing from our market oleomargarine is a very delicate subject. The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) is, I believe, of the opinion that we should prohibit the importation, manufacture, and sale of oleomargarine as was the case before 1917.

Mr. EDWARDS: Absolutely.

Mr. BELAND: Is it advisable that we should do that? Since 1917 the importation, manufacture, and sale of oleomargarine has

been permitted, but as a result of that permission, do we find that the farmers have been receiving a lower price than before for their dairy products? I do not believe they have. Butter sells to-day higher than it did before 1917; cheese sells to-day higher than it did before 1917.

Mr. EDWARDS: So does oleomargarine.

Mr. BELAND: If the average farmer were consulted, if the question were presented to him in this light, namely: "poor families in this country cannot afford to pay 75 cents for a pound of fat under the name of butter, but they can afford to buy a pound of fat under the name of oleomargarine for 45 cents; by prohibiting the sale of oleomargarine, are we going to deprive poor families from enjoying some fat on their table"? What reply would he give? That is a very delicate question. I know that a large body of the farming community in this country is in favour of proscribing the use of oleomargarine in Canada; but taking into consideration the fact that the farmers are selling their dairy products at a higher price than when oleomargarine was prohibited, I think that for a time at least we should permit the use of oleomargarine in Canada.

I did not intend to detain the House so long. I thank the hon. gentleman who represents the riding of Frontenac for bringing this important subject before the House, and I am sure we are all thankful to him for the large quantity of valuable statistics he has given us upon this important subject.

Mr. JAMES ALEXANDER ROBB (Chateauguay-Huntingdon): Mr. Speaker, before the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) closes the debate, I wish just briefly to call to the attention of the House and more particularly of the Government another feature of the dairy industry than that presented this afternoon by the hon. member who has given evidence of having studied the question of inspection, not only in Canada, but in other countries. I rise to speak more particularly on account of the statement just made by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie) who, speaking for the Government, said that the Government were desirous in every way of doing everything possible to encourage the dairy industry of this country. The minister admitted the figures presented this afternoon by the hon. member for Frontenac as showing that the dairy industry of Canada was one of the largest industries of this country, and that much of the future prosperity of Canada depended upon the dairy industry. When my hon. friend said that, it occurred to me that what was required in this country at the present time was not so much a provision for inspection of dairy products as methods of providing for the production of dairy products. For if conditions are going to be continued as they have been during the past two years, the dairy industry of this country will be ruined, and ruined by this Government. We have, sitting alongside of the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, the acting Prime Minister (Sir George Foster), who has in his department two boards of control, each of which is doing all that it possibly can do to destroy the dairy industry of this country. On the one hand we have the Board of Commerce threatening to put farmers in jail if they increase the price of milk to the basis of what it is worth in export countries. That is on record; every hon. member acknowledges that the Board of Commerce, sitting at Hamilton, have, if they are correctly reported in the newspapers, threatened to put farmers in jail if they increase the price of milk. On the other hand we have the Wheat Control Board who not only take upon themselves to fix the price of wheat, but determine that if the millers of this country manufacture flour for export, they shall pay into the coffers of the Wheat Control Board a tax of $2 a barrel,—for export to some countries this has been reduced to $1.50 a barrel—and if the millers will not pay that $1.50 or $2 a barrel, the Wheat Control Board will not allow them to export flour. The consequence is that to-day the sheds in Montreal and St. John, N.B. are piled up with flour that cannot be exported because the markets will not stand the $1.50 or $2 per barrel tax that is demanded, and the large mills are shut down. It is not a question of setting a price for dairy feed for cattle to-day; it is a question of getting feed; there is no feed obtainable, because the mills are not running. If the Government are desirous of encouraging the dairy industry of this country, one thing they must do is to call off the man who threatens to put in jail the farmer who rises early to milk cows, and the other thing they must do is to take hold of this Wheat Control Board and say to them, that no matter how much they may preach protection or try to make the people of this country believe that they are in favour of taxes, they must take off the taxes if the milling industry of this country is not to

be ruined, and along with it the dairying industry of this country, because primarily you must have cheap and good feed for your cattle if you are going to produce milk. You may pass legislation to fix the price of milk and of the feed that goes to the cattle, but you cannot pass legislation that will compel a farmer to milk cows unless he is going to make a profit. So I submit that if the Government are desirous of helping the dairying industry of this country they must do something to enable the farmers of Canada to get cheaper feed for their dairy cattle.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. ROBERT H. HALBERT (North Ontario): When I rose before recess I had no intention of making a lengthy address on this subject, and I see no reason why I should do so. I was greatly pleased at the able manner in which the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) discharged his duty this afternoon in moving the resolution, and the matter of his address was excedingly interesting. I am sure it must have proved instructive to all hon. members who heard it. In my opinion butter should be graded before going into cold storage as well as after coming out. It was this opinion which I desired pre-eminently to express when I rose this afternoon, and incidentally I intended to say that the farmers do not ask for protection. With regard to oleomargarine, the manufacturers tell us that it is something which is intended to benefit the poor. Well, anything that is intended to help the poor will help the farmers; they belong to that class. Let me say, however, that if oleomargarine were really a product for the poor man it could be put on the market in a much cheaper way than it is at present. It is put up in very expensive cases, two-coloured papers, and beautifully engrossed boxes, and is extensively advertised at great cost, all of which facts seem to indicate that the manufacturers are trying to make a profit out of this article which they would have us believe has been established as a sort of charitable institution. I think it should be made an offence to mention the word "butter," in any connection, in the advertising of oleomargarine, which should be so' entirely on its merits and with no allusion to butter either directly or indirectly.

[Mr. Robb.]

Mr. JAMES McISAAC (King's, P.E.I.): I did not intend to participate in the discussion of this important question, but the admirable manner in which the resolution has been presented by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) has aroused in me, as I am sure it must have aroused in others, a very great interest in the subject. The hon. member has given to the House an amount of statistical information so extensive and valuable that it seems to me it is of the greatest importance that it should be placed on the record of the proceedings. I was also impelled to rise to my feet in consideration of the statement which the hon. member made in the course of his remarks that the province from which I come—Prince Edward Island—was a close second to the great province of Ontario in the perfection of cheese manufacture. It was a matter of gratification and pride to me to hear the hon. member say that the cheese of Prince Edward Island graded ninety per cent, or a little over, and I take this opportunity of expressing my sincere thanks to that hon. gentleman and, at the same time, of putting on the record of this House an expression of real gratification at the fact that the smallest province of Confederation stands next to the greatest province, or at least one of the greatest provinces, in the matter of cheese-making. However, in regard to the hon. member's reference to oleomargarine, I do not think I can agree with him. I do not know that I have tasted oleomargarine, or at least, if I have, I must have done so unwittingly. It is said that this substance can be made to look so much like butter and, by means, of flavouring, to taste so much like it that it is sometimes difficult to discover the difference. I do not know much about its manufacture, but I would say that, under our prersent conditions, when the prices of all commodities are so exceedingly high, it would be hardly fair to prevent the poorer classes of people, who might not be able to supply themselves with butter, from obtaining a substitute which is reputed to be perfectly good. I am informed that, properly manufactured, there is nothing deleterious or injurious in the elements that enter into oleomargarine, and for that reason I think that, for the time being at least, those who cannot afford butter might be permitted to buy this substitute. As has been remarked, it would scarcely have any material effect upon the price of butter in the market, especially at the present time; and it has been shown that even formerly, when it was probably

manufactured to a greater degree than it is now and prices were not so high, it was not known materially to affect the price of butter in the open market. I was very much pleased with the statement of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie) that it was the intention of the Government to take proper steps in the matter of inspection, and in every other way to guard the purity and good condition of our butter and cheese intended for export, not only at the port of shipment but in transit, so that these products would be carefully looked after until by the officers and employees of the department they were absolutely on the market. That seems to me to give us a safe guarantee that this matter will be zealously looked after. As the minister remarked it will take some little time to bring this system to the greatest degree of perfection, but it is certain that everything that can possibly be done to safeguard the interests of our butter and cheese producers will be done. Before I take my seat I desire to say one word more. The debate was undoubtedly on a high level and was moderate in every way, and free from anything partisan, until the hon. member for Chateauguay-Huntingdon (Mr. Robb) rose to speak. I regret to say, however, that he was unable to let the occasion pass without injecting a partisan spirit. He threw the virus of party bias into the debate in order, I presume, to have a crack at the Government. It seemed to me that his endeavour to connect the present subject with the Wheat Board and milling and other things was very far-fetched, and the hon. gentleman must have had considerable difficulty in bringing his remarks on those matters to bear upon the subject under discussion. I would not be so ungenerous as to suggest that there might be some thing other than the public good, perhaps a mere personal motive, that impelled the hon. member to wander so far afield, but I do think he could with great propriety have confined his remarks more strictly to the question before the House. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me once again express my gratification at the statement which fell from the lips of the hon. member for Frontenac that the province from which I have the honour to come has taken such a high place in the cheese manufacturing of Canada.

Mr. O. R. GOULD (Assiniboia): I am not sure that volume of words will add anything to the merit of the question or will enhance the able presentation of the subject made by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), and it is not my intention to discuss the question in all its details. Its subject matter is not of such great importance in the Western Provinces as it is in the Eastern and Maritime Provinces. Nevertheless, it is a fact that the people who live on the western plains are annually paying more attention to the dairying industry, and we believe that in the very near future this industry will assume such proportions as will justify its further expansion. However, the fact remains that the provincial governments of the Western Provinces, realizing that the industry is in its initial stage in that part of the country are adopting short courses with the direct object of improving the product of the factories and creameries along the lines suggested this afternoon by the hon. member for Frontenac. They felt that it was the duty of the Dominion Government to assist in this work, but short courses are being held and everything possible is being done in a provincial way to make the product of our creameries of a high standard. The large exports of the products of the creameries and factories from the West does not of necessity come East to find a market. It is a fact—which I know, because I have had first-hand knowledge of it—that the Saskatchewan creameries last year in a test case sent, early in the season, a carload of butter south of the international boundary line, and I may say that when the returns came my cream check showed two cents per pound of an increase in the price of butter fat. That may be due to a deeper appreciation of the merit of our product by the people south of the international boundary, or it may be the outcome of the educational campaign carried on by the provinces.

It seems to me that largely the question can be arranged or else a solution can be found by the competition which must, and does, of necessity, exist among the various provinces. I have with me a clipping that I took from a paper since hearing the address of the hon. gentleman this afternoon, and while he claims everything for the province of Quebec, while hon. members who represent the various districts of that province were very much gratified, while I was very much pleased also, and while I do not want to bring in the statement that I am now about to make to take any of the pleasure away from these hon. gentlemen, the clipping that I hold in my hand declares that the province of Alberta has already taken the lead in the meritorious pro-

duct of its creameries. I am not going to treat that point in an argumentative way, but I refer to it as proof of the assertion that the provinces are on a competitive basis in this regard. I believe that hearty co-operation between the Dominion and provincial authorities will do much to overcome the difficulties as they have been presented to us this afternoon in the able address of the hon. member for Frontenac. I as an agriculturist wish to record my sympathy with the thoughts and ideas that were presented, and that is mainly the reason why I have risen to my feet to address a few words to the House. I want to suggest to these hon. gentlemen that it is because I am in sympathy with them that I am on my feet at this moment. Some day I will perhaps rise to my feet again and want some reciprocity from them in the form of sympathetic consideration for some suggestions of my own. We are extending our hands across the prairies to the Eastern Provinces. That is the position we are taking, and I hope these hon. gentlemen will be equally ready to extend a friendly hand to the West. The province of Alberta has already done a great deal to promote the dairying industry, and the ideas and suggestions that have proved so successful there are now being put in operation in the province of Saskatchewan. They are continuing their educational courses and trying to bring about a movement among the creamery operators which will result in uniformity of product. The same thing applies to the province of Manitoba. All the Western Provinces, I am sure, will be very willing to co-operate. You will find no antagonism from the Western Provinces, but on the contrary they will be willing to enter into hearty co-operation with all the provinces for a Dominion-wide campaign to make the products of our creameries and cheese factories better than they have been in the past, uniform and of such high quality that the label which they bear will be the symbol of merit.

Mr. J. H. BURNHAM (West Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, as there are a number of farmers in my riding, and as they have been more or less exercised over the question of oleomargarine, I wish to say that I thank the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould) and the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Halbert), who is, or at any rate was until recently, the head of the United Farmers of Ontario, for substantially, or indirectly, agreeing with the statement that oleomargarine is a fit and proper product, and something that may be allowed to go upon the open market in Canada. The people cannot pay the price of butter as it is at the present time, but they can pay the price of oleomargarine, and, of course, hon. gentlemen are aware, the process of making oleomargarine is improving from day to day. It costs just now 45 cents a pound, but it is said that the price will be 30 cents in a short time; and whilst it is made of various animal and vegetable fats and vegetable oils, the people generally are fed on a reliable product in oleomargarine. The food constituents are such as to make it in every sense a most desirable product. Therefore, when we read, as we have been doing, that South Africa is giving up its dairy farming in favour of producing oleomargarine, and that more scientific machinery than has been used heretofore in the production of margarine is turning out a cheaper and a better article, we can very well understand that the remarks of the farmers' party to-night through two of their illustrious representatives, the member for Assiniboia and the member for North Ontario, indicate not only a broad and generous spirit, but that they are desirous that oleomargarine shall come in, no matter what any farmer may say. I think that is a sufficient reply to the objections raised by the farmers in Canada. Of course, in farming matters and matters of this kind, I will have to take my cue from those who know best, and I shall be in future an earnest champion of oleomargarine—the cheaper the better. It may be a serious detriment to butter, but of course these gentlemen do not care anything about that. They have been assuring us for some time that they want to see the price of foodstuffs come down, but they told us the other day that if the eight-hour day were adopted the prices of food would rise. Of course they want the price of food, and especially of butter, to come down, they have endorsed oleomargarine and they have made every legislator in this country feel that he had a right to vote for oleomargarine, as he will vote for it. We thank the farmers' party for having made oleomargarine a competitor on the Canadian market and recognizing it as a most desirable food for the Canadian people.

Mr. GEORGE BOYCE (Carleton): Mr. Speaker, it gave me a very great deal of pleasure to hear the able address, of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), the hon. the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie) and the other hon. gentlemen who spoke in regard to that very important in-

dustry of our Dominion, that is the production of butter and cheese. When we look at the returns we see that the Dominion produces in the neighbourhood of $250,000,000 worth of these commodities not taking into account the very large amount that is used by the producers. The industry must then be looked upon as taking a very high place in the productive activities of our Dominion. It has been said by some that the trade in oleomargarine is not antagonistic to the dairy industry. As far as I am concerned I spoke upon that question last year and I think that I will not repeat what I said then. What I did say was not very favourable, to oleomargarine but I have kept a very careful watch and I have not heard of anybody dying or being sick from use of it; therefore, I do not think that it should be condemned. I heard some hon. gentlemen saying that they could almost do away with butter. Well, supposing they did do away with butter, what about the cheese? Would not our agriculture be in a very serious condition then, because there is no question that the farmer who has a good herd of dairy cattle will produce from fifty to one hundred per cent more than the farmer who has no cattle or very few on his farm. I do not think that I would have spoken to-night but for the fact that I occupy the proud position of representing a county which stands second in the production of cheese in this Dominion of Canada. Therefore I could not let the occasion pass without expressing myself with regard to the benefit that is to be derived by agriculture from this industry. As we are well aware a farm conducted as a dairy farm, increases soil fertility and adds greatly to all kinds of agriculture production.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, the manner in which this resolution has been received generally by hon. members on this side of the House has given me no more gratification than the reception it met with from hon. gentlemen on the other side. It is a unique experience for me to have any of my suggestions received in such a friendly spirit by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. BUREAU: When you are friendly we are all friendly.

Mr. COPP: We are improving all the time.

Mr. EDWARDS: It is an experience which I shall not soon forget. I may say, Sir, that my gratification at the manner in which the resolution has been received by hon. members to your right and to your left was somewhat dampened just before the House rose at six o'clock by the attitude of those hon. members who occupy the "cross benches." Indeed, I was surprised and not a littled pained to notice that the God-chosened representatives of the agriculturists of the Dominion should be so conspicuous this afternoon by their absence when a matter of so much interest and importance to our farmers was under consideration. My sorrow in that respect, of course, was somewhat lessened by the late arrival on the scene of the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Halbert) who, Sir, you might have noticed, just previous to six o'clock was manifesting some physical uneasiness, which I did not know whether to attribute to a desire on his part to speak or to absent himself from the Chamber. However, before six o'clock the hon. gentleman set all our doubts at rest by taking the floor and giving us a very interesting, though exceedingly brief, address.

There are only one or two things for me to notice in the remarks made by the hon. member for North Ontario. He told us that the farmers did not want any protection. Then he proceeded to give his sanction to the manufacture and importation of oleomargarine, but he added that in his opinion those interested in the sale of oleomargarine should be rigorously prohibited from using the word "butter" in their advertisements. That, I might point out to the hon. gentleman is obviously asking for protection along a certain line. One might conclude that the hon. gentleman, even though declaring himself an out-and-out free trader and averse to having anything to do with protection, still, like many others on that side of the House, and especially those who occupy the cross benches and are known as the Agrarian group or the National Progressive party, still clings to the idea of some form of protection.

The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould) was good enough to give his approval of the general terms of my resolution. But he thought that the very fact that he had been so kind was something which should call for a quid pro quo from me on some later occasion. In effect, the hon. gentleman said, "I am supporting your resolution, and I hope the time will come when you will not forget that and will support some of the things which I shall advocate in this House." I may say at once to the hon. gentleman that I very keenly appreciate his support, and I can assure him that if during the present or at any later session he brings down any matter which is as worthy of endorsation as

that which I have brought to the attention of the House, I shall be very pleased to give it my support. The hon. gentleman and the party to which he belongs have made it somewhat difficult for me or any other member, except those who occupy seats alongside him, to follow him and his party in anything which they may introduce. He and his friends have organized what they claim to be a superior party with a superior platform.

Mr. BUREAU: A super-party.

Mr. EDWARDS: It does seem to me, Sir, that those hon. gentlemen have made this great mistake—and I believe they will become aware of it in the course of time—that they really have fashioned a god in their own image, and while they believe they are adoring that god they are in reality adoring themselves. I am glad to have the endorsation of these hon. gentlemen, and I hope that their participation in this debate—two of them have given my resolution their approval—is an indication that in time to come—for the rest of the session maybe—they will manifest that independence of everything savouring of party, which they have declared from the housetops to be the cardinal principle of their belief. If, for instance, we should have a debate on the eight-hour day, I would expect these chosen prophets from the agricultural districts not to absent themselves nor to keep absolutely silent as they did when the question was before this House the other day—and no question affects our farmers more—but to rise in their place, almost fighting for an opportunity to raise their voice against the introduction of any legislation to promote an eight-hour day. Because, whatever may be the opinions of farmers in regard to oleomargarine and many other things, there is not any doubt in my mind, Sir, that the vast majority of them would express themselves as against an eight-hour day.

I can understand, of course, the difficulty that these hon. gentlemen experience in taking a course like that, because it has been part of their platform, part of their policy, to link themselves up with labour in this country and they naturally feel diffident about saying anything which might turn aside from their party those of the labour group. In that respect these hon. gentlemen are showing some of the elements of political—would I be in order, Mr. Speaker, if I used the word "trickery?" It is the only word that occurs to my mind at the moment.

Mr. McMASTER: Sagacity.

[Mr. Edwards.]

Mr. EDWARDS: Sagacity—I thank my hon. friend. There is no limit to his vocabulary; that is a better word than the one which suggested itself to me. These hon. gentlemen have manifested some signs of possessing political sagacity, notwithstanding the fact that they tell us that they as a group will have nothing whatever to do with the old political parties; that party politics is something which is abhorent to them.

I wish to devote a little attention to the remarks of my genial friend from Chateauguay-Huntingdon (Mr. Robb) who occupies the important post of Chief Whip of His Majesty's loyal Opposition. I suppose that he sometimes feels impelled to take upon himself the burdens of the whole party on that side of the House and exercise his privilege as Chief Opposition Whip by cracking the whip around the shoulders of the Government whenever he can get an opportunity of doing so. I have no objection to the hon. gentleman exercising himself along that line, but I wish to direct one or two things to his attention. The hon. gentleman made the statement—which I may be pardoned for thinking was a little extravagant—that the dairy industry of this country would be ruined by the course which the Government had been taking. The hon. gentleman wished to leave the impression that the farmers were being, and had been, neglected by this Government; that their interests were not being properly looked after. May I direct his attention to the fact that in 1912 an Agricultural Aid Bill was put through providing for the appropriation of half a million dollars to assist the provincial departments of Agriculture in extending and carrying on their work; that in the next year an appropriation of $10,000,000 was voted to be spread over a period of ten years under the Agricultural Instruction Act, and that in the first four years during which that Act was operative my hon. friend's province drew from the Dominion Treasury for agricultural purposes over $800,000 and Ontario over $900,000? That has been added to somewhat since. May I direct his attention also to the aid which was given by this Government to veterinary colleges by a grant of $20,000 a year? May I summarize by pointing out that from 1905 to 1911 the total aid granted to agriculture by the federal Parliament amounted to $6,930,000 or an average of $1,155,000 a year, while between 1911 and 1917 the total amount granted by this Government to aid agriculture throughout the Dominion

amounted to over $19,000,000, an average of over $3,171,000? I merely direct attention to these figures in order to show the hon. member that if the grants to agriculture are to be taken as a criterion, then the hon. gentleman is not the person to complain of any lack of interest on the part of the Government which has been in power for the last six or seven years.

I wish to refer also to my hon. friend's statement in regard to milk and the alleged threat that the farmers would be put in jail if they raised the price of that commodity. I am not here to defend the Board of Commerce; in fact, Mr. Speaker, I may candidly tell you I do not feel any inclination to defend it. But in regard to fixing the price of milk, I may say that the price agreed upon was suggested by Mr. Stonehouse, President of the Milk Producers' Association, and that that price is very much higher than the price which the U.F.O.—Labour Government at present in power in Toronto are paying to the farmers down in my district for milk which they supply to the provincial institutions. Would my friends who comprise the group of prophets on the cross benches, the agrarian group, those who have laid upon their shoulders the burden of specially looking after the interests of farmers—would they address an appeal to Premier Drury, asserting that in their opinion as farmers and as the special representatives of that particular class of our population it is a crying shame that the farmer Government of Ontario is paying the farmers in my county less for the milk supplied to the provincial institutions than the price fixed by the Board of Commerce in Toronto and against which the U.F.O. members of this House and of the Toronto House directed a tirade of abuse? Now, here is an opportunity for them to show their particular interest in agriculture I trust that they will show it, and show it not as they did when the discussion came up on the eight-hour day—by keeping absolutely silent, but by communicating their views on the subject to the Government at Toronto which is abusing the farmer so shamefully in the matter of the price they are paying for the milk supplied to provincial institutions.

As to the further remarks made by the member for Chateauguay-Huntingdon, without taking the time to go into the details I would say that the lack of credit and the rate of exchange are a fair, full and sufficient answer to the criticism which he offers.

The member for Beauce (Mr. Beland) and the member for East Middlesex (Mr. Glass), very properly remarked that if butter was graded and then kept in storage for six or eight months it would be apt to be off colour or below grade, and that that was an argument against grading. I agree with the hon. gentlemen who have so expressed themselves. My idea is that the grading of butter which is destined for export should take place not six or eight or ten months before it is shipped, but only a few days before it is placed on the boat. That is what is done in New Zealand. I recognize that we are a different country from New Zealand or Denmark or Holland. These are small countries which we could tuck away in one corner of any of our provinces and never know they were there. We have a large country, a great extent of territory and I recognize the difficulties that will face us when we attempt to grade our export butter and cheese.

Most of that export will go through the port of Montreal, but I believe—and I am confirmed in my belief by what I heard at a meeting of the Deputy Ministers from the various provinces held at the Chateau Laurier last week—that the departments of Agriculture of the different provinces can work in harmony with the Department of Agriculture of the Dominion of Canada, and I believe there is a spirit that will enable them to work harmoniously together. I think the provinces should take up as their special work the grading of butter—I mention butter particularly—for home consumption, and that they should work in conjunction with the Federal Department which should assume the responsibility of grading anything that goes overseas. If the different provinces undertook to grade the butter produced in the creameries in those provinces, qualified men being appointed to do the grading, just as the man who would do the grading at Montreal would be a qualified man, I do not think there would be much difficulty about deterioration. In the first place, I am informed by the Chief Dairy Commissioner, who is a practical man and a man who has given a great deal of time and thought to this work, that butter which grades No. 1 is not very apt to deteriorate. He told me at six o'clock that some time ago he tested some butter in the city of Winnipeg which had been kept a year and a half and it was perfectly sound and sweet. I will grant you—and this is easily understandable—that butter grading No. 2, No. 3 and lower, will very easily deteriorate, but butter which grades No. 1 will not easily

deteriorate. That is his statement to me, and I believe that is right, so that I think if we had co-operation between the provinces and the Dominion in the matter of grading, this scheme would be workable to have our butter before it is put on board properly graded by competent men, and in that way we could maintain our reputation for making a good article. Otherwise, if the butter were to be graded six, eight or ten months before it was shipped, that would be a very great mistake because then we might send across the seas butter which bore the stamp of approval of the Dominion Government, and which was found to be inferior. In that way, we would do more harm than if we had never taken up the matter of grading at all.

I do not know that there is anything else that was brought up to which I wished particularly to refer. I appreciate the position taken by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie) and especially after he read the resolution which received the unanimous approval of the deputy ministers of the different provinces, that the time was not presently opportune to legislate on this matter. I believe it has his sympathy and will receive his support and that at the proper time legislation will be brought down which will standardize our butter and cheese for export.

I cannot, however, take my seat without making a brief reference to the question of oleomargarine. I do not agree with the hon. member for Peterborough West (Mr. Burnham), but we are not going to quarrel over that; he holds his opinion and is perfectly sincere in holding it. I hold a different opinion in regard to oleomargarine. The argument is advanced to-day that oleomargarine should be permitted and should be continued in this country, because the poor man cannot afford to pay the price that is asked for butter at the present time. The very same argument exactly, word for word, was advanced by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) and others when the Order in Council was put through on the 10th December, 1917, that the poor man could not afford to pay the price of butter at that time and that, therefore, he should have the privilege of getting oleomargarine. Butter at that time was selling at 40 cents a pound and oleomargarine was selling at 32 to 34 cents per pound. We were told then that the poor man could not possibly raise the other six or eight cents in order to buy butter; that he must have the fats that were essential to his health and that it would be a crime to keep him from having those fats in the form of oleomargarine. According to the statement made to-day by an hon. member opposite, the poor man is paying 45 cents a pound for oleomargarine, or more than he was said not to be able to pay for butter when the Order in Council was put through on the 10th December, 1917. What is the next step in connection with the matter? I presume the next step will be to sell him olive oil and cottonseed oil and let him drink that in order that he may get the necessary fats into his system, and get them at a lower cost than he is now obliged to pay for oleomargarine. No doubt we can feed him on neutral lard and we can give him a sucking bottle and let him take his fats in liquid form, because doubtless he would take the cottonseed oil and nut oil and those other things that form the conglomeration known as oleomargarine and get the necessary fats into his system in that shape, and he will have to get them in some shape like that, if he is going to get them at all, because if he could not afford to pay 40 cents a pound for butter in 1917, he cannot afford to pay 45 cents for oleomargarine in 1920. There is the situation. I maintain that having regard to the food value of butter, butter at 70 cents a pound is the cheapest article that the poor man puts on his table. I noticed the cut of an advertisement of one of those oleomargarine firms which was advertising what they call "King Nut." The advertisement read " King Nut is better than butter." There was a picture apparently of some place down in the South Sea Islands, because it showed a little expanse of water, some islands, some palm trees and some darkies running around with very little more clothing on them than you will see at some of the dress occasions which they have in high society. There was a fellow who, I guess, had got hold of some civilized clothes somewhere and he had put part of them on, but the rest of him was not covered. In that respect he was much like people we have to-day in some civilized communities, but he had on his head something that looked like a crown, and I presume he was the King Nut. The firm was advertising King Nut Oleomargarine made out of nuts and other things they get all over God's creation, gathered by people on whom the dirt does not show because of their natural colour, but no doubt some of it is mixed with the oil they produce. The stuff is gathered from all over creation and then these people who want to make money out of it and who are making thousands and tens of thousands of dollars a year out of

selling it to the people, knowing that they could not sell it unless they gave it an air of respectability, say that it has the creamy butter taste. We shall have an opportunity at some other time of discussing this question of oleomargarine and I am ready to take a hand in the discussion whenever the time comes. I do not believe there is a ten per cent—well, in order to be perfectly safe and not to have to question my conscience in the matter later on, I will say I do not believe there is twenty-five per cent of the oleomargarine sold in this country to-day that is sold as oleomargarine. I believe that 75 per cent of the oleomargarine sold in Canada is sold as butter, and at the price of butter, just as is the case in the United States. Of course, if your retail grocers and others can get this stuff out and have it coloured up to look like pure butter, why, they are going to pass it off, and the very people on whom they will pass it off are the poor men with large families, who are causing so much concern to many men in this House who are backing up oleomargarine. It is significant that those who were responsible for the oleomargarine Order in Council took mighty good care that it was made a punishable offence to mix any oleomargarine with butter. Mix all the butter you like with oleomargarine, but do not mix any oleomargarine with butter. The rich man must have his butter without any chance of contamination, but when it comes to the poor man, you can stick just enough butter in to fool him, and sell the compound to him as butter, as is very often done, I believe. It is a great big fraud, conceived in sin and iniquity. The whole thing is a great big greasy fraud perpetrated on the people of Canada. If oleomargarine is just as good as butter, why in Heaven's name put any restrictions on its sale at all? Why say you cannot mix it with butter? If you can mix butter with oleomargarine, why not let them mix oleomargarine with butter fifty to fifty or two to one, and say this is a compound of two to one or half and half? Oh no, that would not do. The aristocratic palates of some of the millionaires of this country might be defiled by tasting some oleomargarine, and that would not do at all. Keep your butter clear of oleo, but you can mix butter with oleo and put it over the poor man with a large family. He is having it put over him to the queen's taste—perhaps that is hardly an appropriate expression in connection with oleomargarine—but certainly the poor man is having it put over him on this oleo question

But there is a bigger thing at stake. It affects a great big industry in this country, one of the biggest industries in the Dominion with hundreds of millions of dollars invested in it, employing hundreds of thousands of people, and spending millions upon millions of money in wages. Surely this is an industry which is entitled to protection.

Mr. BURNHAM: It does not want protection.

Mr. EDWARDS: It does want protection, so this Government says, and the former Government, and in fact every Government from Confederation down to the present time. We have had a duty of four cents a pound on butter. Can you imagine anything more illogical or absurd than to protect the makers of butter by a duty of four cents a pound and at the same time allow a substitute for butter to come in duty free? It is absolutely ridiculous. I do not care whether you are a free trader or protectionist, there is no logic or sense in it. It is ridiculous from the ground up, and it is made ridiculous because of those who are particularly interested in this conglomeration called oleomargarine, and who by reason of this fraud that is being perpetrated upon the public are putting thousands and tens of thousands of dollars into their pockets. I say there is a great big industry at stake in this country. If I have a right to ask this House to endorse this resolution to standarize our butter, in order that it may win for itself a reputation Overseas, I do not want at the same time to run the risk of Canadian butter losing its reputation through the actions of some persons whose only instinct is to get money, and who would send overseas a conglomeration part butter and part oleomargarine, and palm it off in the markets of the world as butter. That is what is happening here at home, and that is what will happen overseas if they get stocked up with a lot of this stuff. They will mix it with butter and fool the people with it, because it will be money in their pockets to do it. You have to watch that end of it every time. In legislating along these lines, look out for the fellow who is only out after the dollar and does not care about the principle at stake. He will need watching with both eyes.

Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw my resolution because of what the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie) has said, believing that when the proper time comes the necessary steps will be taken to standardize our cheese and butter for export.

Mr. J. A. MAHARG (Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, if I have the privilege I should like to put my hon. friend right on a statement he made with reference to the cross-benchers.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid the hon. gentleman would not be in order. He has not spoken himself. He could correct, by a personal explanation, any statement that had been made about him, but certainly cannot make an explanation as representing the party.

Resolution withdrawn.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. BELAND (for Mr. Bureau):

For a copy of the report made by the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada on the application of the Canadian Pacific and Grand Trunk Railway Companies on behalf of themselves and other railways carrying His Majesty's mail in Canada asking that fair and reasonble rates be fixed by the board for the carriage of mails pursuant to the reference of the matter to the board by Order in Council P.C. 617, dated March 7, 1917, for the determination as to the accuracy or inaccuracy of the claim made by the railway companies, that these rates are inadequate, and, if it is found that the present rates are inadequate to determine as the result of evidence to be submitted by the Post Office Department and the railway companies interested what would be a fair rate of payment for the service. Also a copy of all correspondence between members of the Government or any officials thereof and the Board of Railway Commissioners or any officials thereof in reference to the report mentioned above.

Mr. FIELDING:

For a return showing the cases in which, from October 1, 1896, to the present, in the computation of superannuation allowances to retiring officials, additional years were allowed under the provisions of Section 12 of Chapter 7, R.S., the dates of the granting of the allowances, the names of the officials and the number of years added to the actual service; along with a copy of all Treasury Board Reports and Orders in Council relating to such cases.

Mr. FIELDING:

For a copy of the Orders in Council of December 1, 1919, and December 9, 1919, respecting ratification of the treaties and conventions laid before the House of Commons on Monday, March 1, 1920.

RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF SOLDIERS.

APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS.

Hon. NEWTON W. ROWELL (President of the Privy Council) moved:

That a Special Committee be appointed to consider the question of continuing the War Bonus now being paid to pensioners under the existing pension law, and any amendments to the law which may be proposed or may be considered necessary by the Committee, and to report the result to the House; with power to call for persons, papers and records, to examine witnesses under oath, and to report from time to time; and that Rule No. 11 be suspended in relation thereto.

He said: In moving this resolution, Mr. Speaker, I may say that it is not the view of the Government that the Pensions Committee this year should be called upon to review our whole pensions legislation as it has been called upon to review that legislation during the last two years. I believe that we now have a pension law which both in its scope and, in its general provisions, is an admirable one, and that therefore the work of the pension committee this year will be much less onerous than it has been in the past. While there is no restriction on the matters which the committee may properly consider in the motion I have submitted to the House, I think the important matters which the committee may be called upon to consider will be limited in number.

The first is the one suggested in the resolution, namely, the continuation of the war bonus which was granted by the legislation of last session. Hon. members will recall that a bonus of twenty per cent was added to the total disability and partial disability pensions and to the pensions to widows, should this be continued, extended or otherwise modified. This pensions committee will also be called upon to consider the matter brought to the attention of the House last week by the hon. member for South Quebec (Mr. Power), supported by the hon. member for London (Mr. Cronyn), as to whether, in computing pensions for widowed mothers, the amount of their income from other sources should be taken into account. That is a subject which the pensions committee will be asked to consider. Another matter of very considerable moment—and I mention it so that hon. members may give it some consideration—is the question whether the Board of Pensions Commissioners should be authorized to commute the pensions of those suffering from disability less than twenty per cent. When the disability is less than twenty per cent the pension is necessarily of a rather limited amount, payable monthly or quarterly as the case may be, and the payments are not large. It so happens, however, that more than fifty per cent of the total number of pensions is of this class, and it is estimated that the administrative staff might be very substantially reduced if the smaller pensions were commuted. In fact, the Board of Pension Commissioners estimate that a reduction in the expenses of administration to the amount of not less

than $300,000 a year might be made if these pensions were commuted. It is a question that will go to the pensions committee for its consideration, but hon. members will see that it is an important one from the standpoint of administration.

Mr. BELAND: Most of the employees are returned soldiers, are they not?

Mr. ROWELL: The employees on the staff are returned soldiers, but hon. members will see from the estimates before the House that the cost of administering our pensions is a very substantial annual charge upon the revenues. I do not say that the committee should agree to this; I simply throw it out as an important matter which I think they should consider.

There is a fourth question which was brought to the attention of the House by the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Peck), and that is, whether or not the pensions to the widows at the present time are adequate. That is a proper matter for the consideration of the Pensions Committee.

I think that probably these matters I have enumerated will constitute the most important questions which will come before the Pensions Committee this year for consideration, but the resolution is broad enough to cover any question which any member of the Pensions Committee may think should be considered by way of an amendment to the existing law, and any matter that may be brought to the attention of the committee for their consideration by any hon. member of the House or any other parties interested in the subject.

Mr. BELAND: Has the minister any idea how many members will compose the committee?

Mr. ROWELL: The committee will comprise the following members: Messrs. Arthurs, Béland, Bolton, Brien, Caldwell, Clark (Bruce), Cronyn, Devlin, Fontaine, Green, Lang, MacNutt, McCurdy, McGibbon (Muskoka), Nesbitt, Peck, Pacaud, Pardee, Power, Redman, Ross, Rowell, Savard, and Sutherland.

Mr. BELAND: That is a somewhat smaller committee than the last.

Mr. ROWELL: I think it is the same size as the committee of last year.

Mr. MAHARG: Will the scope of the committee be broad enough to include members of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police who are now drawing pensions?

Mr. ROWELL: No. This committee relates to pensions for the Canadian Expeditionary Force only. That was the purpose for which the committee was appointed in the past. It will deal only with soldiers.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. ROWELL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move:

That a Special Committee be appointed in conformity with the resolution agreed to by the House this day to consider the question of continuing the war bonus now being paid to pensioners under the existing pension law, and any amendments to the law which may be proposed or may be considered necessary by the committee, to consist of the following members: Messrs. Arthurs, Béland, Bolton, Brien, Caldwell, Clark (Bruce), Cronyn, Devlin, Fontaine, Green, Lang, MacNutt, McCurdy, McGibbon (Muskoka), Nesbitt, Peck, Pacaud, Pardee, Power, Redman, Ross, Rowell, Savard, and Sutherland.

Motion agreed to.

OTTAWA MINT ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Sir Henry Drayton, the House went into Committee on the following proposed resolution, Mr. Boivin in the Chair:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend section two of the Ottawa Mint Act, Chapter twenty-six of the Revised Statutes, 1906, as enacted by Chapter thirty-one of the Statutes of 1913, by providing that the yearly payment for defraying the salaries, contingencies, retiring and other allowances and expenses connected with the maintenance of the Ottawa Branch of the Royal Mint and of the refinery forming part thereof, be increased from one hundred and ten thousand dollars to two hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. FIELDING: Will the minister kindly explain?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (Minister of Finance): Mr. Chairman, our work in the Mint is somewhat different from ordinary governmental activities. The arrangements under which the Mint is operated in Ottawa were made by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) in 1906. The Canadian Mint is a branch of the Royal Mint. It is subject to the rules of the Royal Mint. The Royal Mint appoints the officers and does everything which is necessary to be done in order to keep up the high standard of its operations, and is responsible for these operations. We pay for the operations, but we get all the resulting profits from the Mint. There is a yearly payment by Canada to the royal commissioners of the Mint. In 1906 that annual payment was $75,000, and in 1913 it had risen to $110,000. The cost of the Mint has not been carried by the annual payment. The commissioners now desire that instead of supplementary votes

being brought in from time to time, the spirit of the first arrangement should be carried out; that the annual grant made under the statute towards the Mint should be continued and that the amount should be increased to what would fairly represent the present activities of the Mint. The proposition is to raise it to the sum of $200,000. The business of the Mint has very greatly increased. When the annuity was raised in 1913 to $110,000 the coins produced by the Mint numbered 17,668,978, while the coins produced in 1919 numbered 35,986,003. The output has more than doubled and the expenses, of course, are creeping up. One further thing that I should call to the attention of the Committee is that unless the amount of the annuity is absolutely required by the royal commissioners of the Mint on Canada's account the expenditure is not made. In addition to the coins which were milled for Canada's purposes, the Committee may be interested in knowing in 1918 the Canadian Mint produced for the Royal Mint 4,435,000 shilling blanks, while in 1919 the Mint milled for the Royal Mint 1,566,340 blanks. The Mint is one of the few things which really pay. Of course it is not run directly for the purposes of gain, but as a matter of fact from the year 1908 to the end of last year the excess of receipts over expenditures amounted to $6,624,354.44.

Mr. FIELDING: It is a mere matter of accounting. We have to provide for the cost of the Mint and in view of its largely increased operations it is but reasonable to provide for an increased expenditure. At the time that the Mint was established there were some obvious advantages in having it as a branch of the Royal Mint so that the Canadian Mint might expect to be in a position to do minting work for other parts of the Empire. At that time it was thought that probably there would not be enough work to keep the Mint entirely employed on Canadian currency. I think the arrangements that were made for the Royal Mint have proven entirely satisfactory. One result of making this a branch of the Royal Mint was that we had the experience of the men who had been engaged in this work. I suppose we gave up a little bit of what is called patronage, although we are told that patronage has now been abolished. We have nothing to do, practically speaking, with the appointment of the officials; that is done under the direction of the authorities of the Royal Mint in England. Of course, as I said, this is a mere matter of accounting. If the operations of the Mint do not call for this larger sum, as the minister says, it will not be paid. The Mint, however, is a source of profit and whatever profit there is goes not to the Royal Mint but to the Government of Canada. I think the minister has given good reasons why this resolution should be adopted.

Mr. BELAND: Do I understand that the only privilege we have in connection with the Royal Mint is to pay the salaries? Do we appoint the employees?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Our privileges up to date might be covered by the result I have just mentioned—profits to the amount of $6,600,000.

Mr. BELAND: But this last year we have been operating the Mint at a loss?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No.

Mr. BELAND: I thought I heard the statement made the other day by the minister.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Yes, but we stopped that. The country would have been operating the Mint at a loss having regard to the silver coinage. We had contracts for the supply of silver which ran us over a very considerable period of the high silver price so that we were able to mint it at a profit. When we had to buy dear silver we reduced the silver content.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend from Beauce (Mr. Beland) will see that we not only have the privilege of paying but we also have the privilege of gathering in the profit.

Resolution reported.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 30 to amend the Ottawa Mint Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Burrell the House went into Committee to consider the following resolution:

Resolved, That it is expedient that section one hundred and twenty-seven of the The Customs Act, chapter forty-eight of the Revised Statutes, which provides that fire-arms and munitions of war shall not be imported except from the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland unless upon application to and permission given by the Minister, be amended by striking out the exception in favour of the United Kingdom; and, further, that a clerical error in section two hundred and sixty-four of the said Act be corrected by inserting the word "or" between the words "forfeiture" and "for" in the eighth line thereof.

Hon. MARTIN BURRELL (Minister of Customs): The first amendment speaks for itself. We have always had control of the importation of fire-arms from other countries by requiring the owners of such fire-arms to have licenses or permits from the Minister of Customs, but an exception applied to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. With a view to securing better control it has been thought desirable to withdraw this exception. The second amendment is a purely clerical one. By some mistake the section was allowed to stand for some years as drawn, and we are now making the necessary correction.

Mr. CAHILL: Have the Government in mind the entire prohibition of the importation of small arms?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL: I would not like to speak positively as to that in the absence of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), because his department has been dealing with the question under the Criminal Code. Perhaps my hon. friend would repeat his question when the Bill is up for second reading.

Resolution reported.

Hon. Mr. BURRELL moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 31 to amend the Customs Act.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Rowell the House adjourned at 9.35 p.m.

Tuesday, March 23, 1920.

The House met at Three o'clock.

REPORT TABLED.

Annual Report of the Department of Labour.—Hon. Mr. Meighen (for the Minister of Labour).

SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH.

REAPPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE.

Rt. Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Acting Prime Minister): With the consent of the House I should like to propose a motion, which I shall explain in a few words. In the first session of 1919 a resolution proposed by the member for London (Mr. Cronyn) was adopted by the House approving the appointment of a committee on scientific research. On the motion of Hon. Dr. Reid, a committee was appointed. That committee made certain inquiries and on July 1, 1919, submitted a report which contained the following recommendation:

> Your committee would therefore recommend that the committee should be reappointed as early as possible next session to give further consideration to this matter, and to prepare to the House for consideration proposals dealing therewith.

The committee had been unable to complete its investigations; accordingly this recommendation was made. The report was adopted by the House and the recommendation for the reappointment of the committee, therefore approved. The session of last autumn was called for special legislation, and it was not considered best that the committee should be reappointed for that session. At the beginning of the present session I went into the matter, and with a view to carrying out the recommendation of the committee and the wish of the House as expressed by its approval of that report, I beg to move:

> That a special committee be appointed forthwith to consider the matter of the development in Canada of scientific research with power to call for persons, papers and records to examine witnesses under oath, and to report from time to time; that rule 11 be suspended in connection therewith, and that the following persons do constitute such committee: Messieurs Archambault, Béland, Cowan, Cronyn, Denis, Manion, Maclean (Halifax), McGibbon (Muskoka), Nicholson (Algoma), Pardee, Ross (Middlesex), Sheard, Sinclair (Antigonish and Guysboro), Steele, Thompson (Yukon), Tweedie, and Whidden.

That is practically the Committee of last year, with some additions.

Mr. SPEAKER: There having been no notice of this motion, it requires, of course, the unanimous consent of the House.

Motion agreed to.

COMMERCIAL FEEDING STUFFS.

Hon. N. W. ROWELL (Minister of Health) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 32, respecting Commercial Feeding Stuffs.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Explain.

Mr. ROWELL: This is merely a revision of the existing law with the necessary amendments to bring it up to date. The provisions relating to commercial feeding stuffs which now appear in the Adulteration of Foods Act, have been taken out of that Act and are to be included in this, so that the one Act will cover the whole matter.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

CANADA'S CONTRIBUTION TO LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

Out of what appropriation was the sum of $64,043.15 paid on February 13 as Canada's contribution to the expense of the League of Nations?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL: It was paid out of the Demobilization Vote.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

On the Orders of the Day.

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Vercheres): I should like to direct the attention of the Government to some orders for returns standing in my name which were adopted by the House last session. I refer to an order of September 18, 1919, regarding the Siberian Expeditionary Force; an order of September 29, regarding the Military Hospital at Ste. Anne de Bellevue, and an order of October 20, calling for a list of Grand Trunk shareholders. On the 10th of November, the last day of the session, I was assured by the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Doherty) and the then Secretary of State (Hon. Mr. Burrell) that these returns would be forthcoming. I now ask that they be brought down as soon as possible.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I will make inquiry and if they are get-atable I shall have them brought down almost immediately.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I was assured last year that they would be available.

SUPPLY.

GOVERNMENT SHIPBUILDING. VOTE OF $20,000,000.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Marine Department. Government shipbuilding programme—amount required for the construction of vessels in accordance with Government programme, $20,000,000.

Hon. C. C. BALLANTYNE (Minister of Marine): Mr. Chairman, I think it is only fitting, before hon. members are asked to give their consideration to such a large appropriation as $20,000,000, that I should give some detailed information in regard to it. This amount of $20,000,000 is being asked for in order to complete the Government merchant marine shipbuilding programme, and part of the appropriation is a re-vote from last year. If Parliament gives its consent to this appropriation, then the Government have no further Estimates to bring down in connection with the building of steel freight ships.

It might be well for me to refer briefly to the condition of the shipbuilding industry from 1875 up to 1919. This is a comparative statement showing the number and tonnage of vessels on the registry books of Canada on the 31st December in the following years:

Year.	Number of Vessels.	Net Tonnage.
1875	6,952	1,205,565
1885	7,315	1,231,856
1895	7,262	825,776
1905	7,325	669,825
1915	8,757	929,312
1919	8,573	1,091,780

Hon. members will note the great shrinkage in shipbuilding in Canada over the periods which I have just mentioned. During the last ten years, while the quantity is small, the vessels built were of both classes, wood and steel. In 1919, it will be seen that the business revived again on account of the war, and 8,573 vessels were built with a net tonnage of 1,091,780 tons.

Before the war the world's merchant shipping was roughly 43,000,000 tons, of which tonnage Great Britain owned approximately 23,250,000 tons. Owing to the great destruction by submarines during the war, the total world tonnage lost by enemy action was 15,000,000 tons gross, and of these losses British merchant tonnage comprised 2,479 vessels with a gross tonnage of 7,759,090 tons. I also regret to state that 14,287 lives were lost. 675 fishing vessels were lost, with a gross tonnage of 71,765 tons, and in addition 1,885 British vessels, with a total tonnage of 8,007,967 tons were damaged and temporarily put out of commission, involving the loss of 592 lives.

At this point may I be permitted to pay a tribute—which I am sure will be concurred in by all hon. members and in which I am sure I am expressing the opinion of the Parliament of Canada— to the heroic men who manned the merchant marine, and so many of whom gave up their lives during the recent war?

I wish to state very briefly the reason why the Government decided to enter upon a shipbuilding policy. I do not need to refer to the matter at length, because I have already referred in considerable detail to the reason why the Government decided to enter upon this large shipbuilding programme. In a word, the reason was simply this, that, owing to the great loss of world tonnage and the imperative need of Canada creating, owning and operating a merchant marine of her own, and also in view of the fact that the Government

owned a very large system of railways which, when the Grand Trunk is formally taken over, will comprise some 22,000 miles, it was a matter of very urgent importance that Canada should own her own merchant marine to do work in conjunction with our large transcontinental railway system, and also for the purpose of expanding Canada's export business. Later on, I shall have something more to say in this regard, but I will now pass on to the contracts that have been let. The following table shows the several classes of vessels constructed and in course of construction, they being divided into six types, as follows:

Type.	Tonnage.	No. of vessels contracted for.
No. 1	10,800	2
No. 2	8,300	25
No. 3	5,100	8
No. 4	4,500	8
No. 5	3,400 to 3,900	17
No. 6	2,800	3
Total		63

This shows a total of 63 vessels contracted for and a total net tonnage of 380,435 tons.

Mr. DEVLIN: Could the minister give the dates of the different contracts?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am sorry I cannot, at the present moment, give the hon. member the information he desires, but I shall be very glad to get it for him if he so wishes. The contracts are spread over a period from, we shall say, March or April, 1918, up to within a few weeks ago. The average cost of these 63 vessels, including the contracts that were let during the war and since the armistice was signed, is $191-.92 per ton. During the war contracts were let at from $180 per ton for the larger vessels to $215 per ton for the lake size. Since the armistice has been signed, we have been able to contract for the large size at $167.50 per ton and for the lake size at $180.

The contracts have been placed with the following yards:

Ships.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.
Canadian Vickers, Ltd.—			
2	4,575	9,150	
10	8,390	83,900	
			93,050
Harbour Marine Company, Victoria—			
2	8,390		16,780
Collingwood Shipbuilding Company—			
7	3,890		27,230
Kingston Shipbuilding Company—			
2	3,890		7,780
Port Arthur Shipbuilding Company—			
4	3,400	13,600	
2	4,375	8,750	
1	3,890	3,890	
			26,240
Halifax Shipyards, Ltd.—			
2	10,800	21,600	
2	8,390	16,780	
			38,380
Tidewater Shipbuilders Ltd.—			
4	5,100		20,400
Davie Shipbuilding Company—			
2	5,100	10,200	
1	8,390	8,390	
			18,590
British American Shipbuilding Company—			
Ships.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.
2	4,575		9,150
Midland Shipbuilding Company—			
1	3,890		3,890
Dominion Shipbuilding Company—			
2	3,500		7,000
J. Coughlan & Son—			
6	8,390		50,340
Wallace Shipyards, Ltd.—			
2	4,575	9,150	
2	5,100	10,200	
2	8,390	16,780	
			36,130
Prince Rupert Shipbuilding Company—			
2	8,390		16,780
Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company—			
3	2,800		8,400

Then as to deliveries made: 7 ships have been completed of type No. 2, 8,300 tons; 4 ships have been completed of type No. 3, 5,100 tons; 4 ships have been completed of type No. 4, 4,500 tons; 8 ships have been completed of type No. 5, 3,400 to 3,900 tons, and 1 ship has been completed of type No. 6, 2,800 tons. Of the 8,300 ton type, 5 are being equipped with oil fuel apparatus and 13 of the same type are being fitted with refrigerating space.

The expenditure to date is as follows: Total payments up to April, 1919, $19,510,-322.35; total payments from April, 1919 to March 1, 1920, $24,194,639.78—grand total, $43,704,962.13. Balance available on March 1, 1920, from vote for current year, $15,505,-361.22.

There has been some criticism in the press, but very little I am happy to say, in regard to the cost of the Government ships, and I wish to take advantage of this occasion to make a comparison between our cost and the cost of ships contracted for in Canada by the Imperial Munitions Board for Great Britain, also the cost of ships built for Great Britain in foreign countries, and the cost of similar types of steel ships built in the United States.

Mr. DUFF: Would the minister be good enough to give us the date of the last contract he made?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It was about a month ago; I cannot give the exact date at

the moment. From information available it is learned that the vessels constructed by the United States Emergency Fleet Corporation varied considerably in cost. Most, if not all, of the contracts placed by them during the war contained a provision that the price agreed upon in the contract was to increase or decrease according as wages and the cost of materials increased or decreased. Inasmuch as there was a steady increase in wages, there was a consequent increase in the cost of materials, with the result that it was not possible for them to determine the cost of their ships until after they were completed. It was then found that the price ranged very considerably over $200 per ton.

In connection with our system of placing contracts, we first of all had our own technical officers figure up the cost. Then we called for bids and made the very closest and best arrangement we could with the various yards with which we have placed contracts. We made our price and our contracts at so much per ton deadweight. It will be noted that the policy of our American friends differed entirely from the policy pursued by the Canadian Government. They took a base price and then had a clause in their contract to the effect that as wages and the cost of materials varied up or down—and it was always up—an increase in price would be allowed from the time the contract was let until the ship was completed. Consequently, until the ship was ready to be put into commission, they could not tell what the actual cost was. I believe I am making a very conservative statement when I say that the large amount of steel tonnage constructed in the United States for the Emergency Fleet Corporation cost $200 per ton or over. The firm of Skinner and Eddie of Seattle, are constructing a standard vessel of 8,800 tons capacity, and Mr. Skinner, giving testimony before the United States Senate last month, declared that these vessels were being constructed at the present time at a price of $188 per deadweight ton. Vessels somewhat similar in size but more exacting in the matter of equipment, etc., are being built in British Columbia at the present time under the Government programme for $167.50 per ton.

Now I wish to refer to the cost of ships built in this country by the Imperial Munitions Board, and I am offering no criticism whatever of the way in which the board let contracts: on the contrary, I think they deserve a great deal of credit for getting the steel shipbuilding industry in this country started in the manner they did. My figures are taken from the report of the National Committee on Expenditure appointed by the British Government, and are therefore official and authentic.

The Imperial Munitions Board ordered 44 steel ships in Canada at £39.10s per ton which would be equivalent to $190. I wish to point out that when they placed their contracts in 1916 the cost of labour, of shipplates, and of all other material entering into a ship was not nearly as high as when this Government entered on their shipbuilding programme about May of 1918. The Imperial Munitions Board also constructed in Canada 16 wooden ships at a cost of £42 per net ton deadweight, which in Canadian money would be equivalent to $204.

Some criticism has been levelled at the Government for intervening at the time we did instead of allowing the Imperial Munitions Board to proceed with their shipbuilding programme, but I am sure hon. members must see the wisdom of the Government entering upon our very large shipbuilding programme at that time, because the ships built by the Imperial Munitions Board were built for Great Britain. They were put under British registry, and could not be used in conjunction with our transcontinental railway system, or in opening up new trade routes and expanding our export business. I consider, therefore, that the Government acted wisely in informing the representative of the Imperial Munitions Board here that Canada would no longer advance loans to the British Government to have ships built for England, in Canadian yards and under British registry, but rather that it was the policy of the Canadian Government to build their own ships, pay for them with their own money, and afterwards operate them for the national benefit of Canada. I will mention the ships that were built for England in other countries during the war, because I conceive that this information may be of much interest to the House.

England ordered to be built in the United States thirteen steel ships at £41.7.10, equivalent to $200 per ton; in Japan, nineteen vessels at a cost of £44.17.8, or $214 Canadian money, per ton; to be built in China, or at least to be assembled there, three ships at £41, or $199, per ton.

Since the beginning of the present year, Norwegian interests placed orders for cargo vessels of 9,500 tons deadweight, with shipbuilding firms on the Clyde, at a price of $162 per ton, as compared with the price in this country, for the same size of vessel, of $167.50 per ton; and a cargo vessel of 7,750 tons deadweight, 11 knots, oil fuel,

was contracted for recently by one of the companies engaged in transatlantic business, at a price of $220.35 per ton.

The routes on which the Canadian Government Merchant Marine have placed their vessels now in commission are : Canada to Liverpool; Canada to Glasgow; Canada to London; Canada to Brazil and Buenos Aires, calling at Pernambuco, Santos and Rio; Canada direct to Havana, three sailings through the present month; Canada to Barbadoes, Trinidad and Demerara; Canada to Havana; Cuba and Kingston; Vancouver to New Zealand and Australia. These are the routes on which our ships are already sailing, and the proposed additional routes on which the Canadian Government Merchant Marine will place our other vessels as they are ready to be put into commission are: Canada to other United Kingdom ports such as Manchester, and looking into the possibility of moving traffic to Ireland via Queenstown; extending the Jamaica service to Venezuela; weekly or fortnightly service from Montreal to St. John's, Newfoundland, calling at Charlottetown, when traffic offers during the season of open navigation, and the rest of the season from Halifax; considering a service to the Orient when vessels are available; looking into the possibilities of a service to India and, if conditions warrant, such a service will be established; considering a service from Vancouver to South Africa and return via Singapore and Hongkong; investigating conditions regarding a service from British Columbia ports to the west coast of South America.

At this point I should like to make a public appeal to the Canadian manufacturers to bestir themselves and to show more interest in the export trade of Canada than they have shown during the past years. If Canada is to throw off her great financial burden it is indispensable that this country should have a larger export trade than we enjoy at the present time. The Government have done their part by building up this large and efficient merchant marine. We have railway connection, and I have had placed on board these vessels, with accommodation for luggage and samples, additional staterooms in order that our manufacturers may be able to send their commercial travellers to these foreign countries on board Government ships. Our Government Merchant Marine is a great advertising medium for Canada and for our products generally. As hon. members are aware, the name of every one of our ships has the prefix "Canadian" before it; for example, Canadian Pioneer, Canadian Voyageur, Canadian Seigneur, etc. When our ships are in port they fly from the top mast the house flag, a white flag with a red cross and a beaver in the corner. Any one will at once recognize a Canadian ship, first by the name, and also by the house flag she flies while in port. I do not know of any better way in which Canada could advertise her own interests and develop the possibilities of the country than through the instrumentality of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, the ships of which will shortly be sailing the Seven Seas of the world. These vessels will prove of the greatest assistance to this country in the matter of imports. I may say that they were not constructed with a view to carrying manufactured products only. They are intended to carry the products of the mines, the fisheries, the forests and the field. These vessels will prove of the utmost importance and value to Western Canada, which has such vast quantities of grain to ship. These products will travel first of all over the Government railways, and our merchant marine will distribute them to various ports of the world to which they are destined. Continuity is maintained, the grain being handled by the Government system of railways until it reaches the seaboard, where it is transferred to the Canadian Government ships. And if the time should ever arrive when Canada will be discriminated against in any way, although I trust that such a possibility is very remote, then she has within her grasp the right to regulate the rates of freight on the products of the farm, the manufactures of the country, and all our natural products, from the point of shipment right through to the point of destination. Under all the circumstances, therefore, the Canadian Government Merchant Marine is fiilling a long-felt national want.

It may probably be of some interest to hon. members to know what kind of cargoes our vessels have so far been carrying. They are as follows:

CARGOES CARRIED FROM PACIFIC PORTS.

"Canadian Volunteer"—Genoa Bay to Garston, England, 2,085,569 feet of lumber.

"Canadian Trooper"—Vancouver to London, 1,956,216 feet of lumber.

"Canadian Aviator"—Vancouver to Garston, England, 1,934,938 feet of lumber.

"Canadian Raider"—Genoa Bay to Melbourne, 2,005,857 feet of lumber.

"Canadian Importer"—Vancouver to Melbourne, general cargo, consisting principally of the following:

Corsets from the Dominion Corset Company, Quebec.

Sewing machines from Cleveland.
Rubber tires from the Goodyear Rubber Company, Toronto.
Underwear from Hamilton.
Bicycles from Western Ontario.
Newsprint from the Canadian Export Paper Company.
Chocolates from Toronto.
Newsprint from Powell River Company, British Columbia.
Canned Herrings from the Canadian Fishing Company.
Mantles, lumber, laths, whitelead, etc., from various shippers.

This will give some idea of what a general cargo means.

Referring to our smaller vessels that are on the West Indian route, hon. members will be interested to know the vast quantities of raw sugar that were brought from the West Indies to Montreal, Halifax, and St. John, N.B. If it had not been for the Canadian Government ships I think I can say that there would have been a sugar shortage in this country. The sugar carried from the West Indies to St. John and Halifax was 47,266 tons. The total tonnage at present loaded and en route to St. John and Halifax is 14,155 tons. In addition to the above these vessels have undertaken to load before the end of April and deliver at Canadian ports 28,400 tons making a grand total of 89,821 gross tons valued at $13,164,160.40.

The number of voyages that our ships have made is as follows:

VOYAGES MADE TO FEBRUARY 6, 1920.

	Voyages.
To West Indies	27
To Buenos Ayres	4
To London	5
To Liverpool	9
To Glasgow	1
To United Kingdom from Vancouver, via Panama Canal	3
To Bordeaux	1
To Havre	1
To Australia and New Zealand	1
To St. John's, Newfoundland	4
	56

I now come to what must be the most interesting part to hon. members and to the public generally. It is not often that ships, railways or other things are managed and operated by governments in such a way as to show a balance on the right side, but I am happy to say that from the figures I will give in the moment you will see that although 19 of these ships have only been in commission for a short time, not one of them having been in commission for a full year, the balance is on the right side. I wish to explain how the net earnings are arrived at. The Canadian Government Merchant Marine follow good business practice.

They had to put on a new organization and to open up new trade routes. After providing for organization, overhead expenses, operating expenses, depreciation, insurance and five and a half per cent on cost, the ships have made a remarkably good showing.

I think it is only fair that as Minister of Marine, and on behalf of the Government of Canada, I should pay a tribute to Mr. D. B. Hanna and his board of directors of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine for having accomplished such a fine result as I am going to refer to in a moment, not withstanding all the difficulties inseparable from new routes and a new organization. I am immensely pleased as the minister responsible, so is the Government, and I am sure that hon. members and the people of Canada will also be pleased. The profit statement is as follows:

Up to the end of December, 1919, there were delivered 19 steamers. Many of these were received during the late summer and fall, so that only 13 had completed voyages by the end of the year. As already mentioned, routes were opend to South America, West Indies and the United Kingdom. By December 31 28 voyages had been completed. The total gross earnings of all boats amounted to $3,448,030.25, and the net earnings to $1,406,000. This net will provide interest at 5½ per cent on the Government's investment, full reserve for depreciation and a handsome margin in addition. These earnings are held by the company in the shape of bank balances, Victory bonds and accounts receivable. In view of the fact that many of the boats were only in service for a portion of the year, and also as the initial expenses in placing boats in commission are extremely heavy, I think you will agree with me that the operations of the Government's Merchant Marine present an exceedingly satisfactory showing.

It will be of interest, I am sure, to the House to know that the Government boats enabled the exportation of Canadian products last year to the value of $21,362,000, much of which would not have been shipped if the shipping facilities had not been provided by the Government.

It will be also interesting to know that since the first of the year, the shipyards on the Pacific Coast have delivered three boats, the "Canadian Raider," the "Canadian Importer," and the "Canadian Exporter," all of which will be employed in the Canadian-Australian trade. The "Canadian Raider" and "Canadian Importer" have already sailed with a full cargo of

lumber in the one case, and a full cargo of confectionery, newsprint, lumber, rubber tires, etc., in the other.

The " Canadian Exporter " is loading at the present time. It is expected that with the service which the Canadian Government Merchant Marine will be able to provide between Canada, Australia and New Zealand very important business will be established.

I wish also to explain how the Government transferred these ships, built and paid for by public money, to the Canadian Government Merchant Marine. By Order in Council these ships were transferred to the Canadian Government Merchant Marine at the contract price. In lieu of that the Canadian Government Merchant Marine issued notes payable to the honourable the Minister of Finance bearing interest at the rate of 5½ per cent. It is incumbent upon the Canadian Government Merchant Marine not only to meet the interest on the cost of construction on these vessels at 5½ per cent but also to pay the principal from time to time out of earnings. I am very happy to announce that notwithstanding, as I have already explained, that only 19 vessels were for a portion of the year in commission, yet, out of earnings the Canadian Government Merchant Marine have issued a cheque to the consolidated revenue fund of Canada for $500,000 which meets the interest at the rate of 5½ per cent up to the end of December 31, 1919. Hon. members will see that the Canadian Government Merchant Marine are paying their way although they have hardly got started.

It may interest hon. members to know what our sister Dominion of Australia is doing. Australia has half our population but is still a nation of great vision, energy and capability. Here is what Australia has done with regard to shipbuilding:

Australian Shipbuilding Programme.

In the early days of the war, Australia acquired by purchase 15 second hand British vessels with a tonnage of approximately 100,000 tons. In addition the Commonwealth Government undertook a local building programme The original programme provided for the construction of 24 steel vessels of about 5,500 tons deadweight each and 24 wooden vessels of about 2,600 tons deadweight each. A second programme was subsequently undertaken which provided for the construction of 14 steel ships of about 6,000 tons deadweight each. In addition contracts were placed by the Australian Government for the construction of 6 vessels in United Kingdom yards of about 12,000 tons deadweight.

When Australia completes her programme she will possess a total tonnage of 348,400 tons net, a very good merchant marine for our overseas Dominions to have.

Mr. DUFF: Before the minister leaves the subject of net profits, will he be good enough to tell us how much of the profits has been set aside to rest account for depreciation.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I have not with me at the present time all the details of the organizations' bookkeeping.

Mr. DUFF: Could the minister give the gross amount?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: That has been set aside to rest account?

Mr. DUFF: Yes, to rest account for depreciation.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am sorry I cannot give that information at the moment. I have given the gross earnings and the net earnings, and explained how these sums were arrived at, but just how much has been set aside to rest account I cannot say. I know that up to to-day the organization has in the bank, in the shape of cash and victory bonds, the large amount of one and one-half millions, but just what portion of that has been set aside for depreciation I cannot at present state. However, I shall endeavour to get the information for the hon. gentleman before the discussion on this item is finished.

Mr. DUFF: I would like to have the information if possible before the debate closes.

Mr. DEVLIN: Is that over and above the $500,000 cheque that was placed with the Department of Finance?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The cheque of $500,000 was paid out of the net earnings as I have stated.

Mr. DEVLIN: I might state that since asking for the dates of the contracts, I have received the desired information.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I now come to another important adjunct of shipping, and that is the establishment of a steel plate mill and the contract entered into by the Dominion Steel Corporation with the Government. The contract calls for 250,000 tons of ship plates, the Government obligating themselves on their part to take 50,000 tons per year for a period of five years with the

option of increasing that quantity up to 75,000 tons if they should think fit to do so. The contract with the Dominion Steel Corporation was made at a time when the war was on. The Government had entered upon their shipbuilding programme and the only country that Canada could get ships plates from was the United States. We placed a large order in that country for 80,000 tons, but notwithstanding all our efforts to get delivery of steel we were only able, after waiting for twelve months, to get 6,000 tons. At that time no one knew how long the war was going to last and the necessities of shipping were very pressing upon the Government. Therefore they decided that Canada should be self-contained, as far as shipbuilding was concerned, and entered into the contract, to which I have already referred, with the Dominion Steel Corporation of Sydney.

The Government made this contract at a price of $4.15 per hundred pounds. That was during the war, but after the armistice had been signed I summoned the officials of the Steel Corporation to Ottawa and told them that while the contract was binding upon both parties I could not force them to reduce their price, but at the same time the Government would appreciate it if they could see their way clear to make a reduction. I am very pleased to say the officials received the proposal in a very broad and generous spirit, and after several weeks of negotiation, I was able on behalf of the Government to prevail upon them to reduce the price from $4.15 per hundred pounds to $3.65, equal to $11.20 per gross ton, a saving on the entire contract of $2,800,000. The mill commenced operations on the 17th February last, and from the first, ship plates measuring up to the high standard required by Lloyds were being successfully turned out. Within a month after the actual commencement of operations at the mill, the total commitments for the first year were practically disposed of. Thirty-four thousand tons will be required for shipbuilding purposes; nine thousand three hundred and fifty-nine tons have been sold to outside powers; while at the present moment an additional six thousand tons are under option. In addition the Government is in negotiation with the Government of New South Wales for the sale of some 15,000 tons, which it is hoped to conclude successfully within the next thirty days. Further inquiries are being received almost daily for steel, but until such time as the department ascertains the quantity of plates that the mill will be able to produce in the first year it will not be possible to take any further commitments.

I can say, Mr. Chairman, that there will be no difficulty on the part of the Government in fulfilling their part of the contract by taking 50,000 tons, and I am almost certain that we will have to ask the Steel Company, under the terms of our contract, for a maximum quantity of 75,000 tons. I do not want to make any statement that will not prove to be accurate later on, but as far as I can tell from the contracts that we have taken, the contracts that we expect to take, I think I am safe in saying that the Government will not make any loss after accepting the maximum quantity that they have to take under the terms of the contract, and there is a fair possibility that a year hence, if I am spared, I may be able to inform hon. members that there has been a profit in the matter of ships' plates as well as ships.

It might be of interest, particularly to my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) to state that our competitor in ships' plates in the world is not the United King-
4 p.m. dom, but in Australia and elsewhere our competitors are our neighbours to the south, the Americans. The price of ships' plates in England is, if my memory serves me right £27.10 per ton which is very much higher than is our price from the Steel Corporation of Sydney; so much so that we could ship Canadian plate, turned out at the Sydney mill, to any part of the United Kingdom and meet the competition there and still have a good margin of profit. In that connection it is not to be wondered at that the price of plates has advanced in the Old Country. There has been a rise in wages over there and the price of materials of all kinds that enter into shipbuilding, has gone up. No one expects that the United Kingdom will ever return to pre-war prices for steel freight ships or passenger ships either. I have already stated that the price of building steel ships in the United Kingdom, of similar size and design, is just as high as in this country. But there will come a time when the yards in the United Kingdom will not be as fully occupied as they are now. Every yard in England, Ireland and Scotland has more contracts than it is able to turn out for some time to come; but when the pressure on those yards eases off competition is bound to become keener; and if nothing is done for the shipbuilding industry in this country when that time arrives it is difficult for one to forecast what may happen to our magnificent shipbuilding industry, which as it is established at

the present time has bright prospects of becoming very much bigger and greater.

That brings me to the question of subsidies. I am not going to say anything in that regard, further than that the Government have the matter under their careful consideration. The Minister of Finance, when he brings down his Budget will state, in the Government's behalf, whether or not they can see their way clear to do anything to aid the shipbuilding industry in Canada. However it will be gratifying to hon. gentlemen to know that notwithstanding the fact that Canadian shipbuilders have absolutely no protection of any kind they have been able under existing conditions to secure foreign orders in competition with shipbuilders in the Old Land.

The National Shipbuilding Company of Three Rivers—the constituency which is so worthily represented by my hon. friend (Mr. Bureau)—is at the present time engaged in the construction of six ships of 5,000 tons deadweight each, three of 3,200 tons each and two of 6,500 tons deadweight each for foreign registry. These orders were secured from France by the National Shipbuilding Company of Three Rivers in competition with the world. Canadian Vickers, Limited, of Montreal, also in competition with the world, secured a contract from Norway for the construction of two steel vessels of 8,000 tons deadweight each. The Collingwood Shipbuilding Company have secured the contract for the construction of a vessel of canal size for the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, to be employed in foreign waters. That may seem to indicate that our shipbuilders can now compete with the world, on account of the conditions that I have referred to. But I am not so optimistic as to say that one or two years from now they would be able to do so without any assistance whatever.

I desire to pay a tribute to those of our Canadians who have had to do with the building of these ships. They were not skilled in the building of ships when steel shipbuilding was commenced on a large scale some two or three years ago. But although the designs of the ships which are being turned out in the yards from Halifax to Prince Rupert are British, the materials and workmanship are Canadian, and Canadians have demonstrated their skill in shipbuilding as they have in other walks of life, just as when the call of their country came they displayed their adaptation to military life, and their bravery in the field of battle.

Our ships are equal in design, workmanship and efficiency to any ships of the same kind that are built in the old land. I have covered the programme as fully as I have been able to; if hon. members desire to ask any questions I shall be only too pleased to answer them.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I should not have intervened in this debate so suddenly had my hon. friend not seemed to be rather inclined, in respect of my humble efforts of a moment ago, to throw out to me a challenge across the floor. But there was not the slightest need of that, because as he proceeded with his statement I felt that it would be my duty, if I did say anything, to express my admiration of its remarkable lucidity and arrangement and of the evident effort which the minister made to make the whole Chamber hear him—an effort in which I am glad to say that so far as I was concerned he was perfectly successful.

There were one or two points in my hon. friend's statement which attracted my attention, upon which I made a note or two and upon which I think I am able to base a little advice to the minister, if I may be permitted to give it. I listened with interest to his statement as to the ten-year periods. I did not quite catch his figures, but I heard him say at the end that there had been a very great shrinkage in shipbuilding. I do not think that I misunderstood my hon. friend.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: If my hon. friend will allow me, I pointed out the very reverse of that. I was endeavouring to convey an impression of the magnitude of the wooden shipbuilding business away back in 1875, and to show, by reference to ten-year periods, how the shipbuilding industry of Canada had declined from 1875 until recent years, when it had regained the big tonnage of that earlier period.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: That is exactly as I understood my hon. friend; that from 1875 until the most recent period there had been a shrinkage in the shipping of Canada. I understood him perfectly, and he will see why I was very glad so to understand him, as I am a strict follower of truth in these matters. May I point out to my hon. friend, who has always been a strong supporter of the National Policy, though he supported it under the name of Liberal, that from 1875 until the recent period of the war is the period covered by the National Policy?

An hon. MEMBER: 1878.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Hon gentlemen may console themselves all they can with

those three years. So that my hon. friend (Mr. Ballantyne) of all men, comes before us to point out that under the National Policy the shipbuilding of Canada shrank.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: If the hon. member will allow me a question——

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: My hon. friend talked for a long time; he will have to listen to me for a little while now. I am not surprised to have heard the minister make the statement that he did; indeed, I knew that it must be so. The United States, as I have often pointed out in the House, set out in the middle of the last century to be a great competitor of Great Britain in shipping, but in the middle of that century she went in for a national policy of her own and drove herself from the ocean. When Nova Scotia had the shipping, before the period of 1875, to which my hon. friend refers with pride, she had a nominal tariff. So it must always be; shrinkage is sure to take place under restriction. It is under freedom that expansion takes place. So far as the sea is concerned, the two little islands, specks in the German ocean, have given an example to the world of what freedom will do for shipbuilding which has never been equalled and cannot and never will be surpassed. They built and owned before the war more than half the entire shipping of the globe.

Now, it may be desirable that we should have a shipbuilding policy in Canada, and it may not; but the facts to which I have just drawn attention surely have a most important bearing upon what the policy of the Government is to be with regard to a continuance of Government shipbuilding.

I was touched by the pathos of the appeal which my hon. friend made to the manufacturers of Canada. He said: "For goodness sake, buck up and export some." My hon. friend is no better than Pharaoh; he wants the manufacturers of Canada to make bricks without straw. If you exclude imports to your shores you just as certainly prevent exports from your shores. As a general principle of trade that is as certain as any of the Ten Commandments, and as safe.

I observed as I listened to my hon. friend that lumber bulked very largely in his very interesting list of the goods that these Canadian ships have been carrying. What is the lesson of that? It is that if Canada is to meet her enormous liabilities in this reconstruction period, and her financial commitments abroad, Canada's exports must consist very largely of raw materials and food for years to come. The Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) and the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) know what I mean. I may expand this line of thought if I am permitted to make a few remarks upon the Budget; but men of the highest prominence in the financial world in this country, men at the heads of our banks, have been pointing out that, to meet our financial obligations abroad, this country must have a surplus export of somewhere in the neighbourhood of $200,000,000 for some years to come. I do not wonder that my hon. friend wants to see our export trade expand; but that export trade, I repeat, must expand, if we are to reach solvency and prosperity as a nation, in the shape of food and raw materials. My hon friend does not for a moment expect that there is going to be any shrinkage in our export of food and raw materials, does he? He does not expect our wheat fields to produce less; he does not expect our western farms to produce a smaller quantity of stock; he does not expect our huge forests to put out less lumber. Will my hon. friend answer me a question, and this all has a bearing upon the advice which I wish to tender very modestly to the Government? If we are to export manufactured goods and food and raw material, we cover the whole field of commerce; what is my hon. friend going to bring in? Ships to be profitably run must carry goods both ways. I am not referring to war time; I am referring to times of peace. Does my hon. friend want to build up a shipping industry composed entirely of an export traffic? In that case, I want to tell him that will not be a paying line of shipping; ships want cargoes both ways. I hope my hon. friend and the Government generally will pay very great attention to the question I have just put if they are going to embark upon any further business of shipping. If you export manufactured goods, food and raw materials, what are you going to bring in? The answer is—nothing, and you are going to commit yourselves to a shipping policy which is to be made a paying proposition by conveying goods only one way.

With regard to my hon. friend's statement, as I said before, I have not the least idea of attacking him or his policy in any way. In the period of the world through which we are passing, that man best serves his country who seeks for occasion to commend where possible rather than to criticize, who seeks for occasion to construct rather than to destroy.

I want to congratulate my hon. friend that he has come out of this business as

well as he has, despite his figures which were somewhat homeopathic in dosage about the cost of plates. I am just going to permit myself to reiterate an opinion I expressed last year; that some of his bargains for steel plates were, to say the least, not very profitable. I hope that is not a very far departure from the desire to help which, I have just indicated, animates my bosom.

As I think I gathered from my hon. friend, he is not in favour of government ownership as applied to ships. I rather thought I gathered that that was his policy and the policy of the Government. In that case there would be no need of advice from me, because I should find myself absolutely at one with the Government. I think the sound principle in regard to government ownership is this:—Where public services are, in their real nature, a monopoly, then they might be profitably and wisely managed for the whole of the people; if they are a monopoly, then their profits ought to redound to the whole public. But if there is a possibility of competition, then the matter should be left to private enterprise.

An hon. MEMBER: Railroads.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Did I hear someone whisper "railroads?" The defense of the policy of nationalization of railroads was a two-fold one; that whether you believed in the principle or not, the things were in such a condition in Canada that you had to take them, willy-nilly. But I do not want to take refuge behind an answer of that kind. Railroads are in this country at the present time virtually a monopoly. Does any hon. gentleman in this House contend that there is real competition betwen our railroads as regards passenger and freight rates? Freight and passenger rates are both controlled in old England, controlled by Act of Parliament. I contend that railroads are in their nature a monopoly, and I anticipated the interruption and am grateful to my hon. friend for giving me an opportunity to vindicate my own consistency. In the case of ships, no one will urge the same contention. Wherever you have a seaboard and ports, you can have ships built by private enterprise, building them in one port here, in another there and in another further on and so on all round your coast. That is the principle I should apply; that is the way I should look at the principle of government ownership, and, therefore, I contend that this business is not one for the Government to extend.

Here, let me say—and this is by way of emphasizing and driving home things that I have already hinted at—whether success is attained in shipbuilding or not depends entirely upon fiscal policy. An admiral giving evidence before a United States Congress committee said not long ago: "We had better make up our minds whether we really want a merchant marine or not. If we do want a merchant marine, there is only one straight course to having it and that is by having free trade." Every one who has studied the subject knows that, and I enforce it by the simple argument I made in reply to the minister when I rose on this floor to-day. Shipbuilding will be successful or unsuccessful according to your fiscal policy. If you have a tariff barrier round your shores, you will never be a great shipping nation whatever else you may rise to. History proves that and will continue to demonstrate it unless the world gets more rapidly wise than it has done up to now, although I am extremely hopeful upon that subject because changes are happening very rapidly in the world at the present moment, in the field of politics, in the field of commerce, and in the field of enterprise of all kinds. My point is this: If you have the right fiscal policy, private enterprise will build your ships; if you have a wrong fiscal policy, then neither Government nor private enterprise can build ships for long successfully.

It is elementary and obvious that two things are required for running ships. One is a sea-going traffic and the other is seamen. I have dealt with the one; what about the other? Seamen are naturally also the result of policy.

Nova Scotians in the early and middle portions of the nineteenth century liked the smell of the briny as well as the old country people did, but they lost the smell. The National Policy extinguished it. What is the condition in regard to seamen in the world to-day? There may be hon. members of this House who do not know the fact—I am sure they will be pleased to hear it—that at the present moment in spite of all the drain of the war Great Britain has the finest and the most numerous set of marine officers and men that she has ever had in her history. The reason is very apparent. Liking the sea as they did, their was no compulsion in their choosing it in large numbers while the war was on. We know what Great Britain did on the sea while the war was on. Very large numbers of her

sons, instead of fighting in the trenches, took themselves to the ocean. Fortunately, they are not needed any longer for fighting, but having got a taste of the briny, and the thing being in their blood anyhow, they are being drafted into the merchant marine. I just want to say this, and I am sure the House will not attribute any insular boastfulness to me on this point, that the Finance Minister, or any government of any country who think that it is going to be an easy thing two or three years hence to compete with Great Britain, either in building, manning, or sailing ships, will have to waken up and change their fiscal policy.

We have heard a great deal about what the United States has done in shipbuilding. I was in Orillia last Friday, and as I came down on the train I met a returned soldier with whom I had a very interesting conversation. I very soon found out that he came from Boston. He had been an officer, and understood business conditions in the United States. I said to him, "You are building a lot of ships down there, aren't you?" "Yes," he said, "but our people are not very keen on the project because they find, taking conditions all round, it is going to be difficult for them to compete with Great Britain." No humbug about the average Yankee. That is the latest news I have direct from Boston as to the hopefulness of the United States people in being able to compete with Great Britain. I trust the Government will inform themselves fully along these lines before they embark upon any further shipbuilding enterprise, after this vote has been passed and after present contracts have been finished.

Something was said about subsidies by my hon. friend (Mr. Ballantyne) before he sat down. I have had no reason up to now to have the least doubt as to the financial sanity of the present Minister of Finance, and therefore I scarcely need to offer him any advice. He does not find money any too plentiful at the present moment; he has lots of holes for all the money he has got. I observe that Mr. Austen Chamberlain, the Chancellor of the Exchequer of Great Britain, has lately laid down a policy under two or three heads. One is the cessation of borrowing; the other is the establishment of a sinking fund to obliterate gradually the national debt. If projects like that have any attraction for my hon. friend, he will turn a very deaf ear indeed to people who are coming to him for subsidies for any purpose under the sun. What the country wants at the present moment is a wise administration of the common law, a government that does not do so many things, but only does wise things when it does them, a government that will keep the tightest possible hold on the strings of the public purse. If the Government will govern along these lines, keeping out of all foolish projects and turning a deaf ear to people who come to them for Government doles, and my hon. friend the Minister of Finance will bring in an improvement in our system of taxation and an improvement in our fiscal policy, then I have sufficient faith in the people of this country, and in the country itself, to express my firm and sincere belief that in spite of all we have gone through as a young nation we shall before many years are over overtake some of the mistakes that have been made, and find ourselves in a splendid condition of national prosperity and financial stability.

Mr. EDMUND BRISTOL (Centre Toronto): Mr. Speaker, the matter before the House is of great national importance. I have listened to the breath of Cobdenism which has floated across the Chamber today from my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark), and I want to say to him and to other hon. gentlemen who entertain his views that a great many things have happened since Cobden was on this earth—things of very great importance to the British Empire, and of great importance to shipbuilding and other industries both in Great Britain and Canada.

I do not think that anybody in this House will for one moment combat the proposal of the Minister of Marine (Mr. Ballantyne) to complete his shipbuilding programme. I think the country is to be congratulated that we have as Minister of Marine a man who in addition to doing his share in the war, raising a regiment and going to the Front, has had a business career of which any man in this country might well be proud. I think as Canadians we are very proud indeed of having him as a member of this House and a member of the Government. What he has done for shipbuilding and shipping in Canada is a very remarkable achievement. Early in the war he decided that if the shipbuilding business was good enough for Great Britain to carry on in Canada, it was good enough for Canada to invest her money in, and he decided to have Canadian ships built in Canada in the interests of Canada. He went into the project fearlessly, in spite of very severe criticism by many newspapers and by some hon. gentlemen opposite, and to-day he is

in this remarkable position, that he could sell his ships for more money than they cost, and in addition, in operating them he has made a substantial business profit. That is certainly a unique achievement in the history of governments, and it is one upon which the Minister of Marine and the Government and Mr. Hanna and the gentlemen who are operating these ships are to be congratulated, and for which they will receive the thanks of the people of this country. Not only that, but with unexampled foresight the Minister of Marine made a contract for steel plates with the Dominion Steel Company. My hon. friend from Red Deer has sneered at the National Policy and given as an example the failure of Nova Scotia to produce ships, but he was about twenty-five or thirty years behind the time in that observation, because the ships he was talking of were wooden ships and they were disappearing as fast as they could after '74, '75 and '78, and steel ships were coming in.

The Government took measures to establish a steel plate industry in Canada in order to put Canada on her feet in the matter of shipbuilding. For shipbuilding you must have shipyards, steel plates, and skilled labour, and to-day through the efforts of the Minister of Marine and the Government we have these three requisites in Canada, and in splendid shape. Before this we were at the mercy of the United States for plates. Moreover, the Minister of Marine did not tell the whole story; he was too modest. If you try to order steel plate in the United States to-day you will find you cannot get them. The Minister of Marine made such a contract that to-day he is being offered higher prices than the Government is paying. He could sell his contract to-day for a million dollars without any effort. That is what he has done, and that is the kind of Government you are getting from business men associated with the business of the country.

Coming back to the shipbuilding industry, it is interesting to point out that when the war started we were building very few steel ships, and we should be grateful to Great Britain for what she has done through the Imperial Munitions Board towards establishing shipyards in this country, and developing the shipbuilding genius of Canadians who at that time were certainly not skilled in shipbuilding. These contracts were at comparatively high prices, which the minister informs us were higher than his prices, although wages and material were higher at the time he let his contracts. I agree with him, but I want to point out that the Canadian workmen from the moment they started shipbuilding began to improve and are still improving and becoming more efficient and I venture to say that if the industry were accorded the care and protection which should be given to any growing industry from its inception and until it gets firmly on its feet—and that is a policy which I believe is a sound one—in five years from the present time the Canadian shipbuilder will be just as good as any workman in the British shipyards who has been engaged in this occupation all his life. The Government took up the shipbuilding plan and the result of their operations, in conjunction with the efforts of the different shipbuilding yards, has been that these yards have been running to capacity, and the business, started with perhaps a few million dollars, has to-day practically fifty million dollars invested in it. This industry has a payroll of forty million dollars, and over fifty million dollars is invested in subsidiary industries which are maintained for the supply of such accessories as engines, boilers and all the appurtenances that go to make up the ship apart from the hull. There are twenty-three or twenty-four thousand people employed in the industry proper, and twenty-three or twenty-four thousand in the subsidiary industries; and, making the usual allowances in an estimate of the number of people dependent on any industry, there are over two hundred thousand people to-day who derive their subsistence from shipbuilding in this country. In addition to this, a sum of over one hundred million dollars is invested in this industry, and the dependent industries. These facts are of the greatest importance and call for the serious consideration of the people of Canada.

The interest in shipbuilding is very widespread in Canada, for there are two or three large yards in Nova Scotia, four or five in Quebec, five or six in Ontario, and three or four in British Columbia. Altogether, practically four-fifths of the people of the country are interested in the maintenance and upbuilding of our shipping industry.

Now, what is the position of our industry relatively to that of the United States? I say fearlessly, and confirming what the minister has said, that we can to-day beat the United States in prices in shipbuilding, and with the deepening of the Welland Canal, which I trust will soon be accomplished, when we commence to build six hundred foot boats on the lakes, four or five years hence, we shall be able to equal if not surpass the American shipbuilders. My

hon. friend from Red Deer speaks of Great Britain as a free trade country, and I presume it is his opinion that the Liberal party in Canada was a free trade party from the year 1896 on. Well, I desire to pay this tribute to the Liberal party, that they may be free traders in theory, but practically, when they were in power, they were just as anxious to build up Canada, by the operation of a tariff to aid Canadian industry, as any party which ever held the reins of Government in this country. Further, my hon. friend talks about bonuses and bounties as if they were something unheard of, but it will be interesting to him to recall that it was a bounty given by the Liberal Government, in which my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) was Minister of Finance, that put the iron and steel indusrty of Nova Scotia on its feet, an industry that is destined to prove one of the most powerful factors in promoting our commercial and financial interests throughout the Empire. Right in Nova Scotia there are on tide-water the largest iron and coal deposits adjacent to each other that are to be found in the world. To-day in free trade England, with coal costing thirty shillings a ton, with their low grade iron, they must obtain their ore from some other source. I predict that in a few years England will come to Nova Scotia for five million tons of steel billets per annum. These billets will be manufactured in England, where there are the best steel finishing shops in the world, and where transportation is within easy reach. My hon. friend (Mr. Clark) says that if we export foodstuffs and raw materials and manufactured goods nothing will be left to be imported into this country. That is ridiculous. The United States has been longer under protection than Canada, and yet the imports into the United States run into billions of dollars. Unless we can grow things that we can not grow, and do things that no nation can do, there will always be imports and exports. But the point is this: We ought to believe in the National Policy; we ought to believe in turning our timber into the finished product and our iron and steel into manufactured articles so as to provide employment for our Canadian workmen and to supply our Canadian farmers with the implements they require, and give them the home market for their produce. Then let the finished product be sent to other countries, so that money may flow here.

The English shipyards have been in existence for hundreds of years—their modern yards have been operating for about twenty-five or thirty years—and there is no question that so far as the cost is concerned the English yards are cheaper to the British builder than any other in the world. If conditions were the same as they were before the war there is no doubt that the British shipbuilder could beat any competitor. I desire to tell my hon. friend something he does not know, and something that was news to me when I heard it, and that is that during the war Great Britain, a free trade country, gave a bounty of £4.10 to her shipbuilders on every ton of plates. I have a letter from Sir Auckland Geddes addressed to an English member of parliament, and I shall read a part of it which may be of interest. It is dated May 5, 1919, and reads:

> I have been in communication with the Ministry of Munitions, and am now in a position to reply to your letter to Sir Albert Stanley of the 14th April, on the subject of the subsidies on iron ore, pig iron and steel plates.

I observe that he calls it "subsidies."

> As regards steel ship plates no direct subsidy is being given, all direct subsidies to steel makers having been withdrawn on the 31st January, 1919. Up to that date a direct subsidy of 40 shillings per ton was payable on ship plates and in addition to this subsidy steel makers were receiving a refund of the extra cost of coal. This amount varied according to the consumption of coal at different works, but it was estimated to average about six shillings a ton.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Does my hon. friend know that Lord Robert Cecil, the eminent British statesman, who may be Prime Minister any of these fine mornings, recently advised England and the world that what we want to-day is to get rid of the war mind?

Mr. BRISTOL: I have not caught the hon. member's question. If the House will bear with me I should like to conclude this extract from this letter, because it is of interest as showing what Great Britain did during the war.

> It is practically impossible to give the equivalent of the direct subsidies on any particular class of steel. Subsidies have been paid on iron ore, coke and pig iron, and the effect on the finished steel varies according to the district and also according to the process employed at the steel works. The subsidies on coke for instance have varied from four shillings and six pence per ton to seven shillings and threepence per ton according to district.

In this connection I may direct the attention of the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) to the fact that coke comes into this country duty free and not one pound of domestic coks is made in Canada except by gas companies—

The pig iron subsidies have varied from 25s. per ton to over 40s. per ton in certain cases.

When export prices were fixed in December last an attempt was made to add to the home price of steel a figure which would cover all subsidies direct and indirect and in the case of ship plates this was assessed at £4-10-0 per ton. After allowing £2-10-0 per ton for the direct subsidies referred to above, 40s. per ton remains as the estimated equivalent of the indirect subsidies.

This letter is signed "A. C. Geddes," and it goes to show that Great Britain or any other country interested in maintaining a great industry must do what is necessary in the public interest to attain this end, whether by means of a subsidy, a bonus or a protective policy.

Let us consider the position of the Canadian ship owner. He embarked on this business in the middle of the war. His yard cost him at least one hundred per cent more than the British yards cost the British shipowners. That is a first charge. What the minister says in regard to ship plates is correct. Our prices for plates to-day, owing to the foresight of the Government, are practically the same as those in England, or possibly a little less. Another problem is the question of labour. Up to the present time the British workman on ships has been poorly paid. He is a man of long experience and he is a clever workman when he works but he is paid about half the wages that we have to pay Canadians. If you take this industry which has been fighting for its life in Canada, which started patriotically in the middle of the war, which was operated as a war industry, in which there is $100,000,000 invested, upon which 200,000 people are depending you will find that it has the support of every Board of Trade throughout Canada. These boards are urging the Government not to allow this industry to be put out of business. Any Government would be derelict in its duty which did allow an industry of this kind to go to pieces at the present time. I am sure this Government are not of such a character that they would not give the gravest consideration to the question how best to maintain this industry if they do not propose to go on building ships as they have done for some years past. The reason that the prices of ships built in British shipyards are maintained to-day is not because Great Britain cannot build cheaper but it is because the British ship owner is out to get his price from the rest of the world for building ships and even if Canada is his biggest competitor he can still get the business because of his greater facilities and experience. He must of necessity know more about building ships than we do in Canada. If you do not keep the shipbuilding yards in this country going to capacity during the next five or ten years, if you are going to allow the skilled workmen to become scattered, if you are going to disorganize this industry, you are going to cause very serious financial trouble and set back the progress of Canada as shipbuilding is a basic industry. I make the statement of my own knowledge, that over twenty-five per cent of the men employed in the shipyards of Canada are men who saw service in our own expeditionary force. The returned soldiers have petitioned the Government not to allow this industry to suffer, but that they should do what the British Government did in connection with steel plates—namely give some reasonable subsidy to enable the wages of our Canadian workingmen to be maintained and to enable these yards to be kept going for another five years until they are firmly on their feet, so that shipbuilding can be done here not only for Canada but for the different parts of the world. I am satisfied that the result of that policy would be that you would see ocean ships built in Canada at Halifax, Montreal, and Three Rivers, and lake ships built at Toronto, Collingwood and Port Arthur, as cheaply as they could be built anywhere. Colonel Carnegie who is well known to all of us and who was in this country as adviser of the British Government said to me, after spending a day at Toronto and going over the Dominion shipbuilding yard there, that he had not seen a more up to date plant anywhere adding: "After what I have seen of the intelligence and efficiency of Canadian workmen, in a few years you will be able to build ships as cheaply as we can in England." If the Government will give the shipbuilding industry a reasonable chance to bridge over the period necessary to establish it upon a firm footing, in a little while our Canadian shipyards will be turning out ships successfully in competition with the world.

Where you have practically every Board of Trade in every large city where you have the working people and the returned soldiers all supporting this policy, it indicates at all events that the business sense of the country wants to see a Canada for Canadians, wants to see Canada properly developed, wants to see Canada take its place as a manufacturing as well as an agricultural country. That business sense thus

evidenced I am sure the Government will consult and consider in coming to any conclusion as to what is the best policy for the shipbuilding industry. I am glad that we have the distinguished gentleman who now occupies the position of Minister of Marine (Mr. Ballantyne) in charge of the shipping interests of this country, and I believe that he has associated with him those who will give this matter their most careful consideration and that the shipbuilding industry will receive fair play.

Mr. WILLIAM DUFF (Lunenburg): Mr. Chairman, I am sure that we have all enjoyed greatly the excellent address which we have listened to from the hon. the Minister of Marine and Naval Affairs (Mr. Ballantyne) this afternoon. We also had much pleasure in hearing from that stalwart free trader the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) and that stalwart believer in high protection the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bristol). With regard to the remarks of the Minister of Marine, I think most of us were greatly surprised when we received our copy of the Estimates yesterday and noticed the modest amount he is asking for. One of the reasons why I was surprised was that a few days ago I saw in one of the newspapers, I think it was the Morning Chronicle of Halifax, the following desptach:

> Hon. C. C. Ballantyne, Minister of Marine, announced to-night at the annual dinner of the Dominion Marine Association, held at the Windsor Hotel, that the Government has under consideration the building of passenger steamships of 15,000 gross tons in connection with the Canadian National Railways. Mr. Ballantyne briefly reviewed the operations of the Canadian Government merchant marine and stated that the net profits on the steamship service had been a very handsome one.

In view of the fact that the Minister of Marine made that statement a few weeks ago, it certainly is a surprise to me, as it must have been to other hon. members of this House, to see that he has only asked for the small sum of $20,000,000. Twenty million dollars will not go very far in building passenger ships for ocean service. Perhaps the Government had a caucus and the hon. member could not get his way as happened in regard to the naval policy in connection with the report submitted by Lord Jellicoe. The minister told us during the course of his remarks that the Government started this policy of building cargo ships to be operated by the Canadian Government Merchant Marine in May, 1918. When the minister introduced this policy during the war, although we did not believe in government ownership of ships, we realized that as ships were being sunk in all parts of the world, there was nothing for us to do but to agree to that policy. But the war ended in November of that year and if the war was over and ships were no longer being sunk it was not necessary to go further in making future contracts. The minister told us that contracts were made in January of this year. It seems to me that it is bad policy for any Government to go into the shipbuilding and ship operating business. It is a matter which should be left entirely to private individuals; it is not a business for the Government to engage in. The Canadian people themselves can build and operate ships as well as the minister can. I am sure that he believed that he was giving a very glowing account of what his department had done during the past year. I say it was a very poor showing. The minister told us that with nineteen steamers—I presume of an average tonnage of about 4,000 tons deadweight which would make them cost anywhere from $10,000,000 to $15,000,000—there was a profit of $1,500,000 on their operation. Well, Sir, if the little boats that I am interested in only made that much profit comparatively in recent years I would sell them and sell them quickly. The only reason why that large profit was made—of course the minister did not say so but it is evident to everybody—was because the conditions that existed to-day, and which have prevailed for the last two or three years, were entirely unprecedented and it is only a matter of a few months, or a year at the outside when these ships, which have made a profit of a million and a half dollars under abnormal conditions, will go into debt—each one of them.

It must have been gratifying to hon. gentlemen on this side when the Minister spoke of the excellent work that was being done in the shipyards of this country. My mind went back about ten years when the Liberal Party were in power and wanted to build a navy. They told the people of this country that they could do so but hon. gentlemen opposite, who at that time were supporting the Conservative Party, said that we could not build ships, we could not find rivetters—in fact we could not do anything in that line. My hon. friends opposite at that time called to their aid the Rt. Hon. Winston Churchill who made the statement that there was not a spot on the North American continent, to say nothing of Canada, where we could lay down the keel of a ship. Despite that we have had the admission of to-day from the Minister

of Marine. I am glad he acknowledged, —and the hon. member for Centre Toronto acknowledged the same thing,—that Canadian workmen can build as good ships as British workmen can build. I am proud of the fact, we are all proud of it; the only difference is that we on this side knew it years ago and hon. gentlemen opposite are only finding it out now.

I noticed that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bristol) in complimenting the Minister for his shipbuilding policy said he could sell those Government ships at a greater price than they cost. Well, Sir, my advice to the Minister is to sell those ships as quickly as he possibly can and the sooner the better. If he can sell those ships at a higher price than he paid for them, or at even as high a price, there is no reason why the Government of Canada should stay in the shipbuilding business. If those ships can be sold at a profit, private enterprise firms like The Canadian Shipyards, or Vickers Limited or any of the other shipbuilding firms can go out and get the business themselves. I notice that the Three Rivers Shipbuilding Company have had no contract from this Government and that nevertheless they have gone abroad and obtained outside contracts. If the business is good and the ships turned out can be sold at a profit every shipyard in this country can go out and get business for itself. Therefore there is no necessity for the Canadian Government to buy ships and interfere with the operations of private enterprise.

The Minister endeavoured to show that it was necessary to have those ships in order to build up our trade. It was quite true that while the war was on ships were scarce; but, Sir, with the shipbuilding programmes undertaken in Great Britain, the United States, and other countries that condition is not going to continue and I say that the Government has no more right to go into the shipbuilding business than it has to enter upon the manufacture of boots and shoes or candy. It should leave that business to those who are willing to invest their money in it. The Minister gave us a glowing account of the shipbuilding operations but I would like to draw his attention to facts set forth in the Toronto Globe of a recent issue. I have a copy of the paper in my hand and practically an entire page is taken up with an advertisement from the United States Shipbuilding Emergency Corporation in which they offer for sale 441 ships with a tonnage of 1,543,500 tons, and 31 barges with a total of 77,500 tons. In other words the United States Government are offering for sale at the present time 500 boats representing practically 2,000,000 tons of shipping. Now, Sir, if private individuals put up their money and buy these boats is it fair that they should be subject to competition from the Canadian Government?

The hon. member (Mr. Bristol) gave us a reason why we could not build ships in Canada as cheaply as they can in Great Britain that the workmen in the United Kingdom do not get as good wages as do our mechanics. In reply to that let me say that if there is one class of people in Great Britain to-day—and throughout the war and in pre-war times—who receive good wages it is the men in the Clyde Shipyards and other shipyards in the Old Country; and any person who says that the reason for their being able to build ships cheaper over there is on account of lower wages is certainly not acquainted with the facts. This statement is also true with respect to the hours of labour for the British machinists, engineers and shipbuilders do not work any longer hours than those in any other part of the world.

Now, Sir, what about the future of the shipbuilding industry in this country? Is the Government going to continue its policy of building ships just for the sake of having something to do, for I presume if it does that will be the sole reason? If private individuals are willing to build ships I cannot see any good reason why the Government should also enter into the business. As I said before, it is not a matter for the Dominion Government at all; it is purely a business for private enterprise which should be freed from Government competition, and if necessary, assisted. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bristol) told us about the amount of capital invested in the Canadian shipyards and the number of men therein employed. I agree with the hon. gentleman that we should protect that investment as well as the men who are working in the industry. Personally I would not like to see any policy adopted in Canada which would have the result of closing up those shipyards and putting those men out of work. But I say the right way to promote the industry is not for the Government to engage in the industry itself. The Government should go out of the shipbuilding business and frame another policy with respect to any help which it deems to be necessary for the shipyards which, are established at the present time. Of course we are only doing business in a small way in the Maritime Provinces. But during the

war, notwithstanding the necessities of the case, we did not come to the Government and say "We cannot build our little ships down there unless you help us and unless you buy the vessels from us." It would have been just as proper and just as legitimate for the minister to buy our little boats as to buy vessels from Vickers Limited or any other firm. But we did not make such an appeal, we had a duty to do during the war, and we did it to the best of our ability. New shipyards were started, we invested what money we had and borrowed what further sums were necessary from the banks, and we did our little bit towards placing more tonnage on the ocean in order to help Great Britain and her Allies to win the war. If it is necessary to help in the building of ships and the securing of contracts for ships, let a suitable policy be devised; but the Government should not purchase ships and run them itself. If it is necessary, and if after careful investigation, it is found that the present Canadian shipbuilding firms cannot build ships in this country as cheaply as they can be turned out in Great Britain, France, United States, or elsewhere, the Government should in some way grant help. And my suggestion would be that it should be in the way of a bonus. If the Government thinks it is necessary to enter into that policy, I am willing to support it providing it is demonstrated beyond doubt that the Canadian shipbuilders need that bonus for the legitimate development of their business. There is no question but that during the war shipbuilding cost a great deal more money than it would under ordinary conditions, and for that reason, if it is necessary, the Canadian shipbuilding firms should be protected for a few years. But that policy should not be a permanent one, in fact I should not think it would be needed for more than one or two years; still if necessary our shipbuilders should have a certain amount of protection along that line.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: In view of the present financial condition of the country, where will the money come from?

Mr. DUFF: My hon. friend is justified in asking that question, but I am not, under ordinary conditions, in favour of bonusing the building of ships or any other industry. An indispensable condition, however, is that it should be necessary. Perhaps the hon. gentleman did not catch my qualification, but I have always insisted upon that. I have always maintained that any aid given should only be forthcoming in the event of the shipbuilding industry needing it, and as far as I know it does not need it; I think the shipyards have made a lot of money. However, if it is necessary to keep our shipbuilding plants going, and keep the men employed for a year or two, the Government should come to their assistance.

If assistance is not necessary, do not give it to them; and in any case we should give it only after a proper investigation has been made. My hon. friend asked where the money would come from; I really do not know. The only thing I would suggest is that my hon. friend help us on this side of the House to defeat this Government as quickly as possible in order that a Government may be put in power which will properly administer the affairs of the country.

Mr. BURNHAM: I would like to make—

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Keefer has the floor.

Mr. FRANK KEEFER: I represent a shipbuilding city—

Mr. BUREAU: Hear, hear.

Mr. KEEFER: —and therefore, like my hon. friend (Mr. Bureau) I am interested in the shipbuilding problem. But I want to look at the matter from a somewhat wider standpoint than that. There is an aspect of this shipbuilding programme that has not been touched upon by the previous speakers. Longing eyes are being cast upon certain possessions of Great Britain down in the Carribbean Sea and in South America. I speak of the West Indies, British Honduras, British Guiana, Jamaica, etc. The sentiment of the people of these territories is intensively pro-British, notwithstanding the considerable propaganda that has been carred on against that sentiment. But there is a lack of transportation facilities to other British countries from those British possessions. At first blush, one would think that because we do not import so much from those countries, their trade is not important. But the people of the West Indies have never realized that while we have been taking only one-third of their total exports in a direct way, we have been importing indirectly but through a broker in the United States similar products valued at twice the value of their total exports. What is the reason? Lack of transportation, namely, ships—Canadian controlled ships. Heretofore these products have been going to the United States, have been carried by American railroads and

been transported into Canada. I hope that that system will soon cease. My hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) wonders what will be the return cargoes. Trade does not move east and west nearly as much as it moves north and south; therefore we should provide for transportation facilities between Canada and the British West Indies and Central and South American countries in order that we may bring their products to our doors and ship our products to theirs. So far we have failed to do that.

The total exports from the West Indies in 1917—and they are relatively the same now, except that there is a slight increase in values—was $62,939,000, and their total imports were valued at $22,525,700. That was only one-third of all our trade with those countries. They did not realize that of these same articles, 32 in number, we were taking $117,000,000 worth. They were losing to a certain extent, and so were we, on account of brokerage, additional freight charges, and customs duties. Carload after carload of sugar has been transported from New York to the sugar refineries of lower Ontario. Why should that freight return not be going by our Canadian railways? Of every dollar that is being paid out in railway freight charges, about eighty cents represents wages, and our Canadian railway men have been losing all those wages paid in connection with the transport of these West Indian products. The people in the West Indies and British Central and British South America do not think we can produce any more goods than we have exported; they think that that is all we produce and they base their opinion simply upon the small quantity they receive from us. I join with the able Minister of Marine in saying that it is high time that our Canadian manufacturers and exporters should awake to the possibilities of trade with those countries, which are longing for British goods but have been unable to get them. Where we have one Canadian representative down there seeking business, there are twenty Americans. What are the trade returns of their imports from Canada? Of twenty-five articles, running from breadstuffs and cottons down to trunks, they imported in 1916 goods to the value of $35,883,800, and of that amount we sent them only $7,059,370 worth; and they thought that was all we could send them. And yet under this terrible National Policy, which has killed industrial trade export in Canada—so the member for Red Deer says—we were sending out $672,777,000 worth of the same goods, but not to those countries. That market is there if we will only provide the necessary transportation. We need their products, they need ours; one is the complement of the other.

The same argument applies in regard to the passenger traffic, that also should go through Canadian, not American ports. Heretofore Canada has been endeavouring to carry on that trade by paying a subsidy to the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company of about $1,000 a day, approximately $360,000 a year. That company have done excellent work so far. They carried on during the war, but to-day it may be said of them that they are unable to stem the volume of trade that has arisen. Passengers cannot get bookings; passengers who pay for first-class accommodation and for outside berths get second-class accommodation with the second-class passengers. The trade between the islands which these ships are carrying on is tremendously overcrowded; in many cases hundreds of people have to remain on deck without any sleeping accommodation whatever. There is one of the trade routes —namely, the route between the British West Indies and South America and Canada,—which the ships planned for in the programme of the minister can easily serve; and it is a trade which belongs to Canada. Why do I say that it belongs to Canada? A committee was appointed by the Imperial Government to look into the question of West Indian shipping. The object of the appointment of that committee is indicated in the following paragraph in the preamble of its report:

> To consider the probable effect of the shipping position after the war on British trade with the British West Indian colonies, and on intercolonial communications, and to report what, if any, measures should be taken to maintain adequate communication with and between those colonies, and to provide increased port or other facilities for shipping.

A perusal of the report of this committee, which is signed by the chairman, Lieut.-Colonel Amery, Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, reveals a most pathetic state of affairs. There are colonies with which trade communications cannot be established and maintained—I speak of communication with Great Britain—by a passenger and mail service without the payment of heavy subsidies. The report shows that the Royal Mail Steamship Company has lost money in endeavouring to maintain a service between England and the West Indies. The statement is made that a net loss of £1,037,853 has been incurred by the West Indian mail service in the period of twenty years between 1896 and 1915, even taking into account the subsi-

dies paid. The reason is that they were trying to do what is called "bucking nature"; the West Indies are out of the line of the ordinary trade routes.

What does the report of this committee finally recommend? Practically what the Minister of Marine is now endeavouring to do. It says:

> We consider, therefore, that these colonies would do well in their own interests to co-operate heartily with any efforts made by the Canadian Government to open up direct steamship communication with them. In paragraph 31 we have referred to the experiment already made by the Canadian Government of running a cargo steamer between Canada and Jamaica, and we hope that this is only the beginning of a growing connection between the two countries.

Such is the considered opinion in 1918 of an able special committee appointed by the Secretary of State. We have, as regards that trade, powerful competitors. We all know that the United Fruit Company are well entrenched and established with their interests and their steamers. We have to compete with that company. No private concern can do so; but the Government of Canada can, and the Government of Canada can go in there and bring us the fruits, the raw materials that this country needs from that area, to the terminii of our railways so that they will be carried over our railways instead of being carried over American railways. Any person who does not to-day advocate Government control and operation of steamships so long as we have Government control and operation of railways is very short-sighted. What is the good of paying out of the treasury a loss by way of a deficit on railways when with a little foresight you can develop trade and bring it to those terminii and put it upon the railways and give employment to the men?

The freight business is there. The Minister of Marine has shown that some 23 or 24 voyages were made and those voyages have always been with full cargoes both ways. There is no reason why that trade should not increase as well as at least continue. We are only touching the fringe of the business to be done, and yet the business of the Royal Mail Line has not been interfered with. There is a class of business there that we ought also to have, namely, the business of the French islands, Martinique and Guadeloupe. None of the Canadian subsidized steamers are calling there, the reason probably being because of an arrangement between steamship lines so as not to compete at other points. That could not exist with a Government line of steamers; we should have the trade of those French islands coming to and from our ports of Halifax, St. John and Montreal. They want to deal with Canada in preference to dealing with the United States, but the ship transportation problem has so far been insuperable.

Those are some of the reasons why the policy the Minister of Marine has formulated is not only a wise one locally, but wise imperially and wise for the general benefit of the country at large and should be continued.

The following are the details of the exports and imports of West Indian products referred to in general figures above:

Memorandum showing Canada's importations of West Indian products, direct and indirect.

Article.	West Indies Total exports.	West Indies exports to Canada 1916 for 12 months.	Canada total imports.	1919. for 8 months ending Nov. 30.
	$	$	$	$
Sugar	26,000,000	18,370,000	31,560,000	43,940,943
Molasses	2,500,000	1,800,000	2,000,000	3,441,355
Cocoa	12,000,000	519,000	1,500,000	1,751,841
Coffee	900,000	243,000	2,295,000[1]	2,650,283
Spices	800,000	38,000	550,000	303,957
Rice	1,000,000	.....	1,500,000	2,163,916
Cocoanuts	1,500,000	100,000[3]	236,000	429,245
Bananas	1,300,000[2]	.....	2,615,000	4,323,185
Vegetables	1,250,000	10,000	3,800,000	4,382,577
Pineapples	1,000	100	270,000	.....
Oranges and grapefruit	200,000	39,000	4,000,000	4,145,067
Lemons and limes	450,000	1,400	736,000	969,430
Lime juice	1,000,000	6,000	159,000	173,104
Canned fruit	400,000	19,500[4]	611,000	875,392

1. Canada takes $1,000,000 worth from Brazil alone.
2. Much below normal. Jamaica exported $5,000,000 in 1914.
3. Canada took $21,715 in 1913, $5,838 in 1914, $452 in 1915.
4. Canada took a small quantity in 1914 and 1915.

[Mr. Keefer.]

Memorandum showing Canada's importations of West Indian products, direct and indirect.—*Con.*

Articles	West Indies Total exports.	West indies exports to Canada 1916 for 12 months.	Canada total imports.	1919. for 8 months ending Nov. 30.
	$	$	$	$
Figs	.....	.....	246,000	.....
Honey	70,000	8,900	66,000	.....
Beeswax	18,000	4,000	57,000	.....
Salt	100,000	25,000	745,000	1,048,585
Tobacco[5]	250,000	800	6,700,000	8,811,611
Chicle	1,200,000	1,000,000	2,280,000	1,036,404
Sponge	750,000	9,000	70,000	47,568
Hemp	600,000	.....	500,000[6]	1,012,538
Rubber[7]	.....	.....	6,700,000	.....
Balata	800,000	10,000	10,000	28
Asphalt	600,000	.....	500,000[8]	313,319
Mineral oils[9]	1,000,000	.....	14,480,000	19,039,653
Alumina[10]	.....	.....	1,320,000	.....
Hides and skins[11]	300,000	108,000	12,800,000	14,083,279
Cotton	1,700,000	.....	10,000,000	13,979,016[13]
Logwood, etc.	4,200,000	1,400	2,500,000	1,025,931
Wood[12]	1,750,000	200,000	7,200,000	9,972,151
Arrowroot	300,000	5,600	9,000	.....
Total	62,939,000	22,525,700	117,315,500	

5. Tobacco in West Indies susceptible of unlimited development.
6. Canada imported jute cloth, etc., $6,000,000.
7. Extensive plantations in British Guiana, not yet producing.
8. Total in 1913, $800,000 gradually decreasing during the war.
9. Oilfields of Trinidad more than sufficient to supply Canada.
10. Large deposits of Bauxite in British Guiana, not yet developed.
11. Cattle-raising projected on savannas of British Guiana.
12. Timber resources of British Guiana, British Honduras, Jamaica and the Bahamas, hardly yet touched.
13. For some period (8 months) in 1918 it was $20,509,395.

The West Indian market and Canada.—Canadian exports for 1916 to British West Indies.

Article.	West Indies total imports.	West Indies. imports from Canada.	Canada total exports.	1919 for 8 months ending November 30.
	$	$	$	$
Cottons	7,000,000	1,190	488,000	1,207,741[2]
Breadstuffs	7,000,000	3,875,000	341,800,000	215,425,065
Coal	2,850,000	147,000	7,000,000	6,848,133
Fish	2,070,000	1,287,000	24,400,000	25,920,892
Meat	1,700,000	12,600	54,100,000	66,590,412
Machinery	1,620,000	10,000	35,000,000	23,236,286
Hardware	1,440,000	130,000	10,000,000	5,836,193
Fertilizers	1,430,000	295,000	3,370,000	2,636,541
Apparel	1,340,000	11,000	6,350,000	3,841,769[3]
Wood	1,323,000	405,000	77,000,000	70,273,341[4]
Boots and shoes	1,140,000	1,400	951,000	3,194,853
Drugs and chemicals	1,000,000	119,000	9,200,000	9,250,318[5]
Butter and cheese	970,000	127,000	40,000,000	33,620,887[6]
Soap	900,000	22,000	58,000	690,125
Vehicles	850,000	19,000	14,000,000	18,826,621
Condensed milk	625,000	135,000	1,372,000	5,593,660
Vegetables	550,000	197,500	12,100,000	6,302,860
Lard	520,000	235	285,000	2,044,646
Paper	500,000	103,000	26,000,000	37,985,676
Hats and bonnets	310,000	145	226,000	46,719
Cordage	250,000	55,000	1,287,000	5,243,379
Paints	250,000	52,000	987,000	906,079
Fruit	175,000	23,000	2,600,000	4,167,995
Hay	35,000	26,000	4,200,000	.....
Trunks	35,000	8,000	10,000	.....
Total	35,883,000	7,059,370	672,777,000	553,459,700[1]

1. During 12 months ending November 30, 1919, Canada's total exports amounted to $1,251,094,840.
2. In 1918 same period $ 2,645,643.
3. " " 10,260,244.
4. " " 76,651,247.
5. " " 12,203,271
6. " " 36,677,836.

Mr. McMASTER: I do not purpose taking up a great deal of the time of the committee this afternoon, but there are a few things which I should like to say concerning this proposal of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to spend another $20,000,000 of the people's money upon building and, after building, operating a national system of steamships. There is an argument for nationalization of railways. It has been noted by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark) that where anything is a monopoly, either natural or quasi-natural, it is proper and right that that should be controlled by the community. There is, in that sense, an argument which largely offsets, although perhaps it does not altogether offset, the loss of efficiency in management which nearly always goes with bureaucratic or Government control as opposed to individual or company control. But that argument which applies to the nationalization of railways has no application at all in connection with the operation of tramp steamers. That is what these steamers will be; they are not of the size to be used as large transatlantic or transpacific liners; they are the size of vessels which are engaged as tramp steamers, the sort of steamers which have built up in no small measure the wonderful mercantile supremacy of the Old Land. I cannot conceive of any business more inapt, if I may use that word, more improper for Government or bureaucratic control than the management of tramp steamers. You have to be able to watch the trade routes of the world, to bring your vessel home from Buenos Aires and on the next voyage send it off to the Black sea. I cannot understand how a Government can properly manage tramp steamers. The hon. member for Red Deer has very properly stressed the absurdity of a protectionist Government such as this Government is, endeavouring with a tariff to keep goods out of Canada and at the same time to build up international commerce by lines of steamers. But that is not the point I wish to make this afternoon, as it has been very well made by the hon. member for Red Deer. The point I want to make is the impropriety and unwisdom of the Government as opposed to individual or company endeavouring to operate ships. I remember during the war consulting a very well known steamship man of Montreal as to the efficiency which the British Government obtained from the British ships which, as a war measure, they had taken over. The British Government, in order to have the preference of the service of their mercantile marine, laid hands on the mercantile marine of Great Britain. I was told by this friend of mine that the ships were not operated above 60 per cent efficiency, because why? Not because the men who operated them were not patriotic, not because they were not trying to do their very best, but because they did not have the necessary information and freedom, the necessary initiative to carry on the operation of managing ships as private individuals or those in the employ of a company would have had. That is, to my mind, the great and fundamental objection to this scheme of the nationalization or the establishment of a national system of ocean-going vessels. We have had mixed up with the excellent and lucid exposition of the minister, paeans of praise of the protective system raised by hon. members on the other side. The hon. member for Toronto Centre (Mr. Bristol), who rarely visits this Chamber, has given us the benefit of an excellent speech in support of the principle of protection. May I remind him of a story told by some Portuguese legislator? There was a proposition made that the Tagus should be widened and deepened and made suitable for the conduct of commerce up and down that river in order to foster trade between Portugal and Spain; but Portugal had at that time a high tariff against Spain, and this Portuguese legislator said: "How ridiculous it is for us to endeavour to keep Spanish goods out of Portugal with a tariff and then to spend money on deepening the Tagus! Let the Tagus run to the sea as it did in the time of our forefathers." But it is the impropriety and unwisdom of placing the control of tramp steamers in the hands of a bureau, of a Government department, against which I wish to protest. The minister is in the happy position of being able to get out of this business with a profit. Let him embrace the opportunity at the earliest possible moment. Then he will have deserved well of his country; he will have entered into stupendous financial operations and closed those without a loss. How rarely in the history of this country have large operations of a quasi-commercial or industrial character been entered into by a Government and abandoned by the Government without loss!

I press this upon the minister. I am glad that he has made money with his ships and I shall be still more glad to see the exact figures when he lays them before the House, but now that he has made a profit let him remember the French proverb which says that "the better is the enemy

of the good." Let him be satisfied to call a halt and bring these operations to a conclusion when he can do so without loss to the state.

Mr. JOHN H. BURNHAM: Mr. Speaker, I think a casual listener to this debate might get the impression that a large number of the members of this House had been sent here by private interests in order that they might thoroughly smash up everything they possibly can that is in the public interest. They do not seem to be pleading for the public interest. They try to show that it is utterly and absolutely impossible to conduct public business, and that it ought to be left to private individuals. If that is so, why do not these gentlemen leave this Chamber and go home, leaving the affairs of this country to private individuals? Simply because it is impossible to carry on the public business of this country in that way. The answer is before these gentlemen if they will only notice the things that are so plain. Will my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) for one moment contend that public efficiency is so inferior to private efficiency that the Government of Canada should have handed over to a private company the prosecution of the war? There seems to be no discrimination at all in these matters. Let us be patriotic; let us be sensible, and remember that we are here to transact the public business in a public way and by public means, and that it is not to be left to private individuals.

Do not let us forget that it is but a few years since we were at the mercy of the Atlantic shipping pool, and God forbid that we should ever be at the mercy of another shipping pool in our time. If the Minister does not go on with his public ownership programme in the matter of shipbuilding, and give the industrious farmers and labour generally throughout this country a fair show on the ocean, as it has agreed to give to them on land, the Government will certainly meet with the strong disapproval of the people of this country. We do not want the main lines of communication in the hands of private individuals.

Lest the observations of that scientific reasoner the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark) go without challenge, I should like to devote just two minutes to his observations. First of all, he said British shipbuilders, because of free trade, had driven American shipbuilders off the sea. That I absolutely deny. If the hon. gentleman will read the latest work on the history and development of the American marine and American shipbuilding, he will find that from the time American shipbuilding began, British shipbuilders, Norwegian shipbuilders, French shipbuilders, and shipbuilders of every other nation were wiped off the sea by the Americans. It was the Americans with their old clippers who had the lines of shipping to Canton, South Africa, South America and Europe, and one very interesting thing in connection with those clippers is this: It was not the sharp bow that gave speed and efficiency but the blunt bow, which gave both capacity and speed. This history is one of the most interesting things in the world to review. You will find that the Americans simply captured the trade of the oceans. Then what happened? Under protection the American republic developed so rapidly that it looked about for other nations to do its bidding, to do its hewing of wood and carrying of water, its carrying on water, and when the Americans were asked why their shipbuilding had not been proceeded with and why Great Britain had been allowed to monopolize the shipping business they said: "It is because we have so much else to do. We prefer to let Britain do it, and to hire her ships." There are vast numbers of ships which the British shipyards are credited with building, and duly and properly credited with which, however, are under American registry. The Americans will build ships only as soon as they need to do so; it is not that they cannot build them, or because the system of protection forbids it. In the meantime they are drawing from the United Kingdom, Canada, and from all parts of the world, shipping and everything conceivable to enable them to expand as they are doing. Do not let anybody run away with the idea that our shipbuilding is not equal to that of Great Britain because we are said to have a false fiscal system in this country. That is not so at all. You cannot compare Canada with Great Britain, although the minister has announced to-day what has been achieved, and that we are able to take contracts on an even keel, as it were, even with the Old Country itself. That augurs well for the future, if we have a good governmental system. The trial spin has shown what we can do.

There is an extraordinary kink, as it were, in the free trader's mind. Having enunciated the general principle of absolute freedom of trade, he seems to be utterly unable to understand that other elements enter in. Let me illustrate. If between the hon. member for Brome and myself there

should spring up a system of trade it follows, as the night the day, that if my labour cost is equal to his and his to mine, then absolute free trade must obtain between us. But if—and here is the point—I make a profit as against the hon. member for Brome I take just that much away from him and do not give him any return for it. If I make a 25 per cent profit, I do 75 per cent of the work and he does 100 per cent; he is 25 per cent behind. If I make 50 per cent profit, I only do half the work, and if I make 75 per cent profit, I do only one-quarter of the work and to that extent make no exchange of work. This element of profit, which is the basis on which all modern commerce is conducted is absolutely and entirely left out of consideration by these gentlemen. Profit is the basis on which all commerce is founded, and we surely have a clear example of that in the exchange situation to-day, when the United States is making us pay through the nose. It is absurd to say that Great Britain has been able to capture the commerce of the seas by reason of her free trade policy, and that because she exports she must import, because any one acquainted with the facts knows that half the time British shiping goes home absolutely empty. It is no good my hon. friend (Mr. McMaster) shaking his head, because that is a fact. Her profit and her subsidies enable her to do that.

Mr. McMASTER: Can the hon. member give us the figures?

Mr. BURNHAM: I can give the figures but I am laying down now simply a general principle. Let me tell the hon. gentleman, whether he likes it or not, that in order to prevent any loss whatever the British Government subsidizes these lines, and it is this policy that enables Britain to maintain the monopoly of the sea. If I had a telegraph line and discovered that I could lose on telegraphs and make a profit on something else I would be content to lose on telegraphs, and the hon. member for Brome would exclaim: "There, look at what free trade will do"; whereas, as a matter of fact, I am making on something else. It is the same way with the British Government. They know that, from their insular position, if they do not carry the trade of the nations they are undone. They therefore build ships and subsidize them, and in that way get the trade of the world.

Mr. DUFF: Does my hon. friend mean to say that the British Government subsidizes tramp or freight steamers?

[Mr. Burnham.]

Mr. BURNHAM: It subsidizes whole lines; not all, I admit, but it subsidizes lines, and especially missionary lines; and when these missionary lines have run the others out, then perhaps they withdraw the subsidies, as they have sometimes done. But read the history of the development of the American marine and you will find it all laid down there, and you will discover that your antiquated ideas are like cobwebs in your brain. Sweep them out; they are not true; they are not correct; they are not founded on common sense; and business is founded on common sense. Do not, when you are discussing general principles, omit some of the other principles that bear directly on them. You might just as well calculate the orbit of the moon without taking into consideration the influences of the planets and of the sun. Some of the earlier astronomers did that and could not understand why they were wrong. After Newton discovered the law of gravitation, when they made calculations without considering other heavenly bodies, they found that they did not work out. For example, when Herschell discovered Uranus a calculation being made of the orbit of that planet, it was found that it was more than 200 miles out. This appeared to be a negation of the Newtonian theory, but a young Frenchman, Leverier by name, made a calculation on the supposition that the Newtonian theory was correct, namely, that the influence of a planet still further out would account for the unusual motion of Uranus; and, proceeding on that assumption, he discovered Neptune.

Now let me commend this sublime illustration, this tremendous example, as something that may possibly attract the attention of the hon. member for Brome when he is discussing the law of free trade. Let him remember that there are countless other things that pull and haul it in other directions, and until he has taken those into consideration his calculations are absolutely wrong.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I rise to ask a question of the minister. Early in March I asked the following question, as appears in Hansard on page 327:

1. How many contracts for shipbuilding were given by the Government since the 1st of January, 1918?

2. To what firms were said contracts given and what were the respective amounts?

The answer was that there were fifty-six contracts given, and the minister this afternoon in his speech stated that they were

given for the sum of $43,704,962.13. In answer to the following question:

Were all of said contracts given after tender?

The following information was given:

Contracts were placed after orders had been received from the several yards and prices and other details agreed upon.

My fourth question was: "If so, were they given by the lowest tenderer?" and the answer was, "Answered by number three." The answer to my fifth question, which was: "If not, why?" was "Answered by number three."

I have listened very carefully to the speech of the minister this afternoon and I am not very clear yet as to whether these contracts were given to the different shipbuilding companies after proper tenders had been made. Was an opportunity given to every shipbuilding company of Canada to tender?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The policy of the Government, when it was inaugurated in 1918, was to keep busy the existing yards then located and operated in Canada. In addition to these yards that were in existence at the time the policy was announced, two or three new yards have been established. We did not advertise for public tenders in the way suggested by my hon. friend, for the reason that if we did one or more yards might get too great a share of the business. The policy of the Government was to distribute the business evenly in order to keep all of the yards busy and give employment to the workmen in various parts of the country, and, after the Armistice was signed, to returned soldiers. Every yard in Canada was therefore asked to bid for the Government's business. As I stated this afternoon, our own experienced technical officers figured up the cost, so that we had a check on the prices that were submitted to us by the various yards. We also had the Old Country costs to go by. We carried on negotiations for certain types of ships with various yards, making as good a business deal as possible. As I say, we could not call for public tenders in the usual way, because some yards might not get any business while others might obtain too much. As I explained to the House this afternoon, the average cost of Canadian government ships is less than the American cost, and less than the cost of ships ordered by the Imperial Munitions Board.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: There was no competition?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: If the Government desired to place a contract for two or four ships of, say, 8,400 tons, such ships could not be built on the Lakes, and we would ask shipbuilding concerns on the Pacific coast, and at Montreal, Three Rivers and Halifax to give prices for these ships, and we would make as close a bargain as possible, first of all having the cost of the ships ourselves, then having the bids from the yards capable of constructing ships of this size, and having other information to guide us. Altogether, I think we safeguarded the public interest as effectively as if we advertised for tenders in the usual way.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Does the minister not think that if tenders had been called for in the usual way the Government would have been able to secure lower prices?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No.

Mr. FIELDING: In regard to the manning and officering of these ships, has the minister been able to procure Canadian seamen and officers, or have we had to bring outsiders into the service?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: While the ships are owned by the Government, they are not directly operated by the Government. The Canadian Government Merchant Marine, the stock of which is owned by the Government, is entirely under the management of Mr. Hanna and his board of directors, and the organization which he has for the operation of ships. I have no direct knowledge of the personnel of the crews; the Canadian Government Merchant Marine look after that matter as well as the operating of the ships. Incidentally, I might say that I asked Mr. Hanna some time ago if they were many Canadians and he said "No." As a rule the majority of the crews for the time being are old countrymen, but Mr. Hanna gives the preference wherever Canadians are available. My department is doing everything it possibly can, with its schools of navigation throughout the country, to induce Canadians to take the necessary course to become officers or engineers, deckmen and so on. I hope that in the future the majority of the crews will be Canadians, but at the present time they are not.

Mr. FIELDING: We had a discussion a few days ago as to whether or not we had commanding officers available, and I had that in my mind when I asked the question.

Mr. DUFF: The minister spoke about the cost of Canadian ships in comparison with those built in other countries. This after-

noon he gave us figures of contracts made in Great Britain in comparison with those made in Canada. Does he figure the cost in pounds or dollars, and does he take the English pound as having a value in Canadian currency of 4.86 2/3, or what rate of exchange does he take at getting at the figures?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I did not do the figuring myself, and I would not want to give an answer to the hon. member for Lunenburg unless I knew that the figures were absolutely authentic. I will ascertain and let the hon. gentleman know.

Mr. LUCIEN CANNON (Dorchester) (Translation): Mr. Chairman, the debate which took place this afternoon was a very interesting one, but apart from that, it appealed to us of the Liberal Party, inasmuch as it reminded us of another which took place some ten years ago, when the leader of the Liberal Party suggested that we should build in this country a Canadian navy which would promote a new industry, that of shipbuilding, and would certainly lead later on to the building and maintenance of a fleet of merchantmen.

At that time, the leader of the Liberal Party, represented in the House of Commons and throughout the country, the thoughts and ideals of all true Liberals of the day. If I remember well, the present Minister of Marine, who was then a member of the Montreal Board of Harbour Commissioners, was among the strongest and most enthusiastic supporters of such policy.

It is useless, Sir, to revert to the past; it is useless for us, on this side of the House, to recall the debates, the bitterness of which, however, is not quite forgotten. As I said before, if I remember well, the very man who led the forces opposed to that policy is to-day leading the Government in this House—I refer to the Right Hon. Acting Prime Minister. If you cared, Mr. Speaker, to read over again the discussions which took place at the time, you would be very much surprised to notice that the same man whose Government now propose an expenditure of $20,000,000 for the building of a Canadian merchantmen was the first one in the House of Commons and throughout the country, to raise his voice against such a policy and to oppose Laurier's "tin-pot navy." We read in the Gospel that there shall be joy in Heaven upon one sinner that doeth penance, more than upon ninety-nine just who need not penance.

To-day, Sir, as a member of the Liberal Opposition in this House, as a representative of the people who entered the field in 1911 as a supporter of the naval policy of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and was defeated, it is a matter of gratification to me to congratulate the Right Hon. Acting Prime Minister and to tell him that I hope that his change of heart, however late it may be, will prove genuine. And to quote again the Gospel, knowing as I do that the Acting Prime Minister is quite conversant with it, let me tell him that according to Holy Scriptures, the best rewarded labourers were those who came about the eleventh hour.

I do not wish, Sir, to discuss the question on its merits, whether Canada should have a Canadian merchant marine or whether we are entitled to have ships flying our national flag; for to such a question there can be but one answer. Yet, I think there arises an incidental question and I anticipate much trouble in the future, unless the Government tackle the problem and immediately solve it. The man who deals with the upbuilding of this new merchant marine with its operation and in a general way with its development, that gentleman, I say, is Mr. Hanna, of the C.N.R. Now, Sir, I say that if the Government of this country want to be fair and deal honestly with the Canadian ratepayers, and if the Minister of Marine wants to be consistent, and to live up to his Liberal principles—as I have no doubt he should—act—I say that the hon. minister has but one thing to do and it is this: Let him dismiss Mr. Hanna and all those who in any way are connected with the C. N. R. Here are gentlemen who have fleeced the country, here are men who have bled white nearly each province of Canada; here are men who after building throughout the country railway lines in an extravagant and irrational way, have extorted from a too liberal and obliging Government millions which are now filling the coffers of promoters such as Mackenzie and Mann. The thieves must be cast out of the temple, whether that temple be the Government of Canada or the House of Commons. The Hon. Minister of Marine has an imperative duty to discharge: Let him take up his whip, like an honest man, and expel all the knaves from his department.

Is the Government warranted in giving away another $20,000,000, and in handing that money over to that man Hanna who has brought ruin to the Northern Canadian and extorted from the public treasury hunreds and hundreds of millions, the wherewithal to pay the debts of unscrupulous financiers.

One more remark and I am through. Formerly the city of Quebec was the centre of the shipbuilding industry in Canada. The hon. member from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) who always gives proof of erudition and is anxious to be looked upon as a scholar by his colleagues, has just referred to a new shipbuilding policy. Let me tell my hon. friend that he came over to Canada rather too late and that had he come to this continent a little earlier he would know that the shipbuilding business was thriving in Canada in the early sixties and seventies, down to 1875, and this because of an imperative necessity, as civil war was waging in the United States of America, and the Americans were having a very large number of ships built in this country. Whether success is attained in shipbuilding or not, it does not depend upon the fiscal policy, but upon favourable opportunities.

Sir, my opinion on the whole shipbuilding policy is very simple, and in fact so simple that it should also be shared in by the hon. Minister of Marine. I stood in 1911 on the same ground as Sir Wilfrid Laurier did, and the hon. Minister of Marine also took the same stand. Now, in 1920, I stand for the same policy and the members of the Government seem to hold the same views. In connection with this policy, let the hon. Minister of Marine recall that he was a follower of Sir Wilfrid Laurier; let him be mindful of the principles which he then advocated, and so doing he will ever protect Canadian autonomy. Let him not forget the dangers that threatened our trade during the war, because of the fact that England wanted to take over all our Canadian ships and let him in the future see to it that England be mistress in her own house, so far as marine is concerned, and Canada mistress in her own home.

The CHAIRMAN: It is now six o'clock and I leave the chair.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: When the House rose at six o'clock we were considering Item 219, providing for the Government shipbuilding programme, in the Main Estimates for the year ending March 31, 1921. The item had been under consideration since three o'clock and had been fully discussed. Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt the resolution?

Mr. COPP: We are asked to vote the large sum of $20,000,000 to carry out the Government's shipbuilding programme, but we are not given a very lucid explanation of the reasons for that expenditure. We are greatly indebted to the minister for presenting to us the information he had in regard to the item, but I was somewhat disappointed and rather surprised when he said in answer to an hon. gentleman that he did not know whether the information he was giving was correct or not because it had not been prepared by him.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I might say to the hon. gentleman that every figure I gave this afternoon I prepared personally with the exception of the sterling cost of the ships.

Mr. COPP: I was not referring to the statement of my hon. friend but to his reply in answer to a question. Doubtless the minister's statement was correct in so far as it went; but it seems to me that in asking for such a large amount of money at any time, and particularly under present conditions, he should be prepared to give further and detailed explanations in regard to this item. The minister somewhat hurriedly gave a list of ships that had been built, and other details the effect of which it was difficult to grasp without a little study. I would like to know whether the contracts for these ships were let by public tender, and if so whether the lowest tenders were accepted. Or are the ships being built under force contract, with provision for a certain percentage of profit? These are matters of detail which the minister should place before the committee before we are asked to vote this large amount of money.

I do not intend to discuss the question of what should be a proper policy in the matter of shipbuilding. I am free to say that I am not in a position to know whether a policy of shipbuilding by the Government is the best thing for the country. Of course, I have my own opinion about it, and I suppose all other hon. members have theirs; though their opinions may be based upon more knowledge of the matter than I possess. But the advisability of building merchant vessels at the present time is very questionable. It is questionable whether the minister did the right thing when he went into the building of a merchant marine a year or two ago—at a time when the cost

of construction was very greatly enhanced. The minister said this afternoon that notwithstanding the huge expenditures that had been made in the building of these vessels, the return as a result of operation was on the right side. But have the expenditures connected with the operation of these vessels been charged up to the proper accounts, or have they been charged up to the operation of the Canadian National railways? Has a portion of the salaries of the directors of the Canadian National Railway system been charged up to the earnings of the vessels whose operations my hon. friend says have paid a dividend? We cannot know that there has been a proper return on the expenditure made or that there has been a net profit on operation unless we know that these things have been properly charged against the operations of the different vessels. Generally speaking, having regard to the experience of the past, we cannot, in the operation of steamships by a Board of Management appointed by the Government, expect to meet with the greatest financial success. When my hon. friend gives a glowing account of the results which have been achieved through the operation of the Government vessels, he must realize that in the years to come freight rates will not be as excessively high as they are now, and that he is building his vessels at a time when costs and charges are at almost the highest possible point. I think it was the member for Toronto Centre (Mr. Bristol) who said—the minister himself also said it —that we could sell these vessels to-day at a profit. If he can dispose of them at a profit, I would suggest that he do so, for two reasons: First, the responsibility of financing the undertaking would be removed from the shoulders of this country; and, second, the chance of loss in operation would be done away with so far as the country is concerned. Besides, if we handed these vessels over to private interests, we would not then be interfering with or competing with private individuals who were prepared to go into the shipping business. If, therefore, my hon. friend can transfer these ships and rid the country of further responsibility in regard to them without subjecting the country to any loss it is my opinion that he should do so.

Mr. POWER: Is the Board of Management which has charge of the operation of these vessels a member of the Shipping Federation of Montreal?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I cannot make a positive statement, but I should judge that they would be. That, however, in no way binds them as to freight rates.

Mr. POWER: What are the functions of the Shipping Federation of Montreal?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am not familiar with the functions of that body, but I should judge that they would deal with pilotage matters, aids to navigation, harbour dues, allocation of berths and so on. But they have nothing whatever to do with the fixing of rates.

Mr. POWER: Will the minister say that the government-owned ships are competing with other lines running into Canadian ports?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Certainly.

Mr. POWER: Are the government-owned ships charging lower rates?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am not familiar with the rates charged by the Canadian Government Merchant Marine but naturally they would meet competition where necessary. I cannot say whether or not their rates are lower.

Mr. POWER: As I understand it, one of the principal reasons for the building and operation of this Canadian Merchant Marine was that we might be able to ship our products overseas at a lower rate. Unless the Canadian Merchant Marine by competition decreases the cost of transporting freight I hardly see that there is much reason for its existence now that the war is over. It is essential that the minister assure the House that by means of the merchant marine built by the country we shall be able to ship our products overseas at a much better rate than heretofore. If the minister will not answer in regard to this matter, he may answer me in regard to something else. Were any arrangements made with the British Admiralty regarding the taking over of Canadian Government ships during the war?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The British Minister of Shipping had no authority to take over ships of Canadian registry during the war without the consent of the Canadian Government. As to ships under British registry, he had the right to commandeer without consulting the Canadian Government.

Mr. POWER: Is it not a fact that tons of freight were lying on the wharves at Montreal and that we were unable to send it overseas because the British Admiralty

had taken all space for freight going from Canadian ports during the latter days of the war?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: On ships under British register the British Minister of Shipping commandeered 70 per cent of the available cargo space. As regards ships under Canadian register, such as the Canadian Mercantile Marine, he had no such authority, and did not exercise any.

Mr. POWER: Was the available space on the Canadian Government Merchant Marine given one hundred per cent to individual shippers?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Mr. POWER: None given over to British Admiralty purposes?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Not an ounce.

Mr. CAHILL: Could the minister tell us where he expects to get this amount of $20,000,000 from that he purposes spending on shipping?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: If the hon. member will ask that question of my colleague, the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton), when the Budget is brought down, I am sure he will tell my hon. friend. In a general way we shall get it from the revenue of the country, and if that is not sufficient, I suppose, maybe, it will be necessary for the Government to depend on the banks. But I think that question should more properly be put to my colleague the Minister of Finance.

Mr. CAHILL: But the question is before us now to deal with as to where this money is to come from.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I can assure my hon. friend that we shall get the money.

Mr. CAHILL: This is a matter in which the Canadian people are interested. The time has come when the people of Canada are about tired of spending borrowed money for the promotion of the industries of this country. At the last session of Parliament we had the Minister of Finance borrowing money from the Canadian people in order to lend it to countries so that they could buy goods from this country with that money. Much of that money—

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I regret very much to be obliged to call the hon. member to order, but I must remind him that the House is now sitting as a Committee of Supply and not as a Committee of Ways and Means. The finding of moneys for all purposes mentioned in the Estimates comes properly before the committee when it is sitting as a Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. CAHILL: I just wanted to point out by way of illustration that we had been spending a great deal of money on various things for the promotion of the rich men's interests in this country, and this apparently is one of them. This is not only a question of where the money is to come from; it is a question of the policy of the Government. The very item itself states that it is to complete or to promote the Government shipbuilding programme. If the Government have a programme, it must necessarily follow that they have a programme for providing the money for this shipbuilding, and I am simply asking the Government how they purpose going on, if they intend to go on.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I must again point out to the hon. member that the question of where the money will come from or how the money will be provided is not in order at the present time.

Mr. CAHILL: I just want to bring to the attention of the Government the absurdity of their going on spending money by the millions when they do not have it. It is necessary to make some reference to expenditure in order to bring out the point that I wish to illustrate. The Government are spending money on every hand by the millions—

An hon. MEMBER: By the hundreds of millions.

Mr. CAHILL: —by the hundreds of millions, and they state that this vote is to carry out a policy. What I wish to know is where this policy is to lead the country, where the people of Canada are coming to with this policy. We were told this afternoon by one of the supporters of this Government that we must go into the shipbuilding business now in order to provide traffic for the railways. Where is the thing to end. The hon. member who made that reference also stated that we must expect deficits which will come out of the pockets of the people of Canada. I merely want to know from the minister if there is any end to the ambitions of the Government to spend the money of the Canadian people for the benefit of the friends of the Government.

Mr. DUFF: The minister has been asked with regard to the amount which appears

in the Estimates in connection with the shipbuilding programme. It seems very strange to me that a business man should ask his shareholders to approve an expenditure of $20,000,000, or of any amount, without knowing where the money is to come from when he asks for it. It seems to me that the first thing that we should know, whether it is in order or not, is where the money is coming from. No Minister of the Crown should come before this committee without being able to give the information as to where the money is to come from before he asks for it.

I should like to know from the minister how these vessels are chartered. The hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) asked whether the freight rates were higher or lower than the ordinary dealers' freight rates. Are these vessels chartered through brokers or directly through the agents of the Mercantile Marine Corporation?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The vessels are not chartered at all. There is more freight offering both for the outward voyages and the inward voyages than the vessels are able to carry. There is no necessity to charter them in view of the large quantity of freight constantly offering.

Mr. COPP: Does the minister refer to Canadian freight or foreign?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Mostly Canadian.

Mr. DUFF: That is not an answer to my question. I do not care whether there is ten times as much freight offering as can be carried. The fact that a vessel carries freight means that it is chartered; that is, a merchant in Quebec, Montreal or Toronto must charter space in a vessel to carry freight; and I would like a direct answer to my question.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I thought I had made the matter clear to the hon. member who is a shipping man. The Canadian Government Mercantile Marine do not charter their vessels; they see to it that there is an abundance of freight for them. Their vessels are handled the same as the Canadian Pacific or the White Star or the Cunard handle their vessels. Vessels are not chartered through brokers at all. The freight is sent to whatever port the ship is going to sail from, by the Government railways or by some other railway, and the Canadian Government Mercantile Marine sees to it that the freight is there when the ship is ready to sail; but they certainly do not charter any of their vessels.

[Mr. Duff.]

Mr. DUFF: The last answer is what I wanted. The vessels are chartered. The trouble is that the minister does not know what the word "charter" means. A vessel is chartered by John Brown of Montreal or John Jones of Toronto to carry 100 casks of rum from Montreal—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. DUFF:—or flour or anything else. I am pleased at the sentiment that emanates from the other side. Last year I noticed that when the vote was about to be taken many members absented themselves because they did not want to vote for prohibition. I am glad to know from the minister that these vessels are chartered without commissions being paid. Do these vessels pay a business profits tax to the Government? Every private ship owner in the country has to pay part of his profits to the Receiver General under what is known as a business profits tax or a tax on incomes received from vessels. Do these ships belonging to the Government pay this business profits tax?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am afraid the hon. member will have to ask my colleague the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Reid). The railways are under the Minister of Railways, and the ships are also managed by Mr. Hanna and his Board of Directors. Just what taxes they pay, I do not know.

Mr. DUFF: I move that the committee rise and report progress, so that we can get this information from the Minister of Railways.

Motion negatived.

Mr. BUTTS: The shipping question is one of very considerable importance to our part of the country. There is hardly a ton of soft coal that goes into the city of Montreal that does not come in one of our ships from Sydney. There is not a single ton of iron ore that goes into that city that does not come from Sydney or from our sister colony, Newfoundland, of which my hon. friend from Lunenburg is a native. I know my hon. friend is proud that from the ancient colony of Newfoundland and from the furnaces in my county comes the cheapest iron that is produced in the world. I will not say steel, but I repeat, we can produce pig iron more cheaply than any other part of the world.

Now I want to pay a little attention to my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark). We have heard his theories so often. They

are the theories that directed my little infantile legs from the cradle, but I have always found that a man who preached free trade was a protectionist in practice. I wish I could pay my hon. friend the compliment of saying that he was sincere both in theory and practice on either free trade or protection; but I fear I cannot do it. He was a supporter for fifteen years of a Government that preached free trade but practised protection. Is not that true?

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: The fifteen years began in 1896. I only came to Canada in 1902. My hon. friend surely won't hold me responsible for what happened in the six years before I came. I go one step further and point out to my hon. friend that he ought to hold it as an extenuating circumstance that the party got into thoroughly bad lines before I joined it, and I was misled by the name Liberal into thinking the party really was.

Mr. BUTTS: I am most pleased to receive my hon. friend's explanation. I invite him over. We will give him a seat here. Now for a moment we are going to lock horns seriously. My hon. friend would make it appear to this House that England became predominant in shipping during the days of free trade over there. Recalling the history I read when a boy, was it not in the war between England and France when England captured Louisburg and became master of all the inland waters of Canada that England acquired her supremacy at sea, and from that time France's erstwhile predominance began to wane? As my hon. friend from West Peterboro (Mr. Burnham) pointed out this afternoon, the Americans said: We can make more money out of other business, so we will hire our ships from England. Let me say this: It is within my own lifetime, and I am not the oldest man in this House, when the iron ore areas of Newfoundland were first discovered by Graham Fraser, the late president of the Nova Scotia Steel Company—a discovery which led to our beating the whole world, as we can to-day, at the smelting of ore from the coast of Newfoundland up there about Tilt Cove. We produce pig iron to-day more cheaply at Sydney harbour than in any part of this rotund globe. Coming now to free trade, it is a subject on which the people of Canada are fed up.

There are to-day in Canada over forty thousand miles of railroad and canals that have cost about $150,000,000; and we take pride in our court houses, custom houses, post offices, and other public buildings. Did any principle of free trade enter into their construction? Were they not rather built under the aegis of a protective tariff. When hon. gentlemen who talk so much about free trade rise to speak in this House, I sometimes—if the decorum of this Chamber will countenance the expression—I sometimes admire their gall. I will ask these free traders this question: Did they ever know a single man in this House of Commons of Canada who was sincere enough in his convictions to assume the Premiership of this Dominion and put into force a free trade policy? No; they do not. I am going to follow my hon. friend from Red Deer just a little further. Let me inform that hon. gentleman that I am not an Englishman; I am not an Irishman; I am not a Scotsman; I am a Canadian.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. BUTTS: I repeat, I am a Canadian. And when I heard this afternoon the remarks of my hon. friend in regard to navigation and shipping I confess I was somewhat surprised at the meagre extent of his knowledge of the subject. The British Isles, that were almost lost in the German ocean, were, he said, the centre of control and the seat of knowledge in regard to the science of shipping. Well, now, Mr. Chairman, Balboa, who found the route of the Panama Canal, was not a native of the British Isles, nor did Columbus, the discoverer of America, have the honour to claim that spot as his home; and Cabot who explored the coast of North America was not, as far as I am aware, a native of the British Isles. I give Great Britain credit for being the greatest colonizer that the world has ever known, but she cannot be claimed to have been the greatest explorer. The man who wrecked the Empress of Ireland in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, I may say, hailed from those little islands in the German ocean. You never heard of a Nova Scotian ever having made such a mistake in navigation. Now I do not intend to pursue my hon. friend any further, for I see quite well that he works on dreams and theories and not on practical knowledge. Let us get away from bickering and get down to solid facts.

An hon. MEMBER: A good idea.

Mr. BUTTS: Yes, certainly, a good idea; and as a matter of fact, let me say right now that there is in the county I represent a steel works that is capable of producing pig iron cheaper than any other city in the

world. This Government, and particularly the Minister of Marine, has entered into a contract with the company through which there has been established a very large steel plate mill, the only ship plate mill in any place from the Gulf of Mexico to the Arctic sea, with the exception of the "Smoky City" of the United States. We are able to produce there an ample supply of plates, as has been demonstrated within a very few weeks, and are likely to be able to supply the entire Dominion as well as a large portion of the United Kingdom, and may possibly be called upon even by Pittsburgh for the supply of plates. This is something that was not dreamed of ten years ago. Ten years ago in my county people were wondering how it was possible for them to send coal up the St. Lawrence to compete with the coal mines of the United States. Previous to the election of 1911 the city of Montreal entered into a contract with a United States company for bituminous coal. They were to be supplied with 50,000 tons of coal for all the public works of Montreal at a price thirty-one cents below the tender of the Dominion Coal Company, and that notwithstanding the fact that at that time the Dominion Coal Company and all Canadian coal companies had an advantage of fifty-four cents a ton. Under conditions of that kind it is rather difficult to understand why we people in the East of Canada are not a little bit prejudiced against the men in the West. We have very little in common with them. Do they buy our coal? When they bought our steel we gave it to them cheaper than they could buy it in England. We sent our steel rails around Cape Horn and sold them at a very cheap rate in Prince Rupert. These are facts. Now then, there is one other thing: I remember when I was a young fellow down in Nova Scotia the old men, and the old women too,—for I sometimes associated with the ladies—told me of the enormous cost of flour during the days of the Franco-Prussian war in 1870-1-2. They were paying $14 a barrel for flour. They thought it was something enormous. This brings me back to my farmer friends down there who talk to us so very, very much about profiteering. I am going to make this statement, that there is no class in this Dominion of Canada that are greater profiteers than the farmers.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I would just like to call the attention of my hon. friend to the fact that we are still discussing the Government's shipbuilding programme.

Mr. BUTTS: Mr. Chairman, I was going to say that your remarks were so jocular—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. BUTTS: If you allow me to proceed I will promise that my brevity will really amount to wit. I will let my friends the farmers down there go—I can have a slap at them some other time—and I will return to the subject of shipping which is under debate at present. Perhaps I will return to my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark). He talked this afternoon about shipping. My hon. friend from Red Deer does not know all about shipping. The biggest wooden ship that was ever floated on salt water was built right down in Nova Scotia in the county of Yarmouth.

Mr. M. CLARK: Under a low tariff.

Mr. BUTTS: Well now, let us see whether it was in the time of low tariff or not.

Mr. M. CLARK: When was it?

Mr. BUTTS: She was built somewhere about 1876 or 1877 in the county of Yarmouth.

Mr. M. CLARK: Before the National Policy, or you never could have built it.

Mr. BUTTS: There was never a very low tariff in Nova Scotia. It was always so high, so much above your English tariff, that they were able to build bigger wooden ships than you ever built in England. You talk about your free trade or protection, what has it to do with these lines of trade? What is the use of your having built in the county of Yarmouth the biggest wooden ship that was ever floated if she cannot connect with railway lines? Your railway and canal lines were built under protection. The policy of the Minister of Marine has my entire sympathy in every respect; only, as I told him the other evening, I would like him to call into consultation a few experts and drive his good policy just a little bit farther.

Mr. POWER: Will the minister give us some information with reference to the wreck of the "Canadian Spinner."

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The "Canadian Recruit."

Mr. POWER: It left Quebec late in the autumn of last year and was wrecked. I understand the wreck has been ascribed to the lack of proper ice breakers to escort this boat down the St. Lawrence. If we expend large sums of money on vessels of this kind we ought at least to take proper

precautions to see that they manage to get to sea in safety.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: My hon. friend is aware that this occurrence took place very late in the season—in the month of December—when the most powerful icebreaker we had, the "Montcalm" was down around the Straits of Belle Isle trying to reach the lighthouse keepers. I have in my Estimates, when we come to it, an item of $2,000,000 for a very much larger and more powerful ice breaker than the "Montcalm." If we had had such an ice breaker as I propose—we had one but sold it during the war to Russia—there would have been no trouble experienced in relieving the "Canadian Recruit" and also the "Canadian Spinner." When we take up the ice breaker item I shall be very glad to say more in so far as the "Recruit" is concerned. I am happy to say that she is not badly damaged and I do not think there will be much difficulty in having her salvaged when the weather permits.

Mr. POWERS: Has she been abandoned to the underwriters?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: She has been abandoned to the underwriters.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: What was the cost of that ship?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It was $817,000.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Was she fully insured?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Fully insured.

Mr. POWER: Is there any information to be given to the committee with reference to the rather unfortunate cruise of the "Canadian Pioneer" from Pictou?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The "Canadian Sealer."

Mr. POWER: —the cruise of the "Canadian Sealer" from Pictou to the Magdalen Islands? Is there any explanation why this vessel did not reach the Islands where, I understand, the inhabitants were in dire need of provisions and were almost on the verge of starvation?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The only explanation I can give is that owing to the very severe weather and the thickness of the ice it was quite impossible for the "Sealer" to reach the Magdalen Islands. Even the icebreaker "Montcalm" was stuck a month in the ice before she could reach the Magdalen Islands. We were using every endeavour within our power to get provisions to those islands. We also tried to reach the islands with the "Sealer" but the ice was too thick. Eventually the "Montcalm" got through.

Mr. POWER: It seems to me rather bad management on the part of the Canadian Mercantile Marine to have allowed a vessel —which I presume was not an icebreaker and therefore not fitted for a voyage in the depth of winter—to attempt such a trip. There is no doubt whatsoever that in so doing a great risk was being taken, and it seems to me that the Board of Management should have obtained expert advice on the subject before sending a ship which was liable to be damaged on such a dangerous expedition. I think the minister owes it to the people on the Magdalen Islands, who are the parties interested, to explain just on whose advice this ship was sent and why a boat better fitted for the journey was not selected.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I wish at once to relieve the Canadian Mercantile Marine of the onus of sending the "Sealer" to the Magdalen Islands. The "Sealer" had not been turned over to the Canadian Government and it was my own department that forced her to go there. The people of the Magdalen Islands were on the verge of starvation; our icebreaker "Montcalm" was not available at that time; and the situation was so serious that the Government were considering the advisability of sending provisions by airship if they could not be conveyed in any other way. Therefore I think hon. gentlemen will agree that the Government were justified in taking the risk they did. I am glad to say the ship was not damaged, but it was our responsibility and our duty to load the vessel with provisions and try to get her to the Magdalen Islands if it was at all possible.

Mr. PARENT: In view of the statement made by the minister to the effect that the Magdalen Islands were last season without shipping communication it is opportune for the members from the Quebec district to inquire why it is, in view of the Government having such a fleet at its disposal, the Magdalen Islands and Gaspé have been so sadly neglected in the past. Looking at the fleet of ships under Government control I find that their routes are all to places beyond Canada. I notice that those routes are from St. John to London, St. John to the West Indies, St. John to Liverpool, Halifax to the West Indies and so on; but I fail to see any route, for example, from Quebec to the Magdalen Islands or to Gaspé, where it would be clearly a case of serving the interests and

meeting the necessities of our own people—and the minister himself said that the people of the Magdalen Islands were last season threatened with starvation. If the construction and maintenance of this fleet of steamships is, first, last and all the time, a Canadian enterprise, I would submit that the first thing to do would be to meet the necessities of our own people and not to allow them to starve, or to come within measurable distance of it. I understand that the Minister of Trade and Commerce has already granted subsidies to a certain company with a view to establishing a steamship service between the Magdalen Islands and to Gaspé, but no service is yet forthcoming. A reference to an answer given here by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) a few days ago will disclose the fact that the St. Lawrence Trading Company has received a large subsidy for such a service, but the service has never been installed. Many requests have been made to the Government for an improvement in the means of communication with that part of our coast but so far without success. If there is any excuse for this failure to provide much needed facilities it is that the Government is surrounded always by the same big interests which it desires to nourish and protect. The other day we had the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) coming to this House and giving advice to the Government. The only thing he told them was to carry on—that is carry on in the spending of money lavishly in the interest of the people whom the Government wants to protect. In the meantime Canadian ships are going all over the world while our own people are threatened with starvation. It seems to me, Sir, it is time we looked a little more closely after Canadian interests.

The other day I read in the Ottawa Citizen a speech by Mr. Hanna in which he said, referring to the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, that we were adopting a shipping policy of our own, and were going to manage ships ourselves. "But," he said, "We want the politicians not to interfere with what we are doing." Well, Sir, that is very good, but no matter what Mr. Hanna may say, he will never prevent me from pointing out any wrong that I may see in the Government's administration. If there is one thing that a member from the city of Quebec cannot forget, when a programme of this sort is up for consideration it is the fact Quebec, although one of the best ports in Canada, has, during the term of the present Government, been deliberately and wilfully ignored.

Mr. Chairman, if this merchant marine of ours is going to be operated in connection with the Canadian Government Railways was it not the main idea of that railway system that the grain from the Canadian West should be shipped through Canadian ports, and especially through the port of Quebec. And yet I fail to see in the routes laid down provision made for a single vessel to load grain at Quebec, grain from the Canadian West intended for foreign markets.

The member for Westmorland (Mr. Copp) has asked some very pertinent questions. He has asked why these contracts for ships should have been granted to certain firms, whether tenders were called for, and whether in each case the contract was awarded to the lowest tenderer. I am informed that most of these contracts have been given to the same people. We should have information with regard to that, so that we may know whether there is competition in that line of construction. It would be interesting to know also what is the capital of each of these companies which are building Government steamers. We are told that most of them have hardly any capital subscribed, or, if any, that it is very small, and that practically speaking none of these people are taking any risks in connection with the building of the vessels. All this information we should have; it is only fair that questions of this kind which were put by my hon. friend (Mr. Copp) should be answered.

On the Order Paper appears a notice of motion in the name of the member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) asking for a copy of certain correspondence between the Prime Minister and J. T. Ross, president of the Quebec Board of Trade concerning the intention of the Government to build in Canada a number of 15,000-ton passenger steamships for the Canadian service; also a notice of motion asking for a copy of a letter said to have been signed by twenty-two senators and members of the House of Commons representing the provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, addressed to the Prime Minister, recommending the shipment of grain by rail via Quebec; also a copy of the answer to such letter, as well as the letters sent by J. T. Ross to the Minister of Railways in January and February, 1920, concerning the export of wheat via Quebec. It may seem that there is no connection between these subjects and the item under consideration, but there is a connection. If the merchant marine is to

be operated in connection with the Canadian National Railway system and the minister wants to obtain the support of the whole community he should not forget the best ports of this country, especially the port of Quebec.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: With regard to communication with the Magdalen Islands, I may say that the steamer "Lady Evelyn," owned by a private company and subsidized by the Government, was on that route, but, having become disabled about the month of November, was unable to continue her regular sailings. It would not be advisable for the Government to enter into competition with a private concern that was enjoying a subsidy from the Dominion Treasury, provided they were taking proper care of the passengers and freight, and I understand that they were. The "Lady Evelyn" will be repaired and again placed on that route, but if she is not able to carry on the service I shall be very glad to bring the matter to the attention of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine. The hon. member is quite right when he says that these ships are built primarily for the use of Canada and Canadians and that we must serve our home interests before we serve our export interests abroad.

As to the other question raised by my hon. friend and also by the member for Westmorland (Mr. Copp), I have already given the information in answer to an inquiry made this afternoon by the member for Chambly and Vercheres (Mr. Archambault), but I shall be only too happy to give it again. I stated this afternoon that when the Government inaugurated their shipbuilding programme, early in 1918, the policy was to keep the Canadian steel shipbuilding yards fully occupied and to provide the tonnage that the Government desired to have. We did not call for public tenders because the business could not be handled in that way. One firm, for instance, in order to be glutted with business, might quote a price a shade lower than that quoted by another firm, and we would not have been able evenly to distribute the business. The greatest care, however, was exercised in obtaining prices from the different yards. If we wanted a ship of 5,000 or 8,000 tons we asked the yards that were capable of turning out ships of that size what their prices were. We did not accept always the price that was quoted us; in many cases we carried on negotiations for weeks before the price was finally arranged that was satisfactory to the Government. We had a check on the price through the experts in the Marine Department who figured out what the cost of a ship should be; and we had also the competitive bids from the various yards. Moreover, we knew what it would cost to build similar ships in the United Kingdom. If hon. members will ask the shipyards they will be told that we did not let them off very easily. In fact, the shipbuilders in British Columbia felt that their prices were being so much beaten down that they appealed to the members and did everything they could to get us to deal more liberally with them. But I and the officers associated with me did the best we could to get the very best prices. In comparison with what other countries have done, I do not think that we need be ashamed of the contract prices that were arrived at.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Of the sixty-three contracts which have been or are to be awarded, the distribution is among some fourteen different firms and the contemplated total expenditure is something like $74,000,000, $50,000,000 has already been spent, and we are asking now for an additional $20,000,000. It is correct, is it not, that no tenders have been called for and that all these contracts have been awarded by Order in Council.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The contracts were awarded by Order in Council after I as responsible minister had seen that the prices were fair and right. The Government purchased just as a private corporation would purchase.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: But so far as these fourteen companies were concerned, no tenders were called for?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No tenders. There were, I think, seventeen companies.

Mr. PARENT: Were any offers made for the construction of ships larger than those now being built by the Government,— for ships of 15,000 instead of 4,000 or 5,000 tons?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am not aware of any such proposal.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Are further contracts to be awarded, or have all contracts been awarded?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No further contracts.

Mr. CASGRAIN: I endorse every word spoken by the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Parent) a few moments ago. It

is not fair that we should vote such a huge amount of money to be expended for the purpose of carrying the trade of Canada outside of Canada and expanding it abroad if we leave our provinces, and especially the part of our country which is most in need of the services of navigation, without any help at all. The hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Parent) has just referred to the Magdalen islands and the coast of Gaspé. I would call the attention of the minister to the north shore of the St. Lawrence below Quebec, the district which lies between Murray bay and Tadoussac, and as far as the Labrador coast. Last year I succeeded in obtaining from the minister the assurance that the steamer Champlain would be taken from her course and sent to ply between Murray bay and Tadoussac. This went on very well for a certain number of months until last January, when tenders were called for the sale of the boat. Recently, when I put a question in the House, the minister told me that there was no necessity for replacing the ship which was practically sold. I must protest against such an answer. There is a necessity for having a regular boat service from Murray bay down the river St. Lawrence all the time, and especially between the months of October and May. I am told that there is a little story told about this ship, the Champlain. Tenders were called, a certain number of tenders were received, and one was accepted. The reason why the sale was not proceeded with, I am informed, was that some friends of the Government submitted a tender which was to be accepted, but they could not finance the enterprise and pay for the ship. If we are going to vote such a huge amount as $20,000,000 for ships, we should see to it that $500,000 or $600,000, or whatever may be necessary, is applied for building a boat to carry on the service, which is very necessary, along the coast between Murray bay and Tadoussac, and as far as Labrador.

There is another point. I was surprised this afternoon to hear the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bristol) defending the policy of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. This hon. gentleman, everybody knows, was connected for years past with a number of shipping companies, the Richelieu and Ontario, the Canada Steamship lines, and now he is one of the promoters of the Dominion Steamship Line, the Nova Scotia Steamship Line, and he is behind some of the big mergers that are going to be made of all the steel industries of this country, in which English capital is interested. He is still a director of the Dominion Steamships and the Canada Steamship Company, and a few weeks ago, just at the opening of this Parliament, I saw in the corridors no less a gentleman than Colonel Grant Morden who was at the back of the merger of the Canada Steamship Line, who, I am told, with Sir Newton Moore and other prominent men who came from Australia to this country especially for the purpose of organizing this huge steel merger, came here to get an assurance from the minister and the Government that this would go through in order that their interests would be safeguarded. This is the story, and I know it because some people have told me so, and they are just as reliable people as the minister.

I would ask the Minister of Marine for a few moments to get away from those big amounts of money and see that the little affairs of his department are better attended to. I am making no special charge, but I wish to draw to the attention of the minister that in the administration of his department there are many little details which were better looked after formerly, but which since this big policy of shipbuilding has been inaugurated, have been absolutely ignored. For instance,—while this may not be quite relevant to the question under discussion, I want to give an example,—the officers and employees of the steamer Champlain were to be given uniforms by the Minister of Marine, an amount was voted in the Estimates and the uniforms were to have been made. A few weeks ago I received some letters that the men have not yet got their uniforms. When we have the minister juggling with millions every day, the small details are not attended to, and the poor people, the officers and other employees of the departments and also the people who live along the north shore of the river St. Lawrence, suffer.

Mr. J. D. REID: I did not intend taking part in this debate, and would not have done so had it not been that I understood first that when I was in my room, having been called out of the house, a question was put that I should have been here to answer, and second in connection with this department—

Mr. DUFF: I should like to correct the minister, I did not say that the minister should have been here. The Minister of Marine said that the question was one which the Minister of Railways could answer.

Mr. J. D. REID: Perhaps I should have said that the minister having stated that

I was not in the house, the hon. member moved that the committee rise until I should be present. The only objection I could raise to this could be this. If the hon. member had waited a few minutes and had sent to my room, I would have been here in a minute to give the answer to which he was entitled.

Mr. DUFF: It was not my place to send for the minister.

Mr. REID: I agree with the hon. member; perhaps it was not. But I might also add this, that if the hon. member had waited for a few minutes he would have had opportunity to receive an answer as I had intended to return shortly. Another reason is that the Canadian National railways have been brought into this discussion. I understand that the hon. member's question was: Do the Canadian steamships pay a business profits tax? I might answer the question in this way. These ships have not been in operation long enough for the question of the tax to come before the department. The business tax would be for the present year as the ships operated for only part of last year. The hon. member knows that the Canadian Northern railway is paying taxes. These ships are being built and put in the name of a private corporation; they will be operated in the same manner and will be in the same position as ships owned by an opposing company, for instance, the Canadian Pacific Company, and any taxes that a private company will be called upon to pay by the Finance Department, this steamship company will also be called upon to pay as if it were a private company. I think that answers the question of the hon. member. Another point that was raised was this. I understand that the leader of the Opposition and those who sit behind him take the position that these ships, instead of being operated, should be sold.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I expressed no opinion whatever on that point.

Mr. J. D. REID: I understand that some members of the Opposition—

Mr. DUFF: I did.

Mr. J. D. REID: It does not include all the Opposition. As I understand it, the leader of the Opposition takes one position and other hon. members opposite take another.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. REID: Well, the leader of the Opposition, if I am mis-stating his opinion, can state so now.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I expressed no opinion one way or the other.

Mr. J. D. REID: This is a very important question, and I should like the leader of the Opposition to express his opinion upon it. At all events, it appears that some hon. gentlemen opposite are hostile to the Government owning and operating ships in connection with the Canadian National Railway system.

Mr. DUFF: Hear, hear.

Mr. J. D. REID: Why this hostility? Is it for the purpose of crippling the Canadian National Railway system, which will comprise some 22,000 miles of railway? Do I understand that the hon. gentleman expects the Dominion Government to operate that system without vessels on both oceans?

Mr. DUFF: Certainly.

Mr. J. D. REID: The hon. member wants us to operate the system without any vessels?

Mr. DUFF: Absolutely.

Mr. J. D. REID: Well, my opinion is that if we do not have vessels to operate in connection with the system, which would carry the products of the West to European countries, so that we will have control over rates from the point of origin to destination, we cannot operate the Canadian National Railway system successfully. If I understand the policy which the hon. member is advocating, it is that we should send the products of the West to Montreal to be carried from there by Canadian Pacific steamships, or vessels of some other line, whose rates would be controlled by an opposition company, to the injury of the National system.

Mr. CANNON: What about Portland?

Mr. J. D. REID: If my hon. friend will have patience, I will deal with Portland and other ports in a moment. I say that we cannot operate the National system successfully in competition with the great Canadian Pacific railway unless we have vessels working in conjunction with the railway.

Mr. COPP: Does that 22,000 miles include the Grand Trunk?

Mr. J. D. REID: The Grand Trunk, the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Canadian North-

ern, and all Government lines. We have entered into an agreement with respect to the Grand Trunk which will be brought into force within a few days, so why should I not include the Grand Trunk in the mileage?

Mr. COPP: I am not objecting; I simply wanted the facts.

Mr. CANNON: Why not take over the Canadian Pacific road?

Mr. McMASTER: It is solvent.

Mr. J. D. REID: The hon. member for Quebec West finds fault with this Government for having done nothing, as he says, for the city of Quebec. Let me say to him that since Sir Robert Borden formed his Government in 1911, we have spent from $25,000,000 to $30,000,000 on the city of Quebec, whereas in the fifteen years previous, when Sir Wilfrid Laurier was in power, less than $3,000,000 was spent on that city. So this Government has done pretty well, so far as the city of Quebec is concerned. My hon. friend who states that we have done nothing for the city of Quebec knows that we have built a 2,000,000-bushel elevator there; we have built the St. Malo shops, and have spent altogether some $25,000,000 on the city. We have made it at least equal to any other port so far as facilities are concerned. My hon. friend states that the city of Quebec is the terminal of the Transcontinental railway. I had always understood that Halifax and St. John were the terminals. I cannot for the life of me understand why some hon. gentlemen opposite are so hostile to anything the Government may undertake for the purpose of putting the Canadian National Railway system in a position where it can compete with the great Canadian Pacific railway.

My hon. friend said that he had a right to criticise the administration of Mr. Hanna. Of course he has that right. The only point I wish to make is that in justice to Mr. Hanna and the management of the system I hope the criticism will be fair and honest, and not made with the object of trying to injure the railway, or discouraging the management in such a way as to affect the operation of the system.

It seems to me that some hon. gentlemen opposite are trying to discourage the shipbuilding industry in this country. No one would regret it more than I, if by the criticism that is being offered in this House, and which will go forth to the country, the shipbuilding industry in this country should cease. It employs some 50,000 men, I believe.

Mr. DUFF: About 23,000.

Mr. J. D. REID: Well then, 23,000. The amount of money that is expended in wages in this industry is very large. Furthermore, every article that goes into the vessels that we are building is made in Canada from our natural resources. Even the ship plates are made in this country. It seems to me that under a policy of this kind which keeps the money spent on the industry in this country, the shipbuilding industry, should be supported, and I for one am willing to do my part in encouraging the industry. Like other industries, it is for the advantage of Canada. The ships that we have built have done more to advertise Canada in certain countries, and to bring us trade, than has been done for many years past. Most of our ships so far have been running to South America and the West Indies, with which formerly we had very little trade. They have brought us closer together and have brought us trade, and will do more in that direction in the future. The same results will follow in other parts of the world when we get our shipbuilding programme completed. I for one urge upon every hon. member the vital importance of the national control of these ships in order that we may be able to compete with the great Canadian Pacific railway in the matter of freight charges on Canadian products, and be in a position to carry produce from the point of shipment to destination at cheaper rates than can be quoted by our great competitor. If we have vessels that can be operated in connection with our railways, with the advent of the time—which I do not believe is far distant—when we can make both ends meet in the working of the railway system, we shall have solved the great problem of freight rates on the ocean, because we shall then be able to ship products from the place of production to its destination at probably a very much lower rate on the Atlantic than would be offered by our competitors if they had the practical control of the traffic from our Canadian ports.

Mr. CANNON: I asked the minister a question in regard to the port of Portland and he said he would reply in a minute. I should like his answer.

Mr. J. D. REID: What was the question?

Mr. CANNON: The minister told us that the merchant marine was designed to encourage the shipping of Canadian goods

through Canadian ports, and my question is, how can the Government reconcile that policy with the policy advocated last year when the Grand Trunk Bill was under consideration, of keeping Portland and the improvements in Portland, and spending money there, as a terminal?

Mr. J. D. REID: Before we took over the Grand Trunk railway we had no control of the traffic over that road, but the position I take as Minister of Railways is that the products of this country should go by way of Montreal, Quebec, St. John and Halifax so long as we have our boats to take them. The hon. member simply wishes to give the public the impression that now that we have taken over the Grand Trunk we are going to send everything through Portland. That is not the policy of the Government, and I do not believe the people would tolerate any effort to ship traffic away from our own Canadian ports.

Mr. CANNON: If the policy of the Government is as the minister states, why should the Government expropriate the American section of the Grand Trunk leading to Portland?

Mr. J. D. REID: The hon. gentleman knows a great deal more than I do. I did not understand that the Government had so far taken any proceedings under the agreement, because this road has not been handed over to the Grand Trunk Railway Company. How, therefore, can we take any action in the matter of expropriation?

Mr. CANNON: I should not like the minister to leave the House under an impression which I am loath to characterize as intentionally incorrect. Last year when the Grand Trunk debate was on the minister, as a railway expert, vouchsafed his help to the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) who sometimes received that help with pleasure, and at other times, I venture to say, with mingled feelings. Last session the Minister of Railways often came into the House, as he has done tonight, with the avowed intention of throwing some light on the matter in order that we might understand it as perfectly as he thinks he understands it himself. He said repeatedly last year—and my memory is sound in this regard—that the section of the Grand Trunk on American soil was highly important because it led to the port of Portland. This year, however, when we have tabled in this House the agreement between the Government and the Grand Trunk, the minister tells us that he has no official knowledge of the proceedings taken by the Government in the matter of expropriation. I can only say that if the minister desires to retain his reputation as a railway expert and be taken seriously by the people of the country and the members of this House, it is eminently desirable that his speeches should be more studied. Proceedings are taken, the papers mention it, every member in the House is conversant with the subject, and people generally are aware of it; and the minister knows nothing about it he is the only person who is still in ignorance. This Government, which has diverted Canadian trade towards Portland, is composed of men who, when the Grand Trunk Pacific scheme was before the House, opposed it because they were not in favour of an altogether Canadian railway through Canada, but preferred at that time, as they prefer to-day, that only part of the railroad should be on Canadian soil; and they would rather give trade to the Yankees than to Quebec. The minister says that the Borden Government did more since the year 1911 for the province of Quebec than the Laurier Administration achieved during fifteen years. He mentioned the enormous sum of $25,000,000 spent in the city of Quebec. Now, how was that sum spent? Or, to be more precise, to be more in keeping with the methods generally adopted by this Government, I should ask, where was this money squandered? The Minister of Railways mentioned a grain elevator. I know that unfortunately, when he comes to our city, he remains only a few hours on his way to Saguenay, where he fishes trout or salmon; and the next time the hon. gentleman visits Quebec I invite him to call upon me and I shall be delighted to show him around the harbour. I will show him that famous grain elevator of which he has boasted so profusely. The shell of the elevator is there, but it is empty. There is no grain in it, and there never was; and, if this Government is retained in power, there never will be.

My hon. friend also mentioned another bit of construction work on which he said millions had been spent, the workshops in St. Malo. Has the minister developed of late a sense of humour? Is it his desire to laugh at the population of Quebec and their representatives in this House? We know what the St. Malo workshops are to-day. They were to be the greatest workshops in Canada, according to the plans laid down by the Laurier Government. But this Government, so far as those workshops are

concerned, has pursued the same policy it has followed in connection with everything else, and that is to belittle the policy of Sir Wilfrid Laurier thinking that it was given to small men to render as small as themselves a big statesman such as Sir Wilfrid Laurier was. The works are there, the minister can come on one of his trips to Quebec and we will then find if he has any excuses to make about the millions spent in Quebec for building shops. Where were the millions spent? The millions were spent in Levis where the money was given to the friends of the Government to buy fields, property and lots so that the friends of the Government would make some money.

The CHAIRMAN: I must also draw the attention of the hon. member to the fact that we are discussing the amount required for the construction of vessels and the carrying out of the Government's shipbuilding programme. I did not interrupt the hon. member when he was answering the remarks made by the minister concerning money spent in the city of Quebec, but when he talks about there being scandals at Levis and elsewhere he is certainly far away from the question.

Mr. CANNON: I bow to your decision, Mr. Chairman. I think we have enough scandals in our own city without crossing the river and going over to Levis. I shall confine myself to Quebec. Millions, said the minister, have been spent in Quebec. A few months ago some western members came to our city, and in company with several of my colleagues I took 10 p.m. the western members around the city and showed them what I thought were the points of interest. We came, on a street called St. Paul street, to a barn, a shed, a shack, half falling into ruins. One of the hon. members from the west—if I am not mistaken it was the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. MacNutt)—asked me what that was. I said: "That is the terminal station of the Canadian National railways in the city of Quebec." I will show where the minister has spent other millions in the city of Quebec. Right under the Dufferin Terrace, to which thousands of visitors come every summer to admire the magnificent scenery of the St. Lawrence and the Laurentian mountains, at their very feet this Government has erected a building which is a disgrace, an eyesore to every one accustomed to view things which are not ugly. It is a match box. That match box has been erected by this munificent Borden Government, which has spent millions of dollars according to the Minister of Railways. The city of Quebec gave them a magnificent property worth over $100,000 and in return this Government, to show their good faith, to show the interest they had in our city and district, erected a building worth about $25,000 which resembled more a match box than any railway station I ever looked at. The Minister of Railways will tell us that the city of Quebec is being treated better than she was ever treated under the Laurier Government. We had a line direct from Montreal to Quebec run by the Canadian Northern railway—a short line, beautifully located and running along the shore of the St. Lawrence. When the Minister of Railways took charge of the Canadian Northern this line, where there had been a slight landslide, was never repaired and although the line cost millions of dollars it is not even put into use. If a man wants to leave Quebec to go to Montreal, using what was formerly the Canadian Northern railway line, it is a trip that takes twelve hours. What about competing with the Canadian Pacific? The minister tells us that the only desire he has in his heart—

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I must call the attention of the hon. member again to the fact that we are discussing the Government shipbuilding programme and the item of $20,000,000 to be voted therefor. I am sure the hon. member himself will realize that the competition of the Canadian National railways with the Canadian Pacific between Montreal and Quebec is not included in that item.

Mr. CANNON: He mentioned it; that was part of his argument.

The CHAIRMAN: Even if the minister did mention it I rule that it is out of order.

Mr. CANNON: Why did you not so rule before?

The CHAIRMAN: Because I hoped the hon. gentleman would come back to the subject in the course of his lengthy remarks.

Mr. CANNON: When the Minister of Railways spoke a moment ago his main argument was that ships are necessary to run our Canadian railways and that he wishes to have shipping lines as well as railway lines to compete with the Canadian Pacific. The policy of the Government, and especially the policy of the Minister of Railways, is in flagrant contradiction to the argument brought forward by him to-night

in the House of Commons at least as far as the city of Quebec is concerned. Establishing lines of railways to compete with the Canadian Pacific. As I said, from Montreal to Quebec, it takes twelve hours on the Canadian Northern while it takes five on the Canadian Pacific. Not only that but the Canadian Northern line in the city of Quebec does not even touch the waterfront. It may be that our railway expert, the minister, wishes to complete his magnificent scheme for the development of Canada by introducing a third branch into his department, that of aeroplanes, but unless aeroplanes were introduced in the city of Quebec my hon. friend, coming in his private car, would not be able to reach the waterfront on this line. Quebec has been badly treated by this Government. Has Quebec been badly treated on account of her attitude towards this Government? I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. My hon. friend must remember that we are not here to discuss the treatment given to the city of Quebec by the present Government. We are discussing the shipbuilding programme of the Government. He must, according to the rule, remain strictly within the item of discussion.

Mr. CANNON: Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to discuss how badly Quebec has been treated but I wish to underline the remarks made by the minister as to the magnificent treatment given to Quebec by the Government. Now a shipping policy is being considered. What will the Government do for the city of Quebec as regards shipping? Can we expect more in the future than we have had in the past? As I have said many times in this House we have lots of confidence in the management of shipping under the very able direction of the Minister of Marine. He does not claim that he is a marine expert as my hon. friend (Mr. J. D. Reid) claims to be a railway expert. The Minister of Marine is modest. He has not like the Minister of Railways been a minister for years. He has not yet forgotten his modesty. He has not, perhaps, ceased long enough to be a Liberal and has not become like the Minister of Railways a thorough Tory, and here let me say that I never met a thorough Tory who was modest, either in his person or in his demands.

I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Railways to one last point, and I hope that in doing so I will be in order. I do not think that he is much better acquainted with the Canadian Northern railway crowd than the Minister of Marine. The latter is starting a new experiment. I would ask the Minister of Railways to be charitable enough to give pointers and information to our less informed Minister of Marine. The Minister of Railways has dealt with Mackenzie and Mann for over six years. He knows Mr. Hanna, he knows Sir Donald Mann, and he knows Sir William Mackenzie—in fact, I think he knows every prominent man in that crowd; the Minister of Marine does not. I will therefore ask the Minister of Railways to keep his own friends with him and not let that gang enter the office of the Minister of Marine. Unfortunately the Minister of Railways told us that the Government had decided that in Canada's new policy it was imperative for the same men to run the trains as to run the ships. I say that this should not be. It is bad enough to have the old men of the Canadian Northern whom the Minister of Railways knows so well, bad enough to have them again in harness running our Canadian railways to ruin, but this Government should see that the ships are protected from their clutches. Those ships were most unfortunate last fall. One was stranded at the very spot where the Minister of Railways, after strenuous days of work, goes to take his rest fishing salmon, at the opening of the Saguenay river. There she lies, one of the first ships built by Canada, affording a very sad spectacle. Another ship went further down the river and got caught in the ice, and she was experimenting to show the rest of the world that winter navigation was an easy task. A third ship disappeared on the coast of Nova Scotia, doubtless not having received instruction and advice from my hon. friend from Cape Breton South and Richmond (Mr. Butts). This has been a poor start. The Minister of Marine ought now to change his policy and take control of matters into his own hands. For those hands are very competent, the reputation that the Minister of Marine has left in connection with the Harbour Commission of Montreal is one of the best. Therefore he should take over the control of matters himself instead of having Mackenzie and Mann strand our ships after having wrecked railroads.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I wish to say a word or two in reference to the port of Quebec. I concur almost altogether in what the hon. members from that famous city have said, with the exception of the statement of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, which was if I understood him correctly, that no grain had recently passed through the grain elevators at that port. Very large quantities of grain have passed through the elevators there. I am

not a pessimist as far as the port of Quebec is concerned. It is one of the best equipped ports in the North American continent; and now that the National Transcontinental railway is in running order not only the preseent government-owned ships but the larger ships that I hope will shortly be on the St. Lawrence route will make Quebec their terminus. I look forward to the port of Quebec doing a very much larger business than it has ever done in its past history for it is one of Canada's national ports and will be treated as such. There is no warmer advocate of the further development of trade through the port of Quebec than I am; and I can assure hon. gentlemen personally, and also on behalf of the Government, that every thing will be done not only to make the port of Quebec what its parliamentary representatives quite properly desire it to be, but what the situation of Quebec and the facilities which it possesses should render it—a port doing fifty or one hundred times more business than it is doing at the present time. I for one am satisfied that more freight is going to pass through Quebec and more ships are going to stop there. Naturally, owing to the existing depth of water large ships stop there at present and the larger vessels that are to come will also do so. I hope that a year from now, if we are spared, I will be able to show hon. gentlemen that the business of the port of Quebec has grown and has exceeded in volume anything it has ever done in the past.

Mr. BUREAU: Where does Three Rivers come in?

Mr. DUFF: We are all pleased with the speech which the Minister of Railways gave us this evening, although I do not know whether I should apologize for bringing him in, or thank him for coming. The minister may know a great deal about railways but he has certainly shown by his speech tonight that he knows nothing about shipping; and when any member of the Government tells this committee that we cannot run railways without ships I think he had better go away back and sit down, and learn. If the operation of ships and railways is to form part of the Government's policy why should the Government not operate farms also? Why should it not go into the West, cultivate a couple of million acres, and produce stuff for this great railway that he talks about to carry to the seaboard to be there placed on steamships and transported across the ocean? The minister rather insinuated, if I might be allowed to use the expression, that if the Canadian Mercantile Marine was not built and operated so as to convey across the ocean the products to be carried by the Canadian National railways from the West the Canadian Pacific railway would gobble up the business. Of course, that is the old game,—trying to make out that we are in favour of the Canadian Pacific and against the nationalization or public ownership of railways. But that argument does not go very far, because it will be a long time before the tramp steamers that the Government are building will compete with the steamers of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. It is useless for the minister to draw a comparison between the Canadian Pacific steamers which carry goods brought from the West to Montreal and St. John on the Canadian Pacific railway and the Canadian Government steamers which take goods from Montreal, Quebec, St. John, or Halifax, because the two classes of steamers are quite different. The buyer in Liverpool or in London knows exactly when the Canadian Pacific steamers will arrive, but the tramp steamers cannot operate on any specific schedule; consequently the shippers will not send on the tramp steamers the same class of goods that they will send on steamers that carry both passengers and freight.

The Minister of Railways knows so much about shipping that he has told us that through the construction and operation of these ships a great deal of business had been opened up between Canada and South America and the West Indies. But that is not the case, because this business was opened up long before the Canadian Government built and operated these ships, and although I am not a prophet or the son of a prophet, I venture the assertion that that trade will be there when within five years from now the Canadian Government ships are scrapped and sold as old junk.

But what aroused the anger of the Minister of Railways was my simple question whether the business profits' tax would be paid by the company operating these steamers. The minister rather sidestepped the question by saying, in the first place, that these steamers had not been operated for a year. Of course, I have to take the minister's word, but my memory is fairly good, and I think he will not deny that some of these vessels have been operating for nearly two years. Now is the time when every business man must file a statement with the Inspector of Taxation concerning his business profits. What I want to know is whether this marine company is filing a statement similar to that which

every private shipbuilding company has to file. Just here I would like the Minister of Marine to answer two questions that I put to him this afternoon. First, how much of the $1,400,000 which he says was the profit in connection with the operation of nineteen ships, was placed to rest account for depreciation?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I explained this afternoon that the profit statement had been arrived at after providing for depreciation, interest on the cost of the ship, insurance, overhead charges and operating expenses. The amount allowed for depreciation is, I understand, five per cent. The hon. member will agree that that is a fair amount to allow for depreciation on a new ship. I repeat the statement I made this afternoon that none of these nineteen ships have been in commission a year. Some of them have made only one voyage; others have made only two.

Mr. DUFF: Then, there was the question of sterling exchange. With regard to the difference between the cost of vessels here and the cost in England, was sterling exchange figured on the basis of $4.86, or at the current rate?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: At $4.86.

Mr. DUFF: Then the minister did not give the House proper information this afternoon when he made a comparison between the cost of vessels in Canada and the cost of vessels in England, because everybody knows that six months ago English sterling was quoted at only $3.60.

Mr. CHAPLIN: He would have to make a new estimate every week.

Mr. DUFF: I thank my hon. friend for that suggestion. But the price per ton should be figured either at the average rate or at the highest rate, whichever the minister likes. It was not fair to make a comparison based on a rate of $4.86 for the pound sterling.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It really does not make very much difference, because during the past two years the cost of some types of ships has been about the same in the yards of the United Kingdom as in the Canadian yards. The point I tried to make was that during the past two years ships could be built as cheaply in the yards of Canada as in the yards of the United Kingdom.

Mr. DUFF: That does not alter the fact that if a man wanted to buy a ship in the British Isles he would pay for it at the prevailing rate of exchange; consequently, as I say, it was not fair for the minister to base his comparison upon a rate of $4.86 for the pound sterling.

The minister has kindly told me that the amount put to rest account for depreciation on these ships is five per cent. For the sake of argument we will say that that is a fair amount, but these ships are new, and during the first year new ships require hardly any repairs. The minister will find out before he is a manager of ships very long —I beg his pardon; he transfers them to his friend the Minister of Railways—the Minister of Railways will find out that five per cent will not go far for depreciation.

It has been stated that nineteen ships earned $1,400,000; that is about $73,000 per ship. Well, the Minister of Marine has no occasion to congratulate himself upon a vessel of 4,000 or 5,000 tons earning only $73,000. That is a mere bagatelle, and the only reason why they earned that is because of the present abnormal conditions—conditions which will not be prevailing in the years to come. If they could earn only $73,000 with freight rates as they are to-day, they will earn practically nothing when the freight rates are reduced. Then, from the $73,000 has not been deducted the business profits tax which the ordinary shipbuilding company has to pay. Next year the net profit will be reduced a good deal by the payment of this tax.

I am opposed to the Government operation of ships, because it is not fair to private companies or private interests. It will discourage the building of ships by private interests. There is no reason why the Government should enter upon a shipbuilding programme now that the war is over. The minister says that if they have not the ships he cannot carry his goods after they arrive at the seaboard. Well, how many railways in the United States have steamship lines? Perhaps one or two, but most of them have no steamships; they go out in the open market and make arrangements for the carrying of their freight, and that is what this Government could do. It is not necessary that the Minister of Railways should have ships to carry the freight which comes over his line from Winnipeg or other western points to ports on the Atlantic ocean. Moreover, in the next year or two when freight rates reach a normal figure, the Minister of Marine and the Minister of Railways and the Government will find that instead of making $73,000, they will lose that much and a lot more. In addition to that, the property is decreas-

ing in value and it will cost a great deal more to keep it in repair. The Government, therefore, will find that instead of having a bonanza as they think they have, they will have a white elephant on their hands.

Mr. COPP: If the Minister of Marine sent a hurried message out to have his colleague the Minister of Railways come in and help him through with this item, I am afraid he made a mistake in doing so, because the Minister of Railways has put before the Committee arguments that must be answered. I suppose the Minister of Railways was hurriedly aroused from his after-dinner rest and came into the House somewhat excited, and he possibly went a little further than he would otherwise have gone. But he having gone so far, we must find out just what this means, and we are getting some information, even if we are getting it piecemeal and through somebody getting rather excited and saying things that possibly he would not otherwise have said. The Minister of Railways says to-night that we must continue in this shipbuilding programme because we cannot successfully operate 22,000 miles of railway unless we have nineteen ships to help us do so. When I asked him if the 22,000 miles of railway included the Grand Trunk Railway system that was to be taken over under the Act which was passed at the last session of Parliament and under an agreement that has already been entered into between the Government of Canada and the Grand Trunk Railway Company, he said it did. Then, this only loads up that system with $75,000,000 over and above the $700,000,000 or $800,000,000 of a burden which the people of Canada were obliged to shoulder under the legislation passed last session. My hon. friend says that he as Minister of Railways is going to see to it that not one pound of freight that is brought from the West down to the city of Montreal is going to find an outlet through any other ports than our own Canadian ports. How does he get past the statement which he has made many times in this House, namely, that he as Minister of Railways or the Government has nothing whatever to do now with the operation of the Canadian National railways; that that system is in the hands of a Board of Management, and the Government is absolutely cut clear and loose from any interference with the operation of that railway? That is what we were told last year. I want to ask the minister this question. When that load of wheat that he, with his fertile imagination, loaded up in the great West a few moments ago, is brought down over the Canadian National railways to the city of Montreal, if Mr. Hanna, or the Board of Management that has charge of the Canadian National railways, gives an order to take that load to Portland, will my hon. friend interfere and have it sent down to St. John or Halifax to be shipped from there? Can my hon. friend do that under the arrangement he has to-day with this Board of Management of the Canadian National railways?

So much for what the Minister of Railways has said. I want to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne) a question. I believe he said that there were seventeen different shipbuilding plants in the Dominion of Canada with which he had entered into arrangements for the building of vessels. I want to ask him if the Government have in any way assisted in the construction of these plants for the different companies who are building these ships.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: In no way whatever.

Mr. COPP: I want to draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that we have from the Minister of Marine this afternoon and evening the information that he has given contracts for the building of 63 vessels of different tonnage and types to seventeen different companies. I want to protest in the strongest manner possible that it is not reasonable to expect that we shall get the best possible solution of the difficulties that arise in giving out contracts by one man being able to go to seventeen different contracting firms in the Dominion of Canada and say to them: I want you to build me so many vessels. I give my hon. friend all credit for doing the very best he can and getting the best prices he can from these firms. But it is not natural for water to run up hill; and it is not natural and not a proper business method for my hon. friend to go to the different shipbuilding firms in the Dominion and ask them what they will build a vessel for. The only safe and reasonable way to carry out the construction of these vessels for which we are to-night asking the people of Canada to shoulder a burden of $20,000,000, is for tenders to be called for, and then company "A" does not know what company "B" is going to tender, and company "B" does not know what company "C" is going to tender, and so on down all the line of the seventeen different companies. Instead of that,

contracts are being entered into behind closed doors without the people of Canada having any opportunity of expressing an opinion, without any tenders having been asked, without any person but the seventeen different companies knowing that any such contracts were to be let. My hon. friend lets these contracts; he comes back to the Cabinet Council and he makes a recommendation that a certain contract be let to a certain individual company, and an Order in Council is passed. That is all the people of Canada have to say about this expenditure of $75,000,000 for the purpose of building ships without which the Minister of Railways says he cannot successfully operate 22,000 miles of railway, part of which is a bankrupt railway that he is taking out of the hands of individuals and companies in which some of our friends in different parts of the Dominion of Canada are deeply interested.

Mr. POWER: I was rather sorry to ascertain a few moments ago that the control of Canada's Merchant Marine is vested almost entirely in the Minister of Public Works, the Minister of Railways, whom we now find out to be a naval expert, and Minister of Shipping. He reminds me of the old poem of, I think, Thomas Hood, who referred to a person as—

> A bo'sun tight, and a midshipmite,
> And the crew of the captain's gig.

It appears to me that the Minister of Railways will about fill that description. I said I was sorry that the Minister of Railways is in charge of the Canadian Merchant Marine, because the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has shown a certain amount of sympathy with the people of the constituency I represent and with the people of the province of Quebec. He has also shown a considerable knowledge of his subject. I am sorry I am not enough a seafaring man to say that the Minister of Railways and Canals has not shown a knowledge of the subject, but he has been far from convincing hon. members on this side of the House that he has shown such a knowledge. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has shown us that he takes a sympathetic interest in the district of Quebec. He has told us something that I am sure none of the members from the Quebec district knew; in fact, I am almost positive that nobody in the province of Quebec knew that the city of Quebec was to be the terminus for the ships of this fleet, and I shall take the first opportunity of informing my electors that this decision has been arrived at. A somewhat different point of view is taken by the Minister of Railways and Canals, who in spite of protests and requests and demands by various public bodies in the city of Quebec, has for the past few years invariably refused to assist the port of Quebec by giving us a reasonable rate on grain from the West. Some years ago he gave a through rate from Armstrong to Quebec which permitted the Transcontinental, now the Canadian National railway, to compete with the Canadian Pacific and other railways. This rate was put into effect for a certain season, and the result was that large quantities of grain were shipped from the port of Quebec. I have repeatedly asked the minister to endeavour to put this rate into effect once more, but on every occasion he has told me that it was no longer possible. I ask him again now. He knows as well as I and most hon. members of this House know, that fully 75 per cent of Canadian grain is now being shipped through American ports, and I think the largest percentage of it goes through New York. Now that he has this 22,000 miles of railway, now that he has, in spite of his assertion, a summer terminus in the city of Quebec and a winter terminus in Halifax, I would suggest to him that he use the national railway to ship Western grain through Canadian ports on these ships. We certainly do not want our mercantile marine to go to American ports. Let the minister use the national railway to carry the grain and, if necessary, make a slightly better rate in order to fill Canadian ships with Canadian cargo, and let the greater portion of the products of the West be shipped from Canadian ports in Canadian vessels. I think if my hon. friend (Mr. Reid), in his capacity of Minister of Marine would sit down with himself in his capacity of Minister of Railways and co-ordinate his efforts—that of his right hand as Minister of Marine with that of his left hand as Minister of Railways—he might be able to come to the conclusion that he could work both hands together, and if he did, I have no doubt it would be for the benefit of the country. I am merely suggesting this as a bit of advice, knowing that probably the minister will take it as a piece of impertinence for me to advise such a technical marine expert as himself; but at the same time I should like him to look into the matter very carefully, and if in following up his avowed policy of helping Canadian railroads by encouraging a Canadian Mercantile Marine he finds it at all possible to listen to my suggestion, let

not his prejudice, legitimate prejudices perhaps, against the city and port of Quebec carry him away to such an extent that he will not put into practise his more practical views, let not his reason be overwhelmed by what might be termed his political emotions.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Before this item carries, I think we should have some declaration from the minister or the Government as to what their policy is going to be in awarding future contracts—whether public tenders will or will not be called for. I think if one wished to raise a point of order in regard to this particular expenditure, the point might be well taken. I have in my hand the Revised Statutes of Canada 1906, Vol. I, and I see that section 36, Part II, General of Chapter 39, an Act respecting the Public Works of Canada, provides:

> Whenever any works are to be executed under the direction of any department of the Government, the minister having charge of such department shall invite tenders by public advertisement for the execution of such works, except in cases—
>
> (a) of pressing emergency in which delay would be injurious to the public interest; or
>
> (b) in which from the nature of the work it can be more expeditiously and economically executed by the officers and servants of the department; or
>
> (c) where the estimated cost of the work is less than five thousand dollars and it appears to the minister, in view of the nature of the work, that it is not advisable to invite tenders.

These contracts are for the most part for amounts between half a million dollars and over two million dollars, and on a total expenditure running up to $72,000,000 the Government has not invited a single tender, according to the minister's own statement. There is no pressing emergency at the present time, and unless it were for the statement which the minister has made this evening, that all these contracts have been already awarded, I do not think that we would have any right to permit this item to pass without the announcement that tenders are to be called for. The accepted practice of all governments of this country for some years past has been, I think, to safeguard public expenditure in the awarding of contracts by inviting public tenders. I know that during the period of the war the Government for reasons of urgency and emergency departed widely from this practice, but that is only a reason why, now the war is over, we should return to it in the public interest. I should like the minister to make some statement to the House as to whether what he is asking us to do at the present time is to be taken as an indication of the line he intends to pursue in the future, or whether he regards the present action of the Government as something relating to the war period, which he would like to have excused on that ground. I think we ought to have a statement from the minister as to the policy of the Government in inviting tenders before awarding public contracts.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am sure my hon. friend is aware that public tenders are as a rule called for, and quite properly so, but we could not follow that policy in ordering ships. For argument's sake, suppose I had called for public tenders for six ships of 8,400 tons. Suppose that the Vickers Company, of Montreal, and five or six other shipbuilders had tendered, and that the Davie Shipbuilding Company, of Lauzon, which has not the facilities for turning out that number of ships except after a very long time, were the lowest tenderers. The Government would have no option but to award them the contract. We would not be able to distribute the orders. I quite understand the point of the leader of the Opposition, and that is, the desirability of safeguarding the public interest. The statute from which he has quoted makes it plain that the minister has power to use his best judgment, and the Government to purchase by the best means what it requires. I do not know of any method that would so well safeguard the public interest as the course we have followed. I believe we got lower prices than we should have obtained by public tender. When the Government asked for prices on ships, as I have already twice stated to-day, they did not necessarily take the prices that were quoted. If a price was considered satisfactory it was accepted and if it was too high it was of course refused. By the method we followed we were in a position to distribute the business evenly over seventeen yards at a cost probably lower than if we had called for public tenders in the way suggested by the leader of the Opposition. It must be borne in mind also that time is an important feature of the programme, and we could not allow one yard to take more business than it was capable of turning out. Some yards have two berths, some four and some six, and all these facts have to be taken into consideration in allotting the work. It was desirable to distribute the contracts in such a way that labour would not be concentrated in one particular place, but that workers would be evenly employed throughout the seventeen yards from Halifax to Prince Rupert. I have already said that the Government are at an end of their steel

programme, and if I thought that the suggestion of the leader of the Opposition, whose opinion I regard very highly, was of any practical importance I would gladly recommend it to the Government. But from the business experience that I have gained during the last thirty or thirty-five years, I am bound to say that I think the Government have followed the best possible course.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: With all deference to the minister, I would point out that what I quote from the statute is part of the law of the land.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It gives the minister an option.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There may be reasons of expediency of one kind or another why it should be advisable to allow the minister to distribute work from the Atlantic to the Pacific and allot it to different shipyards; but this Parliament has certainly laid it down in black and white that, in the matter of public contracts, where the amount exceeds $5,000 there shall be no option on the part of the minister. The minister says that the statute gives him the right to do as he thinks best. Let me once again quote the section:

> Whenever any works are to be executed under the direction of any department of the Government, the minister having charge of such department shall invite tenders by public advertisement for the execution of such works.

That is the law. There are certain exceptions. The minister referred to subsection three, which provides that where the estimated cost of the work is less than $5,000 and it appears to the minister, in view of the nature of the work, that it is not advisable to invite tenders—

Mr. BALLANTYNE: That is it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The minister says "That is it." He will note, however, that this sub-section applies only to works under $5,000. But the contracts under consideration vary in amounts from half a million to two million dollars apiece. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) is in his place and I am quite prepared to leave it to him to say as to whether or not my interpretation of the statute is not literally correct, namely, that the law provides that where a contract is of an amount over $5,000 there shall not be, except under certain specified circumstances, any option to the minister to distribute the work as he likes. He is obliged to call for tenders by public advertisement.

Mr. EDWARDS: Are there not two qualifying subsections?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes; first, subsection "A" which provides against any pressing emergency in which delay would be injurious to the public interest. When speaking before, I pointed out that possibly these contracts were awarded in war-time, when there was a pressing emergency.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Most of them.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The minister, however, is inclined to base his right in the matter on a section which, I am afraid, gives him no ground whatever to stand on.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Most of these contracts were entered into under the War Measures Act, but even if they were not made under that Act, and putting aside altogether the legal aspect of the argument, I think that any business man in this House will agree with me that it would be unwise to attempt to order ships under public tender by reason of the wide distribution of the yards. Some of these yards are large and some small, and it was the desire of the Government not only to get the ships as quickly as possible but to have the labour distributed evenly throughout the country.

Mr. EDWARDS: Will the leader of the Opposition be good enough to read section "B."?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I will read the entire clause:

> Whenever any works are to be executed under the direction of any department of the Government, the minister having charge of such department shall invite tenders by public advertisement for the execution of such works, except in cases
>
> (a) of pressing emergency in which delay would be injurious to the public interest; or
>
> (b) in which, from the nature of the work, it can be more expeditiously and economically executed by officers and servants of the department; or
>
> (c) where the estimated cost of the work is less than $5,000, and it appears to the minister, in view of the nature of the work, that it is not advisable to invite tenders.

I contend that a point of order could be raised in this connection, and would be sustained if it were raised. I do not raise it, however, because I have no wish in any way to delay the programme that the Government has under way. I believe it was started in a period of war. These contracts have already been awarded, and to raise a point at this stage would only be to delay the final execution of the work. But I do say that we should have from the Government, before allowing this item to pass, a declaration as to future contracts. The ground the minister has taken at present I do not think we can permit to stand for a

moment, because it would mean that in the future he would feel at liberty to award contracts as he pleased regardless of the law of the land. There are two courses open to the minister. He can either get the law changed; or, if it is to remain as it is, obey it; it is part of the obligation of every hon. member of the House to uphold the law as it stands.

Mr. DOHERTY: I think it is quite clear that without getting outside of the terms of the law, what was done was perfectly justifiable. What was pressing to get done was precisely to get the whole shipbuilding capacity of this country at work, and this end could not be attained if you called for tenders and proceeded to allot the work to the lowest tenderer. It was probably as important to get the shipyards all to work, as it was to get the ships themselves.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Is the minister speaking in reference to the war period?

Mr. DOHERTY: What is being done now is merely completing what was started during the war. As to a declaration of future action, there is no doubt that the Government intends that, when the exceptional circumstances that prevail in the present instance do not apply, they will be governed by the law as it stands, so long as that law remains on the statute book. But I think that a moment's reflection will show that the condition here comes very well within the first clause which gives the minister an option in cases of pressing necessity. It must be quite clear that if we gave all the work to the lowest tenderer we would experience considerable delay in getting the ships; and superadded to this fact, there was the desirability, apart altogether from the necessity for the ships, of providing work for the entire shipbuilding facilities of Canada. When you say that you should call for tenders from all the shipbuilding plants of Canada, in the nature of things you could not do this particular thing in that particular way. You could not get the result. You could not get the ships which we were pressing to get promptly and as early as possible. If you called for tenders, gave the contracts to the lowest tenderers and waited until the lowest tenderers could get the ships finished you would be waiting still.

Mr. W. C. KENNEDY: I listened with a great deal of interest to the explanation given by the hon. the Minister of Marine (Mr. Ballantyne) as to why he did not ask for tenders, and I was not convinced by what he told us. From a purely business standpoint it was proper to advertise. We do not expect one shipyard is going to build all the ships required by the country, but surely the hon. gentleman could ask for tenders and limit the time that any one tenderer might have to build a ship. The practice of allowing a minister or a Government to spend $75,000,000 of the people's money by arrangement with shipbuilding companies and deciding how these contracts shall be distributed from Halifax to Vancouver is wrong. It is not in the interest of the people that this should be done and it is not the proper way to carry on public business. I listened very attentively to the minister this afternoon and I regret very much that we did not have the pleasure of hearing his answer to the question put by my hon. friend from Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) this evening. My hon. friend asked: Where is the $20,000,000 to come from? He was ruled out of order by the Chairman on the ground that this is not a matter to be taken up at this time. It seems to me that it is good business to find out before you arrange to spend your money where it is coming from. I think that is what the people want to know. I believe the statement by the hon. gentleman showed that we were making money out of the steamship business but I think he will agree with me that conditions are abnormal. He cannot expect that freights will continue where they are to-day. He knows, and nobody knows better than he, that it is only a matter of a short time until freights will decrease in volume; there will not be so many cargoes to carry, some of the ships will probably have difficulty in securing business, and we will consequently operate at a loss.

I notice that there have been a great many recommendations in the press recently as to the desirability of establishing a shipbuilding business in Canada. When I read these articles in the newspapers I sometimes wonder where they emanate from, and I am not quite sure that this insistent demand that the Government shall keep on shipbuilding does not emanate from the gentlemen who are profiting out of it I am not quite sure that they are not behind the movement to create a public sentiment in support of shipbuilding. Might I suggest to my hon. friend that those people who have made so much money out of building ships when the war was on should continue the business without asking the Government to guarantee their profit now the war is over. What they are doing is what the railway builders did in the past. Contractors built railways, made their profit, but when the profits

dwindled and deficits occurred they handed these railways over to the Government and put the burden on the shoulders of the people. These people who are in the shipbuilding business have been making their profits and they desire to continue making profits but they want to hand the business of operating over to the people so that the people will pay the deficit on operations.

The important question in connection with this matter is, I repeat, that which was asked by my hon. friend from Pontiac. It is true that the question should be discussed on the Budget but I believe that the Minister of Finance will have enough to do to handle the finances of this country without putting the people into a business that is going to lose them money. It is not good business and the people insist that this Government should carry on their affairs with reasonable business caution. It is not good business to ask the people to invest $20,000,000 when we are told that the shipbuilding business will have to be subsidized. The hon. the Minister of Marine would not put his own money into a prospect if he thought that it would be unsuccessful with a possible loss within a few years; and if that is the case why should he put the money of the people into this enterprise now? I listened to his remarks with reference to the cost and I was very much impressed with his statement that we were building ships at a reasonable price in Canada to-day. We were told that we were building ships at approximately $160 per deadweight ton. But the hon. gentleman knows full well that we will have to compete in a short time with ships that were built in pre-war days at from $60 to $70 a ton. There is only one way to meet that competition and that is to take the loss because lower freights will get the business. As against what we are doing here, the United States Government are selling their ships and I am told that they are so anxious to get out of the business that they are willing to sell them at $100 a ton. At the very time that they are willing to take a loss and go out of the business we are going into the business, putting $20,000,000 more of the people's money into it and, then we are told that we will have to subsidize it very shortly. On top of that we are told that $75,000,000 of the people's money is spent without a single tender being asked for. It is all right for hon. gentlemen to spend their own money if they want to, but they

11 p.m.

are the trustees of the public and they have no right to spend the people's money without giving the people the protection of public tenders and full knowledge as to whom these contracts have been awarded and why.

There is also the question of where these ships are going and what freights they are to carry. The hon. gentleman told us to-day that one of these steamers had left Vancouver for Australia. He did not tell us what she was bringing back from Australia. I think we know pretty well just what they export from Australia. They export wool, hides, wheat and tallow. They will not bring that kind of a cargo back to Canada. They will probably go to England and from England they will get a cargo to bring back here. There is no objection to that; if we are in the carrying trade that is good business. But why should we spend our money to establish and operate a line to build up business between Australia and England? It is not good business. We were also told that these ships would carry cargoes to South America. What do they carry from South America?—cattle, grain and hides. These they take to the English market. This is all right for Great Britain, a great food-consuming country. They send out their finished products, bring back raw materials and get cargoes both ways. We do not want any wheat in this country, we are not looking for cattle, we are not asking for mutton; and yet these are the things that are being carried from Australia and the Argentine to England. The conditions in Canada do not parallel those of Great Britain, consequently there is not the same possibility of a mercantile marine being a financial success. These, amongst others, are the reasons why I am opposed to this vote and I shall oppose it here and shall also oppose it when we come to its consideration in the Budget.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think we ought to clear up this point in regard to future contracts. I am sorry that the Prime Minister, or the Acting Prime Minister, is not here to speak but possibly the Minister of Justice could make a statement on behalf of the Government as to whether in regard to future contracts the Government will adopt the policy of calling for tenders as required by statute.

Mr. DOHERTY: The Government contemplates in future abiding by the provisions of the law as it understands it has abided by the provisions of the law in the past. If the circumstances which seem to have existed in this case, and which made it necessary and justifiable under the provisions of the statute to take the course we

did, arise again, I am not in a position to say that the same thing would not be done. But the Government, as I understand, will apply and conform to the general rule of the law save where the circumstances set forth in the law as justifying an exception shall arise.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Would the minister say whether he thinks that this particular expenditure would be justified under the exception with reference to inviting tenders provided for by subsection (c) which says:

> Where the estimated cost of a work is less than $5,000 and it appears to the minister, in view of the nature of the work, that it is not advisable to invite tenders.

Mr. DOHERTY: I am not prepared to say the cost of the work should be under $5,000. The first subsection, if I remember correctly, does amply cover the particular case here where there was the necessity of getting ships in the shortest possible time.

Mr. KING: The Minister of Justice takes a view quite different from the view of the Minister of Marine as to his rights under this particular section.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: If the leader of the Opposition will allow me. My view is exactly the same as that of my colleague; you have got to take all the sections together.

Mr. EDWARDS: I do not know whether as a layman I am not justified in putting forward my view here where so many lawyers are talking. It strikes me that the law as quoted by the leader of the Opposition covers this case exactly although not in section C nor perhaps in section A. If I understood the Minister of Marine correctly he gave us to understand that these vessels were more expeditiously and economically constructed under the plan adopted by the Government than they could have been under any other plan. If I am correctly repeating what I understand the minister to say then you have the reason given in section B.

Mr. KING: No.

Mr. EDWARDS: I think so.

Mr. KING: My hon. friend has not observed that section (B) states "more economically or expeditiously executed by officers of the department." This work has been done by shipbuilding companies. I will read my hon. friend the section so that he will see the point for himself:

> in which from the nature of the work it can be more expeditiously and economically executed by the officers and servants of the department.

I think that answers my hon. friend's point. This work has not been done by officers of the department, it has been done by contractors.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. McMASTER: This item should certainly not carry—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. McMASTER: —and the more so in view of the refusal of the members of this Government to accede to the most reasonable suggestion of the leader of the Opposition that in future they would interpret the law as demanding that in connection with the proposed expenditure of $20,000,000 of the people's money the law should be applied as in ordinary cases. The war is over and it is of paramount necessity that the Government of Canada should realize it. They were given during the war very wide powers. Let me tell them, with all respect, that the people of Canada, and His Majesty's loyal Opposition as representing a large proportion of those people, do not propose that they should be allowed to carry on as they were allowed to do during the war. The law is absolutely plain. The Minister of Justice nods his head with confirmatory action. I am, Mr. Chairman, specially qualified to speak upon this question because when a law student I sat not at the feet of Gamaliel but at the feet of the Minister of Justice. Now let me read section 36:

> Whenever any works are to be executed under the direction of any department of the Government, the minister having charge of such department shall invite tenders by public advertisement for the execution of such works—

That is the general principle. Here are the three exceptions:

> Except in cases—
> (a) of pressing emergency in which delay would be injurious to the public interest.

Now the war being over how can any one pretend that there is a pressing emergency which would enable the Government of this country to over-ride the principle of the law. There is no such pressing emergency.

Mr. EDWARDS: How do you know? You have got to back that up with more than your statement. Your statement is not sufficient.

Mr. McMASTER: For this reason: We and the United States are the two great

nations of this continent. Our economic life, our industrial development, and our trade relationships with the rest of the world are very much on a parity. The United States instead of going ahead with their shipbuilding programme are selling the ships which they built during the war. That is one good reason. Now a "pressing emergency" is one in which delay would be injurious to the public interest—not to private interest—not to the interest of one yard as opposed to another yard but to the interest of the whole public of Canada. I do not believe that any member who supports this Government, if he were talking to me quietly outside of the House, would contend that there was any such pressing emergency at this time requiring the immediate construction of ships in this country and that this protection of the public interest—this protection to safe and sound and honest business—should be disregarded. Now what is the next exception?

Mr. EDWARDS: May I ask my hon. friend a question?

Mr. McMASTER: I would be delighted.

Mr. EDWARDS: That may be. Is it not true that after an agreement was entered into by which wheat and flour passed freely between Canada and the United States, the latter country saw fit to place an embargo on Canadian wheat going into that country? That is true, I think I am stating the facts correctly. I think one reason why the United States did that was because they wanted to make sure that they could secure the necessary ships to get their own wheat out of the country, and so they prevented Canadian wheat entering the United States, and going to their own ports and probably taking up the shipping space that would be required to ship their own wheat. If that is true I do not think we should be placed in the position of depending upon the United States or any other country for ships; we ought to have ships to transport our own goods. There you see the public interest, and not a private interest. It is the interest of all those who have goods to ship.

Mr. McMASTER: In answer to what has been rather a "shorter catechism" than a question by the hon. gentleman, I would say that you cannot regard a condition as a pressing emergency when there is a very serious difference of opinion in the country as to whether the Government's programme is a wise or unwise one. The words "pressing emergency" must mean an emergency which is so pressing that there can be no practical difference of opinion among the people of the country as to the necessity. For instance, when war breaks out, if it is necesary to build a ship or construct a bridge—

Mr. PARENT: Or repair a wharf.

Mr. McMASTER—or repair a wharf, something of that kind, the minister in charge would be able to do it. There you would have a presing emergency; we can all imagine many instances of that kind. But here is the continuation of a shipbuilding programme which has been going on for several years and which I cannot regard as being a "pressing emergency" in any way, shape or manner. The second exception to the general rule to which I invite attention is:

> (b) in which from the nature of the work it can be more expeditiously and economically executed by the officers and servants of the department.

That exception does not apply. The third exception is:

> Where the estimated cost of the work is less than $5,000 and it appears to the minister in view of the nature of the work that it is not advisable to invite tenders.

In order to come within this third exception the estimated cost of the work must be less than $5,000 and it must be the opinion of the minister that it would not be wise to ask for tenders. Certainly these exceptions do not apply; therefore the only ground that the minister has to stand on is the view that a pressing emergency exists and that to fail to act as he proposes would be injurious to the public interest. Now, believing sincerely that this policy is a mistake and that the Government is not a proper agency for the operation of tramp steamers, I think that the public interest would be better served by the abandonment of the scheme. But certainly there is no such emergency as would take this matter out of the plain principle of the law, a principle which every man administering the money of others must desire to adhere to, namely, that he shall openly ask for tenders for anything that he has to buy or any work that he wishes to be performed in order that he may be able to say to those whose money he is administering: If it costs more than you thought it should cost, the fault is not mine: I gave full notice to every one and that is the lowest price at which after public tender and public advertisement I could get the work done. I ask the Government to fall in with my

views in this matter, which I believe, are correct.

I should like to say a word concerning an argument advanced by the Minister of Railways. The minister was in the somewhat unfortunate position of one who comes into a debate after it has proceeded for some time and attempts to answer arguments which he has not heard. His view was that we needed Government-owned ships in order that we might round out and complete our national system of railways. Well, I do not think that is necessary. I believe that men controlling the vast amount of traffic which the Canadian National railways will control will be able to make proper traffic arrangements with steamship lines. But even a stronger argument in reply to that of the Minister of Railways is that the ships which the Minister of Marine proposes to build are not liners fit to co-operate with the great system of national railways and act as a link in a great transportation scheme which would take the products of Canada from British Columbia over to the Orient and from Nova Scotia, Quebec and New Brunswick across the Atlantic to Great Britain and Europe. What the minister proposes to build is a number of tramp steamers which cannot attain that success which the skill and initiative of private ownership and private control can alone assure.

Mr. PARENT: How much of the $40,000,000 voted last year has been spent in the construction of the twenty-five steamers now operated by the Canadian National Railway system?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The amount spent up to date is $24,000,000.

Mr. PARENT: On March 11, 1920, the following questions which I had previously put to the Minister of Railways were answered:

1. Has the Canadian National Railway at the present time twenty-four or any number of vessels plying in various routes?
2. If so, how and on what terms or conditions have said vessels been acquired by said Canadian National Railway, and what is the name of each steamer?
3. Who is the present owner of each of said steamers or vessels?
4. What is the tonnage of each?
5. What port or ports is each one of them plying between?

The answers given by the minister were as follows:

1. Yes.—25.
2. Vessels are being operated as provided for by Order in Council passed June 2, 1919.

[Mr. McMaster.]

In passing, I may remark that a reference to an Order in Council which had not been made public is hardly an answer to the question. However, that is not the point that I want to emphasize. On March 11 we are told that the Canadian National railways are operating twenty-five steamers, and the names are given; each name is preceded by the word "Canadian." But evidently some persons are better informed than the Government. I hold in my hand an article signed by John Kidman, in which he speaks of Canada's Merchant Marine—and highly praises it, too. But he gives the names of fifty-three steamers, while in the answer to my question of March 11 only twenty-five were mentioned. Whether or not that is right, I do not know, but this gentleman appears to be well informed.

An hon. MEMBER: Read the names.

Mr. PARENT: I will read first the names of the vessels mentioned in answer to my question of March 11. They are as follows, the word "Canadian" being prefixed in each case:

Voyageur, Pioneer, Warrior, Ranger, Recruit, Volunteer, Trader, Sailor, Trooper, Seigneur, Signaller, Miller, Adventurer, Gunner, Aviator, Sower, Navigator, Settler, Spinner, Raider, Importer, Exporter, Drummond, Sheba, Makee.

Then, here is the list given by Mr. Kidman, the name "Canadian" being prefixed in each case, as before:

Voyageur, Pioneer, Warrior, Volunteer, Trooper, Aviator, Raider, Recruit, Signaller, Gunner, Settler, Rancher, Fisher, Forester, Trapper, Hunter, Trader, Sailor, Adventurer, Sower, Mariner, Explorer, Navigator, Ranger, Seigneur, Miller, Spinner, Planter, Armourer, Composer, Beaver, Runner, Carrier, Importer, Exporter, Inventor, Prospector, Cruiser, Constructor, Sealer, Miner, Reaper, Thrasher, Otter, Squatter, Farmer, Observer, Artificer, Engineer, Victor, Conqueror, Commander, Leader. Total deadweight tonnage——

They even know that much.

——313,150. Total value,, 53 vessels,——

That is also known by them.

——$61,233,450. Average cost per ton deadweight, $195.54.

If, Sir, you are interested to know where this statement comes from, I can tell you that it is from the Montreal Gazette Commercial and Financial Review of the Year 1919, compiled by the staff of the Gazette and printed as a supplement with the issue of January 5, 1920. On the cover there is also this statement:

Canada does more business per capita than any other country in the world.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: If the hon. member would allow me, perhaps we might save a little time. I am, of course, not responsible for what any publisher might print, but apparently he has given the list of ships that have been contracted for by the Government along with the ships that are in commission. That will explain the difference between the answer given to the hon. member and the reporter's statement that he has just read.

Mr. McMASTER: Does that mean, therefore, that some ships have been contracted for that are to be paid for out of this vote?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Not at all.

Mr. McMASTER: Then the amount of $63,000,000 is wrong.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am not accountable for a newspaper article.

Mr. McMASTER: I know that.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: This amount of $20,000,000, that we are being asked to vote is a very large sum; we have been discussing this item a long time, and I think there has been no effort on this side to obstruct, but only to elicit such information as is in the public interest. I should like to ask the minister to let the item stand for discussion at some subsequent sitting of the House. It is a large enough sum to warrant further discussion, and we ought perhaps to have a little more information as to just what the consequence would be of the item not carrying. I should like to hear from the minister just how far the programme he has in view is from completion and in what degree it would be affected if the item should not carry.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: If the item did not carry, of course, that would be the end of it. While I would like very much to meet the views of the leader of the Opposition, because the Government has been met in a very fair spirit, not only by himself but by all the members opposite,—and I might say that this is not the first occasion on which they have treated this question as a national one, but they have done so at previous sessions—I gave to the best of my ability very detailed information this afternoon; we have been on this item now since half past three o'clock. Much as I should like to meet the views of the Opposition, I think we ought really to pass the item now. If there is any further information that the leader of the Opposition or any other hon. member desires, I should be glad to give it, but we are all anxious to get through with the business of the session.

Mr. BELAND: This is a very important item amounting to $20,000,000, one of the largest items that is submitted for our consideration. Undoubtedly, a number of hon. members who have not been present in the House this afternoon and evening may require some further information. I am sure that on this side of the House we do not want to obstruct this item in any way, but merely wish to elicit the information we require in order to justify this expenditure. The Government, therefore, should not refuse postponing until a further date the consideration of the item.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: In view of the request of the leader of the Opposition and also of the genial hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Béland), the Government will agree to postponing the discussion of this item.

Item stands.

Progress reported.

PRIVATE BILLS.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill No. 9, to incorporate Scottish Canadian Assurance Corporation.—Mr. Mowat.

Bill No. 10, respecting The Trust and Loan Company of Canada.—Mr. Cronyn.

Bill No. 7, to incorporate The T. Eaton General Insurance Company.—Mr. Mowat.

THE T. EATON LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY.

The House went into Committee on Bill No. 8 to incorporate the T. Eaton Life Assurance Company.—Mr. Mowat; Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On the preamble.

Mr. McMASTER: I would like to know when the consent was obtained for the use of the name "T. Eaton." I do not find that name among the promoters of the Bill and it seems to me that the member for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat) should give the Committee some assurance that the use of the name is authorized. On the face of it there is nothing to connect T. Eaton with the formation of the company.

Mr. MOWAT: The incorporators, some of whom are the principal officers of the company, I am assured and am convinced, have been authorized by the T. Eaton Company to make this application. It is not likely that any general life insurance will be done by the company at all; otherwise they would choose some name of a more commercial character. I can assure the hon.

gentleman that the application is perfectly bona fide and that the incorporators have simply adopted the form of the model Bill which is in the Insurance Act. I hope the measure will be allowed to pass.

Motion agreed to.

Bill reported, read a third time and passed.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 24, to incorporate The Pabos, Amqui and Edmundston Railway Company.—Mr. Pelletier.

Bill No. 25, respecting The Pacific Coast Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Stevens.

Bill No. 26, respecting The Pacific Marine Insurance Company.—Mr. Stevens.

On motion of Right Hon. Mr. Doherty the House adjourned at 11.30 p.m.

Wednesday, March 24, 1920.

The House met at Two o'clock.

REPORTS AND PAPERS TABLED.

Certain Orders in Council relating to the organization and work of the Department of Health:

1. Order in Council, P.C. 1627, dated August 2, 1919, naming the President of the Privy Council as the Minister of the Crown to preside over the Department of Health, and providing for the transfer to the Department of Health, from the Department of Immigration and Colonization of the staff of the Quarantine and Medical Service.

2. Order in Council, P.C. 1765, dated August 23, 1919, transferring to the Department of Health from the Department of Trade and Commerce the administration of the Adulteration Act, the Proprietary and Patent Medicine Act, the Commercial Feeding Stuffs Act, and the Fertilizers Act.

3. Order in Council, P.C. 2204, dated October 30, 1919, transferring to the Department of Health the work of the Housing Committee of the Cabinet.

4. Order in Council, P.C., 2321, dated November 21, 1919, transferring to the Department of Health from the Department of Marine and Fisheries the administration of marine hospitals.

5. Order in Council, P.C. 2612, dated December 31, 1919, transferring to the Department of Health the medical branch of the Commission of Conservation.—Hon. Mr. Rowell.

General orders and routine orders of the Canadian Militia, also appointments, promotions and retirements, Canadian Militia and Canadian Expeditionary Force, 1919.—Hon. Mr. Guthrie.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

CIVIL SERVICE RE-CLASSIFICATION.

*Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Are appeals taken before the Board of Hearing against certain items of the re-classification of the Civil Service dealt with finally by the said board?

2. If not, is the Governor General in Council or the Civil Service Commission, or both jointly, passing finally on the decisions of the board?

3. If the latter is the case, what is the use of the Board of Hearing?

4. Has the Governor General in Council or the Civil Service Commission, or both jointly, refused to confirm decisions of the Board of Hearing or ignored them altogether?

Rt. Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

1. No.

2. All decisions of the Board of Hearing are submitted to the Civil Service Commission, for final action. In cases where an increase of compensation is involved the recommendations of the commission are submitted for the approval of the Governor in Council.

3. The Board of Hearing was established to enable employees of the Public Service to make their representations regarding the compensation, duties and qualifications to a board, composed of representatives of the departments and the service itself and to give the Civil Service Commission the benefit of the views of men in the service who have made a study of the Civil Service Classification and to facilitate the hearing of complaints and adjusting the classification. The Civil Service Commission has expressed itself favourable to the establishment and continuance of the board.

4. The Civil Service Commission has confirmed all recommendations of the Board of Appeal. The Governor in Council has approved all but one, and in this case the department concerned reported that the office is to be abolished.

PRINTING BUREAU LINOTYPES.

Mr. FORTIER:

1. Are there any unused linotypes at the Printing Bureau, as a result of the dismissal of employees?

2. If so, how many?

3. Is it true that the Government, instead of selling these machines, tolerates their breaking up and deterioration?

Rt. Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

1. There are no unused linotypes at the Printing Bureau as a result of the dismissal of employees.

2. Ten linotypes are not now operated because they are not required to handle the output of the Bureau.

3. No.

ALFRED PEAT MANUFACTURING PLANT.

Mr. CAHILL:

1. Was the peat manufacturing plant at Alfred operated during the past year? If so, by whom?

2. If not by the Government, under what agreement or arrangement was it operated?

3. What was the cost per ton of production when operated by the Government?

4. At what price per ton was peat retailed to the consumer under governmental operation?

5. If the plant is now operated by private interests, what agreement, if any, is there restricting the price at which peat produced at the plant shall be sold to the consumer?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. Peat fuel manufacturing operations were conducted at Alfred last season by the Peat Committee which was appointed jointly in 1918 by the Dominion Government and the Government of the Province of Ontario.

2. The answer to this question is the same as to No. 1.

3. At the conclusion of the Government's manufacturing operations at Alfred in 1911 an estimate was made of the cost during 93 working days (not a full season) of manufacturing one ton of peat fuel. This cost, including overhead charges, was $3.05 per ton. This was the cost of the peat on the field ready for loading into cars or into shed. It was further estimated that this cost per ton of fuel would be reduced to $1.82 during another season's work, but at the end of this year (1911) governmental activities in this line were discontinued.

4. A limited quantity of peat was sold to consumers in Ottawa for $3.50 per ton. It was sold at this low figure, which was below the cost of manufacturing, plus shipping and delivery, for the purpose of introducing this fuel to the public and to get an expression of their views concerning its value as a fuel for domestic purposes.

5. The Peat Committee has not yet concluded their investigation and nothing at the present has been done concerning restrictions of the price at which peat produced at this plant or any other plant for the manufacture of peat fuel, shall be sold to the consumer.

MILITIA DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEES IN LONDON.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. How many employees of the Department of Militia in London, England, were brought to Canada and placed under the jurisdiction of the Department of Militia and Defence since the signing of the armistice?

2. How many of these employees are still in the service of that department?

3. How many of those who are still employed were residents of Canada at the outbreak of the war?

4. How many Canadians have been dismissed from the Department of Militia and Defence since the date of the armistice?

Hon. Mr. GUTHRIE:

1. 59.

2. 47.

3. 43.

4. 67.

CONNAUGHT RIFLE RANGES.

*Mr. TOBIN:

1. How many acres of land comprise the Connaught Rifle Ranges, situated in the County of Carleton, Ont.?

2. From whom was the land for said ranges purchased?

3. What was the total cost of the land?

4. What has been the total cost to date of equipping the Connaught Rifle Ranges?

5. What has it cost each year to maintain these ranges?

6. What has been the total cost of everything to date in connection with the purchase of land, equipment and maintenance of these ranges?

7. Has any revenue been derived from the land comprising said ranges?

8. If so, how much per year?

9. Have the ranges ever been used for competitions?

Hon. Mr. GUTHRIE:

1. 2,717.70 acres, including roads.

2. G. A. Armstrong, J. Armstrong, N. Boucher, Catherine Burk, T. Burk, A. Davidson, I. B. Davis, Jennie V. Kennedy, J. Lavelle, R. Richardson, W. O. Riddell, J. Scissons, S. Scissons, G. Sparks, G. H. Sparks, W. Smith (Estate), G. I. Scott, G. Taylor, E. B. Whelan, Andrew Whelan, J. Whelan, Thos. Watt, Wilson Bros., E. Younghusband.

3. $206,700.

4. $770,490.45.

5. $1,684 per annum.

6. $986,160.45.

7. Yes.

8. Pasturage (tenders called for), 1915, $250, 1916, $250; 1917, $925; 1918, $925; 1919, $925. Total, $3,275.

1920—Pasturage rights transferred to Central Experimental Farm (Dominion Government).

9. No, the construction of the Ranges has not been entirely completed.

DEPARTMENT OF MINES EMPLOYEES.

Mr. DEMERS:

1. Have Messrs. John Blizzard, engineer, Wm. Campion and Henry Pereira, draughtsmen, Joseph Keele, expert in ceramic, and Robert Cantelo, chemist, of the Department of Mines, resigned?
2. If so, why?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. Messrs. John Blizzard, Technical Engineer, William Campion, Draughtsman, and Robert C. Cantelo, Assistant Engineering Chemist of the Mines Branch, Department of Mines, have resigned. Messrs. Henry Pereira, Draughtsman, and Joseph Keele, Expert in Ceramic, have not resigned.

2. The reason given in each case for resigning was that a more remunerative position had been offered, and accepted, outside of the Government service.

PRINTING BUREAU STAFF.

Mr. FONTAINE:

1. How many employees have been dismissed from the Government Printing Bureau since the 1st of November, 1919?
2. Why were these employees dismissed?
3. How many of the said dismissed employees are French Canadians?

Rt. Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

1. 233.

2. Two employees were dismissed upon recommendation of the King's Printer on the reports, verbal or written, of the officers directly in charge of these men.

Under Order in Council P.C. 22, approved January 10, 92 notices of retirement have been served, 90 of which took effect on February 1, and two of which were made to stand until further orders.

Under Order in Council P.C. 205, approved January 29, notices of retirement have been served upon 46 employees, and took effect on February 7.

Under Order in Council P.C. 417, approved February 21, notices of retirement were served upon 89 employees, and took effect February 29.

Under Order in Council P.C. above mentioned, the names of six employees were removed from the roll of the Department and their positions declared abandoned.

3. No record.

QUEBEC AND SAGUENAY RAILWAY.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Is the Quebec and Saguenay railway now finally completed?
2. If not, why?
3. When is it to be finally completed?
4. Who is in charge of the road now and operating same?
5. To what funds are the earnings of the road paid or credited?
6. Has the Government officially taken possession of the road on its own account?
7. If so, when? If not, why?
8. When does the Government intend to take possession of the road on its own account?
9. By whom was the suspension of the daily trains between Quebec and Murray Bay ordered, last November?
10. By whom was it authorized?
11. Why was this train suspended?
12. Has the Government since then received complaints and petitions from public bodies and individuals of the county of Charlevoix, asking for a daily train service between Quebec and Murray Bay?
13. If so, why has the Government not complied with said requests?
14. Does the Government intend to give effect to said requests? If so, when?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. The work is still being carried on by the contractors to bring the Quebec and Saguenay railway up to the standard. Until contractors have finally ceased work it cannot be considered as completed. During the time the contractors are at work it is deemed advisable that operation of the railway be carried on under their supervision.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. During the current year.

4. Answered by No. 1.

5. The Department of Railways and Canals.

6. Answered by No. 1.

7. Answered by No. 1.

8. Answered by No. 1.

9. The suspension of the daily trains was agreed upon last fall after consultation with the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Railway Company, who suspended their daily trains in November last.

10. By the Department of Railways and Canals on the recommendation of Mr. Gordon Grant, Chief Engineer, Quebec and Saguenay railway.

11. The business offering did not warrant a daily train service.

12. Yes.

13. Answered by No. 11.

14. As soon as business warrants the running of daily trains this service will be given.

C.G.S. "CHAMPLAIN."

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. How many tenders were received for the purchase of the C.G.S. "Champlain?"
2. What were the names of the respective tenderers and the amount offered by each?

3. Has a sale been finally made of the said steamer?

4. If so, to whom, for what amount and what were the conditions of payment?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. Five.

2. Gulf of St. Lawrence Shipping and Trading Co., Ltd., Quebec, P.Q., $61,050; R. T. Sainthill & Company, North Sydney, N.S., $55,000 (subject to inspection and approval and received after other tenders opened); Thomas A. Duff, Toronto, $31,500; John C. Hearn, Quebec, $4,500; W. J. Thomson, Quebec, $4,250.

3. No.

4. Conditions of payment, cash.

QUEBEC-MONTMORENCY AND CHARLEVOIX RAILWAY.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Does the Government contemplate taking over the Quebec-Montmorency and Charlevoix Railway for the purpose of linking same with the Quebec and Saguenay Railway under the management of the Canadian Government Railway system?

2. Have there been any negotiations with that object in view?

3. If so, what were they and with whom?

4. If not, will the Government investigate the desirability of such acquisition?

Hon. Mr. REID:

I. The Government did contemplate taking over this line, as will be shown in Bill passed by Parliament on May 18, 1916. Owing to legislation being defective, proceedings were stayed from that time to the present.

2, 3 and 4. Answered by No. 1.

BANK INTEREST RATE TO GOVERNMENT.

*Mr. KENNEDY:

1. What was the rate of interest allowed by the Canadian banks to the Dominion Government on balances standing to its credit during the fiscal years, 1917, 1918 and 1919?

2. What did said interest amount to during each of the said years?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. Included in the balances due the Dominion Government as reported in the return by chartered banks published in the Canada Gazette are the advances of Dominion notes against securities made by the Department of Finance to the banks for war finance purposes. Upon these advances interest was paid during the years referred to by the banks to the Government at the rate of 3½ per cent and 5 per cent. The interest bearing portion of these balances as shown in the Gazette has varied according to the time of year from approximately 40 per cent to 75 per cent of the total.

During the flotation of the three Victory Loans in the years mentioned the remaining portion of the balances referred to was increased by payments on account of subscriptions. No interest was paid by the banks on this portion of these balances. Heavy payments were called for from time to time necessitating the holding of large balances until the proceeds of the loan were exhausted, and the banks were unable, because of the large and numerous drawings, in the interim, to place an appreciable part in time loans. There is practically no market in Canada for day to day money, and this portion of these balances could not, in consequence, be made remunerative.

2. For the year ending February 28, 1918, $616,743.07; for the year ending February 28, 1919, $2,381,347.08; for the year ending February 29, 1920, $3,202,069.05. Total, $6,200,159.20.

SIR WILLIAM DILLON OTTER.

Mr. ETHIER:

1. What pension is being paid to Sir William Dillon Otter as a retired Field Officer of the Department of Militia and Defence, what is his age and the date of superannuation?

2. What appointments has Sir William Otter held since 1914 and has any salary or allowances been paid him for same? If so, how much?

3. What is the total amount received by him since 1914 to date for any extra services rendered and all amounts paid for handling expenses and disbursements?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. An annual superannuation allowance of $4,100, dating from April 1, 1913. Age 77.

2. Director of Internment Operations at $5,000 per annum.

3. Nothing beyond salary mentioned in No. 2.

SAGUENAY RIVER DREDGING.

Mr. SAVARD:

1. What is the cost of the dredging of the Saguenay river?

2. What is the depth of the channel at low tide?

3. Is the Government aware that, at certain places, there are land slides which may block the said channel?

4. If so, does the Government intend to erect protective walls at these places?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. $522,867.41.

2. 16 feet.

3. No such information.

4. Answered by No. 3.

PORTAL IMMIGRATION HALL.

Mr. GOULD:

1. Are the shingles which are to be used on the Immigration Hall at Portal, Saskatchewan, being purchased in the United States?

2. If so, why are they not being purchased in Canada, thus saving difference in exchange?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1 and 2. Competitive tenders were received to make repairs, including the shingling of roof of building, and contract was awarded to Mr. D. Clarke at $407. No information as to where he purchased his shingles. No question of exchange involved so far as the Government is concerned.

THE TEMISCOUATA RAILWAY.

*Mr. GAUVREAU:

Is it the intention of the Government to acquire the Temiscouata railway, which runs from Rivière-du-Loup to Edmundston, N.B., in order to make it a branch of the Canadian National Railway?

Hon. Mr. REID: No.

ST. JOHN RIVER WATER POWERS.

Mr. CALDWELL:

1. Has any person, firm or corporation got a Dominion Charter to develop the water power at Grand Falls, on the St. John river, N.B.?

2. If so, what is the date and what are the terms of such charter?

3. If such a charter exists, why has no development taken place?

Rt. Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

1. No information.

2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.

RELIEF AND SEED GRAIN ADVANCES IN ALBERTA.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. What was the total amount advanced for relief and seed grain in the years 1914-15 in the Medicine Hat, Lethbridge and Calgary land districts respectively?

2. How much of these advances have been paid back in these land districts respectively?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1.

Land District.	Advances. Seed Grain 1915.	Relief 1914-15.	Total
Calgary	$ 686,583.50	$ 480,598.38	$1,167,181.88
Lethbridge	605,161.20	468,803.53	1,073,964.73
*Medicine Hat	529,179.81	580,750.63	1,109,930.44
	$1,820,924.51	$1,530,152.54	$3,351,077.05

2.

	Repayments. Seed grain principal.	Seed grain interest.	Relief principal.	Relief interest.	Total repayments.
Calgary	$ 538,943.43	$ 57,323.11	$ 280,883.90	$ 30,036.20	$ 907,186.64
Lethbridge	598,983.78	47,382.62	434,852.67	45,007.36	1,126,226.43
*Medicine Hat	400,769.24	25,328.58	334,093.44	26,299.58	786,490.84
	$1,538,696.45	$ 130,034.31	$1,049,830.01	$ 101,343.14	$2,819,903.91

*Note.—The Medicine Hat land office was closed March 13, 1918, and the land included in Lethbridge district. The repayments for Medicine Hat district given above are up to date office closed; subsequent repayments are included in the figures for Lethbridge district.

LA MALBAIE-TADOUSSAC STEAMSHIP SERVICE.

Mr. SAVARD:

1. Does the Government intend to do something to replace the service done by the steamer Champlain between La Malbaie and Tadoussac?

2. If so, what?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. As far as the Department of Marine is concerned, no.

2. Answered by No. 1.

CIVIL SERVICE RECLASSIFICATION TO BE RETROACTIVE.

Mr. STEVENS:

1. Having reference to reclassification of the Civil Service, did the Government pledge itself to the Railway Mail Clerks' Federation to make such reclassification, when finally passed, retroactive?

2. If so, to what date?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to bring in a Bill confirming the reclassification this Session?

4. Will such reclassification be made retroactive until April 1, 1919?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1, 2, 3 and 4. It is the intention of the Government to bring in a Bill making the reclassification retroactive as from April 1, 1919.

MONTREAL HARBOUR WHARVES.

Mr. DESLAURIERS:

Is it the intention of the Government to go on with the works already begun to the wharves of the Montreal harbour, in Hochelaga Bay?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: These works are under the charge and direction of the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.

The programme of the Harbour Commissioners, as approved by the Government, calls for the construction of a portion of these wharves in the near future.

RECLASSIFICATION OF CIVIL SERVICE.

On the motion of Mr. Ethier:

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams and reports relating to the reclassification of the Civil Service by American efficiency experts in the employ of the Arthur Young Company; also all documents relating thereto, which have been submitted to, and received by the Civil Service Commission and comprising (a) a list of names who, in consequence of such reclassification and subsequently thereto, resigned from the service; (b) the reasons given in support of such resignations, and (c) the nature of the duties of each person who resigned.

Rt. Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This motion will have to be amended before we can assent to it, for the reasons I gave the other day. The immense amount of correspondence that has taken place would make a very bulky return if brought down and it would require a small army to look after its preparation for a reasonably long campaign period. There is no objection at all to the passing of clauses (a), (b) and (c), and if the motion is amended accordingly, any correspondence with reference to those three clauses will be brought down.

Mr. E. B. DEVLIN: I understand that Mr. Ethier has some special cases with which he wishes to deal, and if the minister is agreeable, I think it might be well to let the motion stand until he returns.

Motion stands.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

For a copy of all correspondence and telegrams between the Dominion Government and the Alberta Government relating to irrigation development in Alberta, and more particularly to Lethbridge Northern Irrigation District.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

For a copy of the correspondence between the Minister of Lands and Forests of the Province of Quebec and the Soldiers' Settlement Board.

FLAX PRODUCTION AND SPINNING INDUSTRY DEVELOPMENT.

Mr. S. F. GLASS (East Middlesex) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, National Economics demand that broadest consideration be given to such means as may be necessary to encourage the fullest development of the natural resources of the Dominion.

Propaganda waged during the trying years of war for increased production proved a stimulus that justifies a continuance of similar efforts, especially as regards products of the soil, as from this source, possibly more than from any other, must be created that new-found wealth, so necessary to the up-building of our national structure on broad and permanent foundations.

The exigencies of war have forced upon our country the development of hitherto latent resources, the success of which should impel us to even greater endeavour, so that the country may reap in the most ample measure the economic advantages of all its many and varied products.

To this end further substantial encouragement might be given to extending and developing production in flax, hemp, and other fibres, for which the soil and climatic conditions of different parts of the Dominion have proven their suitability:

First.—By establishing experimental and demonstration stations convenient to the area within which such fibres have been successfully grown, so that scientific instruction and direction may be given to growers in the most modern and approved methods of preparing their fibres for the world's markets.

Secondly.—By lending such encouragement as may be needful to the perfecting of mechanical appliances for harvesting the crop, so that growers may overcome the handicap of competition with cheap labour in foreign countries.

Thirdly.—By scientific standardization and grading of seed and fibres a permanent market may be obtained for our exportable surplus of these products, thus giving our growers an advantage in competing with foreign countries.

Fourthly.—By competent direction and encouragement (by propaganda) in order that production of these fibres may be extended to all of the provinces of the Dominion, wherein the climatic and soil conditions justify the expectation that they may be successfully grown.

Fifthly.—By continuing and further extending such encouragement as may be necessary to develop the spinning industry in Canada, so that in the fullest measure possible the products may be spun into yarns and woven into cloths within the Dominion, in order that the full economic value of our fibres in their many and varied uses may be conserved within the country.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this resolution covers a very wide range of subjects, and I rather imagine that hon. members will surmise at the outset that its latter clauses are those to which I shall more particularly direct their attention this afternoon. I have in the past been very much impressed with the idea that the policy followed in 1916 and 1917 for increased production in this country bore sufficient fruit to justify the continuance of that effort in these times of peace. During these years, when it was necessary not only to produce but also to economize in the use of foodstuffs, it was shown that by scientific direction and encouragement of production and by concerted action we were able not only to increase to a very great extent food production in this

country, but also by conservation and thrift to prevent the waste of food products. As a result of these two lines of effort we were able to send to the starving peoples of Europe largely increased supplies of food stuffs. Why should not this propaganda be carried on at the present time? I should like to direct the attention of the House to an item in the Toronto Star of last August giving the opinion of Doctor Hastings, the city medical health officer:

> Regret over the reduction in backyard gardening in Toronto during the past summer is expressed by Dr. Hastings in the current number of the Public Health Bulletin. The doctor points out that over 1,000 of the lots that were cultivated during the war are now bearing only weeds. In 1918, he states there were 5,285 back-yard gardens and vacant lots under cultivation, yielding 528,285,000 pounds of foodstuffs, or as much as was shipped to Europe during any year previous to the war.

The stimulus given to production was in evidence not only in the backyard gardens of the cities and towns, but throughout the whole country. It was shown that the well-directed efforts of the Government had achieved their object of very largely increasing the supply of food products. If it was necessary during the years of the war to increase production in order to accomplish a patriotic and benevolent purpose, because at that time millions of people were on the verge of starvation, why is it not advisable to pursue the same policy to-day, when conditions in Europe would justify us, not only from the standpoint of patriotism and generosity, but from the standpoint of our own material benefits, in using every means possible to increase the products of the soil? Let me direct the attention of the House to an extract which I clipped from the Dominion Agricultural Publication, the author of which, I believe, is one of the heads of the Department of Live Stock Industry of the Department of Agriculture. This extract reads:

> Farmers should not forget that Canada before the war annually produced one-sixteenth of the world's supply of wheat. That shows us the relative size of the market, and is a measure by which our live stock men can gauge their own opening. But in live stock the Dominion lags far behind. It has hitherto only produced enough to feed its own population. Mexico, with a population not quite twice that of the Dominion, annually exports four and-a-half times as many cattle. Argentina, farther away from European markets, and hampered by a 7,000-mile ocean route across the Equator, and with a smaller population than Canada, exports five times as much mutton, and four hundred times as much beef. Denmark, with a population of less than 3,000,000 people, with an area of only 15,300 square miles, i.e., about one-half the size of New Brunswick, and about one-eighteenth the size of Alberta, annually exports four times as much pork products as does the Dominion. But when we come to Australia shipping 3,000 times as much mutton, and little New Zealand shipping 4,000 times as much, our Dominion trade seems to fade out of sight.
>
> These considerations should be enough to show that our Canadian live stock development has only just begun.

The conditions prevailing in this country to-day are not peculiar to Canada. We find that Europe, like ourselves, is finding it necessary to use every means possible to stimulate the production of foodstuffs there. Lloyd George, as early as August last, called the attention of Great Britain to the conditions then existing, and I shall quote some pregnant remarks of his. Speaking about that time at a public gathering, the British Prime Minister made the following significant statement:

> The Prime Minister significantly remarked that greater production was necessary to enable Labour to maintain the substantial gains it had made during the war. The reduction in the hours of labour had resulted in a corresponding reduction of output in many lines. If the policy of limiting output is not corrected, Great Britain will not long be able to support her present population. . . . .
>
> Our excess of imports from the United States has cheapened our money across the line. Our export trade must be enlarged to pay for this excess and to meet our extensive war borrowings in the United States. Greater production is imperative to swell our export trade, and thrift is necessary to curtail the importation of luxuries. Canadian labour, like British labour, cannot maintain a standard of living above the value of its production. The world can be saved from economic collapse only by hard work.

I have been very much impressed with the fact, which seems quite evident in this country, and indeed throughout the continent of North America, that too many men are imbued with the falicious idea that they can find a substitute for work. It cannot be done, Sir, and I do not understand how the labour organizations of the country are going to reconcile their policy with the interests of the farmers in trying to reduce the hours of labour even below eight. How can they consistently appeal to the farmers to produce foodstuffs in order that the cost of living may be reduced, while they indolently lie by, reducing their hours of labour to a point where the cost of production must necessarily be enhanced? Labour and the farm must get together. Their interests are naturally allied; but apparently their efforts at the present time are being directed in channels diametrically opposed to each other. No doubt this is due to a lack of proper understanding between them of the respective conditions that prevail in the rural and urban centres. I find that

in different parts of Western Ontario there is at present a tendency on the part of chambers of commerce, boards of trade, and business organizations generally, to seek co-operation with the farmers' interests. They ask the farmers to appoint committees and representatives to these organizations, and both sides are gradually getting together and arriving at a proper understanding of each other's position. Every means should be adopted to foster and encourage sympathy and co-operation between labour and the farmers, so that we may work, not for individual or sectional advantage, but for the greata national need and the national interests of the country.

Let me draw the attention of the House, Mr. Speaker, to a clipping from the Globe, in regard to present conditions:

"The world to-day is in flux; the ferment of unrest is universal. I believe the course and origin of this unrest is in Europe, and being both political and social, is mainly found in the shortage of food existing through the latter years of the war, and even now existing amongst the European peoples.

There were approximately 300,000,000 people east of the western front concerned with this war, and all Europe, both east and west of the old fighting line, is bare. It is a fact that those European countries, including Asiatic Russia, who were actually engaged in the war, and over whose territories the war was actually fought, produced in 1913, the last complete statistical year, over sixty per cent of the entire bread grains of the world. Taking the four bread grains—wheat, oats, barley and rye—for the year mentioned, the figures strikingly reveal the situation which we of the western world are called upon to meet.

Austro-Hungary, Belgium, Bulgaria, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Roumania, Russia, Serbia and Turkey produced in 1913—

	Bushels.
Wheat	2,059,733,000
Oats	2,642,079,000
Barley	1,002,345,000
Rye	1,748,448,000
Total	7,452,605,000

The entire world production for the same period was—

	Bushels.
Wheat	4,127,437,000
Oats	4,697,437,000
Barley	1,650,265,000
Rye	1,880,387,000
Total	12,355,526,000

These countries produced one-half of all the wheat produced in the world, a little over one-half of all the oats produced in the world, more than sixty per cent of all the barley produced in the world, and more than ninety-three per cent of all the rye produced in the world.

Mr. Hoover, of the allied food commission, has recently made the statement that not to exceed seventy-seven per cent of a normal crop may be expected in Europe in this present year. The twenty-three per cent shortage, based on 1913 production, would mean a shortage in bread grains in the war-torn countries of 1,714,000,000 bushels, a shortage so huge that even the unprecedented crops of North America in 1919 cannot begin to satisfy.—F. P. Mount of the Advance Rumley Co., at the Industrial Congress in Calgary.

There are two important objects which should engage our earnest consideration in the present unsettled condition of things, and the first is, the necessity for disabusing the mind of the farmer of the opinion that there is any possibility of overproduction in foodstuffs, at least for the time being. With that assurance, and with encouragement to produce to the limit of capacity under the present extraordinary conditions, by which the farmers are enabled to receive such plendid prices for the products of the farm, the problem of the hour would be largely solved. Does it not, therefore, seem a wise policy to encourage the farmers by every means possible, to a maximum of production, with the possible assurance that prices will be well maintained during the present year? Man cannot see far enough to say what is going to happen in this world in the next two, three or four years. It is all guess work, it is all more or less a gamble, but we do know that the supply of food in the whole world is far beneath the requirements to feed the population of the world. We know that millions of people are starving and that the production will only in a small degree alleviate the suffering and misery that exist by reason of this shortage which has accumulated for a period of years. I have very much sympathy with the idea that the farmer wants to be left alone and I do not mean that we should interfere or trespass in any way upon the prerogatives or rights of the farmer but I think the farmer himself will concede that with the facilities at the disposal of the Government and with an organization such as they have throughout all parts of the world, it is quite possible to gather information and present it to him in such a way that it will serve as a guide to him in determining for himself the policy that is best for him to pursue. I have not the slightest doubt as to the conclusion that the farmers, as sound business men, will come to when they have these facts properly presented to them.

I am interested in a small clipping containing a statement, the author of which is Dr. C. A. Zavitz of the Experimental Farm at Guelph, showing that not only by encouragement but by scientific aid and training through the agricultural representatives who are now scattered throughout the vari-

ous counties and townships of Canada, the farmer is led to the adoption of more scientific methods and as a result greater production takes place. Dr. Zavitz says:

According to the Bureau of Industries for Ontario the increase in yield per acre for the last eighteen years in comparison with the eighteen years previous amounts to 20 per cent for barley, 14 per cent for winter wheat and 10 per cent for oats. These increases in yield per acre for the three crops in the past eighteen years would mean increases in the market values of these crops to the province as follows: Oats, $65,632,441; winter wheat, $35,239,437; barley, $33,795,525, or a total of $134,667,403.

That, Sir, I understand, is not a result attained by cultivating a larger area but it is a result that has been attained by better farming, by the use of better seed and by following scientific directions in the cultivation of the same quantity of land as was used previously. I am not unmindful of the great efforts the provincial departments of agriculture in co-operation with the federal Department of Agriculture are making along these lines and I have no word of criticism in so far as they are concerned, but I do point out that that feature has very materially assisted in increasing foodstuffs and other products of the farm. Having encouraged the maximum of agricultural production, having given all the reasonable assurance that it is possible to give with the information in the hands of the Government that prices are likely to be maintained may we not hope that the national economic value to this country will be so immense and so important that they will be fully justified in the eyes of the people.

The question of waste is also important. During the years of the war we were counteracting to some extent the deficiency in production by economy in the utilization of foodstuffs. We have apparently abandoned that policy at the present time. I realize that at times like this the people want to be pretty well left alone. Whilst these objects were attained by Orders in Council and directions of the Government, I do think that an educational policy that would point out the evil of unnecessary waste of foodstuffs would not be resented by the people and that it would result in a great saving of foodstuffs. After all the extent to which we can help the countries of Europe which need our food is the extent of our surplus for export and if by conserving what we have we increase that surplus we attain our object to the same extent as we would by greater production.

While we increase our production and economize and conserve our products, it is important that our people, in view of the condition of international exchange and of the world-wide conditions, should pay closer attention to the use of the products made in Canada. We have a Canadian Industrial Reconstruction Association which has published a little pamphlet or slip, giving as they are called, "Ten Commandments for Canadian Trade." I was attracted to a signboard in the city of Toronto while I was passing through last week. In large letters there appeared these lines:

Canadian Money,
Canadian Made,
Should stay in Canada
For Canadian Trade.

The ten commandments are as follows:

1. Buy Canadian products. In doing so you develop the home market, encourage factory expansion, provide employment for new populations, and create bigger and better markets for all kinds of farm produce. New factories, expansion of old factories, greater production, more workers and better agricultural markets mean national progress.

2. Import only necessities, and then only if similar Canadian articles or substitutes are not available. With Canadian money at a discount of from 10 to 15 per cent, exchange with the United States is costing Canadian consumers between $75,000,000 and $100,000,000 a year.

3. Produce to the limit in field and factory. Increased production means new wealth, and is essential to the success of any effort to reduce imports and promote export trade.

4. Co-operate, conserve, specialize, standardize. These are the means to maximum production of high quality goods at minimum cost.

(5) Develop export markets. Foreign business gives stability to trade. It reduces unit costs, benefits domestic consumers, affords employment to factory workers in times of depression, and corrects adverse exchange by improving trade balances.

(6) Utilize Canadian services. Ship by Canadian carriers through Canadian ports. Patronize Canadian railways, Canadian steamships, and Canadian banks. Place insurance in Canadian companies. Employ Canadian architects, engineers, scientists, and other experts. Spend vacations in Canada.

(7) Manufacture raw materials to final stages in Canada. Hundreds of million of dollars are lost annually to the Dominion, and especially to Canadian wage earners, by the exportation of raw materials and semi-manufactured products.

(8) Use science for the determination of the development of natural resources. Industrial research will reveal new wealth, improve industrial processes, and help to relieve our economic dependence upon outside sources for fuel, iron and other essentials.

(9) Make quality the hall-mark of Canadian products. In return for public support of the home market, Canadian manufacturers should provide products that compare favourably with imported goods, and Canadian workers should recognize good workmanship and maximum production as their standard.

(10) Be fair to capital. Canadian money should be encouraged to invest at home, and

foreign capital attracted to promote Canadian industrial expansion.

To my mind there is nothing suggested in these commandments that should not commend itself to any citizen of Canada who has the interest of national upbuilding and national development at heart.

Now, Sir, I have said that I think we ought to get together. We want the labourer in the city and the labourer on the farm to get a closer understanding of each other and of each other's interests. Someone has said—I think it was in this House I heard the remark some time ago—that the pyramid of national prosperity rests squarely on the base of agricultural production; that there is no prosperity in a country such as ours that does not have its genesis in the soil. Therefore the responsibility resting on the farmers in Canada demands that they should have increased sympathy and support by every means possible, to the end that agriculture shall attain the maximum of efficiency in production.

The farmers occupy an outstanding position in our social system. They foot the bill for the nation. The farmer is the foundation stone which carries the whole deadweight of the natural structure. In effect he is the national paymaster general. He is the greatest consumer of manufactured goods and the greatest user of transportation. The total production of farms in the Dominion of Canada last year—I think, Sir, this is a significant thing and bears testimony to the splendid energy, the splendid courage and the splendid devotion with which the farmers of this country responded to the call for production—with a population presumed to be about nine millions was equal to the total production of the farms of the United States in the year 1880 when that country had fifty millions of people. That a people of nine millions should produce an amount of foodstuff equal to the production of a people of fifty millions certainly to my mind redounds to the credit of Canada. It will be seen, Sir, that the new found wealth created by the farms of this country in a single year equals the total net national debt of the country. Is that not significant? Does not that bear testimony to the splendid service that agriculture is rendering the country at the present time? Nevertheless it is only a tithe of what may be expected under well directed co-operation and organization through the several departments of agriculture, and the local branches which are being established throughout the different provinces of the Dominion. We are asked for increased production. This does not mean for the individual more work or harder work, but it does mean more efficient work and a new attitude towards work, a desire to make every stroke tell to the utmost. In a word it means willing, painstaking, and well directed effort, backed by capital and guided by science, to bring our acres to the fullest fertility, to build up and utilize adequately our forest resources, our fisheries and our mines, to develop and co-ordinate our transportation systems, to develop our water-powers advantageously and to distribute widely the resulting power—to check reckless waste and encourage the effective use of all our resources to the end that we may establish better and more satisfying types of rural life.

The waste of lumber is deplorable. As Mark Twain said about the weather we all talk about it but do nothing. Take pine; the value of resin, turpentine, ethol, alcohol, pine, tar, charcoal, lost in this waste represents three or four times the value of the lumber produced but great as is this loss it is modest compared with our colossal fire waste. We have been prodigal wasters, reckless destroyers, mere skimmers of cream. If we are to meet our national needs and build up sanely our superstructure on safe and sound foundations we must change the policy which has guided us in the past. Unrestricted individualism must now give way to controlled co-operation guided by a constructive economic policy which shall be nation wide in scope. We must bring to the solution of peace problems the unity and cohesive power developed throughout the war. Sir, let us be a nation of builders, creators, and distributors. Let us be proud of our country. It is time to build, time to unite, time for trade and for brotherhood. Let us be glad we are Canadians and let us stand for Canadian institutions. Let us have a little more patience, a little more charity for all, a little more devotion, less bowing down to the past and more looking forward to the future when Canada will be ripe for a great burst of light and life.

I now, Sir, leave the introductory part of my speech because, as hon. members may have surmised, I have more interest in presenting to them the unusual conditions surrounding that subject which I have directed to the attention of the House for some years back, viz, the flax industry of this country. I first drew the attention of the House to the very important subject of flax culture in 1916, and the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. J. E. Armstrong) preceded me in the good work in

1915. While we have very good reason to commend the federal Department of Agriculture—we have received very little support from the Departments of Agriculture of the provinces—I am still of opinion that that department has not put sufficient force into its work during the last four or five years to fully develop the possibilities of flax culture in this country.

Mr. BURNHAM: Might I ask my hon. friend if he is opposed to the theory enunciated yesterday by members of the Opposition, that all these matters should be left to private individuals?

Mr. GLASS: Perhaps my hon. friend will pardon me for not answering him now. In a few minutes I am going to direct his attention to a report concerning flax growing, published by authority of the British Parliament, in which a very full answer will be found to his question.

The flax industry is not new in this country; in fact, it dates back three hundred years ago when a Frenchman named Hebert grew flax on the banks of the St. Lawrence, and since that time the habitants have developed the culture of flax for their individual use, and they have become so expert with the hand loom that they are able to weave cloth of the finest texture. Indeed, I understand that robes for the clergy in the province of Quebec are made from these fine cloths.

Unfortunately flax culture has not advanced in this country in any degree corresponding with the importance which it bears to the great textile industry of the world, and naturally the question is asked, Why? I think the duty of finding an answer to that question devolves upon the Government. We have heard it said: Here is an opportunity to encourage flax growing in this country, for the stress of war has brought about conditions that never prevailed before and which should act as a strong stimulus to our farmers to produce flax. But the pessimists ask: How do we know that these conditions will continue for any length of time? How do we know that within two or three years Russia, which formerly produced eighty per cent of the world's flax crop, may not be again producing fibre at such a cost as would make it impossible for our growers to compete?

In answer to such questions, I want to tell the House that if Russia cannot produce a better quality of fibre than she produced before the war, our growers need have no fear whatever of being driven from the field. Under the direction of the Federal Department of Agriculture, backed by the persistent efforts of our growers, the cultivation of flax has reached such a high standard that Russia would have to very greatly improve her methods to be able to compete with the product of this country. We have achieved that progress, Sir, during the last few years, and at the present time Canadian fibre is finding a ready sale in the markets of Great Britain, Ireland, Belgium and France, the highest grades of linen being manufactured in Europe from fibre grown in this country.

3 p.m.

Now, Sir, I regret our paucity of production of fibre when I realize its enormous economic value to the country at the present time. If this country produced 100,000 tons of fibre at the world's current minimum market price—I say minimum because there are prices away beyond the price I have in mind—the economic value to this country would be $200,000,000. Is not such a valuable industry worth developing? Yet with all the effort directed during the past two or three years towards encouraging the production of flax our maximum production in any one year has not exceeded 3,300 tons.

Some of our farmers felt rather anxious lest with the re-action following peace the price of flax would drop so low that there would be no advantage to them in producing the fibre. Directly the opposite has been the result, Sir. To-day the minimum price in the markets of France, Belgium and Ireland is $600 a ton above the highest price current during the whole period of the war. The whole world is to-day starving for this material. We in Canada have demonstrated that we can grow a fibre of the highest quality, and yet our total production for last year was only a miserable 2,400 tons. It is true that is worth $5,000,000, and including the seed, $6,000,000; but to my mind there is no reason why with proper education and encouragement our farmers should not have produced $50,000,000 or $100,000,000 worth.

Throughout the centuries certain fundamental objections have existed to the growth of this product. Primarily the farmer is of the opinion that its culture is injurious to the land. I submit that if there be one thing a Government can do by proper propaganda work it is to once for all, by liberally advertising in the agricultural press, to dispel this objection. I may say that I do not care very much for

the pamphlets which are issued from time to time, as I think they are a very poor medium of communicating with the farmer. My suggestion would be that the Agricultural Gazette might well be dispensed with. I am convinced that the same amount of money spent in an extensive advertising campaign through the agricultural press would bring far better results.

I find that notwithstanding the discussion that has taken place in this House year after year hon. members are still quite frequently impressed with the fact that the cultivation of this crop is very injurious to the soil, and I think steps should be taken to completely disabuse the minds of our people on this point. In the discussion in 1916 I quoted from Mr. Zavitz of the Experimental Farm, and his opinions will be found in the Hansard of that year. He said:

> The actual amount of fertilizing constituents taken from the soil by different crops is an important matter from the farmer's standpoint. To secure this information it is necessary to have a knowledge of both the yields and the chemical composition of the crops. Unfortunately, the statistics gleaned by both the Dominion and the Provincial Governments do not furnish sufficient data for these calculations.

For instance, the Ontario Bureau of Industries has not collected information in regard to yields of seed and straw of flax or of straw of cereals. At the Agricultural College, however, accurate determinations are made from year to year of the yields of both grain and straw per acre of the different farm crops.

Flax, winter wheat, oats and barley have been grown under similar conditions in the experimental grounds at Guelph in each of the past twelve years. The varieties used for these determinations of the comparative exhaustiveness of soil fertility were common flax, Dawson's Golden Chaff winter wheat, Banner oats and Mandscheuri barley. In each case the chaff was included with the straw. The flax was grown in duplicate plots each year with an average of seventy-seven pounds of seed per acre, and the average returns, therefore, represent twenty-four tests in the twelve-year period.

For the chemical composition the figures used were obtained from the 1915 edition of 'Feeds and Feeding' by Henry and Morrison, with the exception of those of flax straw, which are not given in that publication. For the chemical composition of the flax straw, use has been made of the figures determined by Kennedy in his thesis prepared at the Ontario Agricultural College. The flax was obtained from the Field Husbandry Department, and it was analysed in the chemical department of this institution. The following table gives the average annual yields for the twelve-year period and the amount of fertilizing constituents obtained through the sources previously indicated:

Variety.		Yield per acre.		Nitrogen N.		Phosphoric acid, P 205.		Potash, K 20.	
		Bushels and tons.	Pounds.	Per Cent.	Total in crop (Lbs).	Per Cent.	Total in crop (Lbs).	Per Cent.	Total in crop (Lbs).
Common.	Seed	18.3	1024	3.62	37.1	1.50	15.4	.95	9.7
Flax.....	Straw...	2.45	4900	.72	35.3	.31	15.2	1.02	50.00

I do not know that it is necessary to read the figures; but as they are very important and are the result of scientific research spread over a period of years, I would suggest that it might not be amiss, if, with the consent of the House, the figures were repeated in Hansard. They are very important, as one of the greatest objections the farmers has to the growing of flax is the wrong impression he has that it is injurious to the soil.

I now give the answer, on the authority of Mr. R. J. Hutchinson, chief officer, Division of Economic Fibre Plants, in the year 1918, to the question "Is flax a specially exhausting crop?" Mr. Hutchinson says:

> This question is usually answered by our farmers in the affirmative, but this opinion does not appear to be warranted by the chemical analysis which have been made of this crop, showing the principal elements of fertility taken from the soil during the period of its growth. The results which have been obtained by chemical examination have furnished the following figures, which represent approximately the plant food removed from the soil by flax, wheat and oats.
>
> An acre of flax producing 15 bushels of seed and 2,000 pounds of straw takes from the soil 26 pounds nitrogen, 14.86 pounds phosphoric acid, and 9.28 pounds potash, for the 840 pounds of seed, and 20 pounds nitrogen, 9 pounds phosphoric acid, and 28 pounds potash for the straw, a total of 46 pounds nitrogen, 23.86 pounds phosphoric acid, and 37.28 pounds potash.
>
> A crop of wheat, yielding 25 bushels of grain and 2,200 pounds straw to the acre, would take from the soil 28.5 pounds nitrogen, 12.68 pounds phosphoric acid, and 8.54 pounds potash, for the 1,500 pounds grain, and 12.03 pounds nitrogen, 4.96 pounds phosphoric acid, and 20.57 pounds potash for the straw, a total of 40.53 pounds nitrogen, 17.64 pounds phosphoric acid, and 29.11 pounds potash.

Comparisons are also made with oats and other cereal crops, but I do not think it is necessary to delay the House in dealing with that matter.

I should like also to direct the attention of the House to a statement made by the Seed Commissioner. The opinion has existed amongst farmers that flax is a dirty crop, and you cannot disabuse the mind of the farmer of that false impression. There is, however, a plain reason which can be communicated to the farmer. In years gone by there was not proper machinery for cleaning the flax seed, and as a result of that the farmer got what he sowed. If weed seeds were in the seed that was sown, naturally he would get a crop of weeds. I wish to direct the attention of the House to a bulletin published by the Seed Commissioner in 1915 in which he was examining some flax seeds. He says:

> The noxious weed seeds in the sample containing 15,424 per pound were made up as follows: Wild mustard 11,936, false flax 1,792, wild oats 1,280, hare's-ear mustard 288, and stickseed 128. It also contained 11,616 other weed seeds per pound, mostly lamb's quarters. This sample was taken in central Saskatchewan and represented seed that had been in the stack over winter and threshed the following May. It was sown at the rate of one-half bushel per acre, which would put approximately 2,700 noxious and 2,000 other seeds on each square rod.

That would give approximately that quantity of weed seeds in each square rod. Surely there would be reason to expect that unfortunate results would follow the sowing of such seed.

We have during the last few years, by force of circumstances, given evidence to Great Britain and, indeed, to the world at large that Canada can produce flax and flax seed for quality and fibre equal to the best standards of the world. I directed the attention of the House last session, in 1916, and also in 1918, to the importance of standardizing and also of protecting the reputation that we were building around our flax seed products. I am glad to say that the then Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Crerar), following the suggestions made in the debate of last year and further encouraged by the hon. member for Lambton East (Mr. J. E. Armstrong) at that time, has taken measures to protect the standards and the reputation attained for Canadian flax seed in Great Britain. What has the Department of Agriculture done? This order from the Seed Branch published in the early part of last autumn has had the unanimous support of the flax growers of Western Ontario and their unanimous co-operation in safeguarding the interests of shippers of seed from this country. This circular from the Department of Agriculture says:

> In order to safeguard your export trade in Ireland through the maintenance of a uniform standard of high quality seed, the Federal Department of Agriculture has made provision for an inspection and grading service for the flax seed crop of 1919. It may be expected that for years to come Ontario seeds will come into keen competition with Japanese, Dutch and Russian seeds, and unless Ontario can insure the Irish trade with a quality of seed that will compare at least favourably with that from the countries mentioned, you will be much handicapped in maintaining your market. You are offered the following service:—
>
> Any flax seed producer in the province of Ontario upon application to the office of the Seed Branch, 28 Front St., East, Toronto, may procure inspection for his seeds, subject to provisions, to wit:
>
> 1. Producer must have at least a carload of 400 bags ready cleaned for inspection (see standards herein described.)
>
> 2. The seed must be properly bagged in sacks of standard and uniform quality, net weight 189 lbs. and each sack must be securely sewed and sealed.
>
> 3. Each sack must be branded in red letters, (a) Ontario Fibre Flax Seed growth of 1919, Grade No..... Inspected by..... Department of Agriculture, Canada. (b) On the other side must be branded the shipper's name and address and the words "Certificate Number" followed by a space in which the number may be branded when known.

So that every bag of seed that is sent overseas bears a number which is recorded by the Department of Agriculture and the name of the man who inspected it. Thus, the man who is responsible for inspection and the man who produces the seed are both known to the department:

> 4. The grower must submit a representative sample of his seed for germination test to the Seed Branch, Ottawa, at least one week before the date of shipment to tide water.
>
> After compliance with the foregoing, the inspector shall be authorized to issue a certificate to accompany the bill of lading to Ireland. The number of the certificate shall correspond with the number on the sacks of the shipment and the Department of Agriculture in Ireland shall be so notified.
>
> For producers who have not appliances for cleaning the seed to standard, provision has been made whereby they may have their seed cleaned at any of the following points:
>
> Canada Flax Mills, Seaforth, Ont.
> H. Fraleigh, Forest, Ont.
> A. L. McCredie, St. Mary's, Ont.
> Canada Flax and Seed Co., Oshawa, Ont.
>
> whereat inspection services may be procured and the seed cleaned to standard at not more than 11c per bushel, including the following charges; unloading, elevating, cleaning, rebagging, sewing, sealing, reloading, five days storage and insurance. Those who ship to these points will be required to remove chaff, etc., with a fanning mill before shipping for cleaning. Owner of seed shall pay for his own bags. All screenings shall be returned to him unless other instructions are given.

The growers of Western Ontario submitted their flax seed to proper cleaning methods at the different points. Germination tests were held, and the seed was examined thoroughly and bagged, and the result has been that every bag of seed that has gone to Ireland this year, amounting in the aggregate to over 100,000 bushels, carried upon it the stamp of standardization by the Department of Agriculture in Canada. The standards fixed were fairly high, and if I had any criticism to make in that direction I would suggest that it might have been possible to establish a No. 1 Extra standard, in addition to the others. The grade standards that have been fixed for Ontario Fibre flaxseed for 1919 are as follows:

No. 1. Flax seed for seeding purposes shall be mature, sound, dry and sweet; shall be practically free from seeds of other cultivated plants; shall be free from noxious weed seeds within the meaning of the Seed Control Act (1 noxious weed seed per oz.) shall be well cleaned and graded to remove light and damaged kernels common weed seeds and other foreign matter and shall be capable of germinating at least 90 per cent. Certificates of this grade may be issued for Ontario Fibre Flax Seed providing that the seed is accompanied by an affidavit of pedigree or certificate of registration satisfactory to the Chief Seed Inspector.

No. 11. Flax Seed shall be the same as No. 1 in all respects except that it may contain 5 noxious weed seeds to the ounce.

Standard sacks may be procured, properly branded, upon application to the Department of Agriculture, Ottawa.

Producers shall seal sacks that have been inspected and have come up to the required standards with seals supplied by the Seed Branch (Toronto Office). Presses will be lent for this purpose.

What has been the result of the precautions taken by the department in this matter? I have before me a copy of the Irish Telegraph, published at Belfast, I believe, dated December 15, 1919, and in large type I find the following—and this is very important because our market for years to come for a very large amount of the seed we produce must necessarily be Ireland:

Canadian (Genuine Ontario) Fibre Flaxseed, Dutch Child, has for some years given yields and values of flax in Ireland superior to those obtained from Blue Blossom Dutch of the best brands.

The Irish Department of Agriculture has made careful and extended tests, comparing the various seed supplies on the basis of yields and values. For 1919 these tests resulted as follows:

	Stones per acre	Value per acre
Dutch Blue Blossom	24	£47
Canadian (Ontario) Fibre ..	26	52
Greater Return from Ontario	2	5

This would justify a farmer in paying as much as thirty shillings per bag more for Canadian (Ontario) Fibre Seed than for Dutch. These results are common in the experience of farmers throughout Ulster.

The Canadian Government this year considered it desirable to inspect and control the supplies of Genuine Ontario Fibre Flaxseed so as to enable Irish growers to be certain of getting their supplies of that seed without danger of substitution or adulteration. All such inspected and controlled seed is shipped in bags of 189 pounds each with the Canadian Government Brand printed on each bag in large red type and bearing Grade No. 1 and Shipper's Certificate No. All such branded seed germinated 90 per cent or better, with no more than 2 per cent of impurities. Dealers or the Department of Agriculture will advise farmers as to the Brand, the value thereof, etc.

The reason why we have this market is that conditions during the war forced the growers of Great Britain and Ireland to solve the problem of an insufficient seed supply. Ireland is in this peculiar position: While they can grow a fair quality of flax there, just as good perhaps as we grow in Ontario, and there is none better, they are unable to preserve any seed on account of climatic conditions. The flax is pulled by the roots when it is more or less immature, before it has reached what we call the ripe stage, and the peculiar weather conditions of Ireland prevent the maturing of the seed after the flax has been pulled, notwithstanding that the sap remains in the straw on account of the flax being pulled by the roots. Another reason is that the season for dew retting the flax is so short that after the flax is pulled the farmer cannot leave it in stook long enough to ripen, even if the sun would ripen it, and still have a sufficiently long season left to complete the retting of his crop. Therefore, Ireland, and Great Britain to a very large extent, have in years past depended upon a new supply of seed from year to year, and they have obtained their seed from Holland. This seed originated in Siberia—Riga seed it was called—and it was then grown one year, and sometimes two, in Holland. If it were grown one year in Holland, it was called Dutch Child. Year after year crops were grown with new seed purchased in Holland. If the seed had been developed for two years in Holland it came out as Dutch Grandchild. Up until that time we in Canada, for want of experiment and experience, had been under the impression that, like Great Britain and Ireland, we had to buy our seed from Holland from year to year. While some growers took the seed purchased in Holland and grew it on their farms for a year and possibly two or three years, nevertheless the impression prevailed generally that the seed must be renewed after a period of three or four years or its

vitality would run out and as good a quality of fibre could not be produced. Therefore each year the grower in Ontario would grow some of this Dutch seed to produce seed for the next year's crop. Saving the seed for fibre purposes was not, of course, a matter of very great concern to Ontario growers at that time, but in the year 1916 Great Britain found that there was no seed available from Riga, and not sufficient available from Holland. They could not produce the seed from their own crops in Ireland, so they commenced to look to new fields for the seed necessary to crop the land for flax. Then for the first time the experiment was tried of using fibre seed produced in Canada for growing flax in Ireland, and from the very commencement the experiment met with success. Year after year it was shown that with the Ontario seed better results were attained, and I am at liberty to say that at seven different competitive shows held in Ireland last year fibre produced from seed grown in Ontario in 1918 won first prize over competitors from the rest of the world. We have therefore developed from the position of being a non-exporter of seed to the position where last year Canada was almost the sole source of supply for the Mother Country. We have attained an enviable reputation. I can understand that in the stress of circumstances Great Britain and Ireland might say at that time: " This is the best that is available and we shall try it out and see what the outcome will be." The fact, however, that as a result of that seeding we produced a fibre higher in quality than anything produced in Great Britain or Ireland last year is attributable to the merit and value of our seeds, and justifies the very great care that has been exercised by the Department of Agriculture in jealously guarding the reputation that we made during those years. An hon. member, as I came into the House this afternoon, said to me: " What do you want to have done in this matter? Do you want a bonus or a bounty?" I replied: " No, we want scientific direction and help in order to achieve a larger and better production." As I have said before, if Canada is to retain the position she so proudly holds to-day in the production of flax fibre we must not be satisfied with the standards we have at present; there must be constant direction and scientific aid on the part of the Department of Agriculture, and the object must be primarily not so much a larger tonnage but a better quality which is the factor that will count in the home markets and the markets of the world in the years to come. Canada's soldiers have won for her an indelible reputation in Europe and one that we have every reason to be deeply proud of, and it is but right that we should also jealously guard our reputation for honesty in the products of our industry by every zealous safeguard that can be devised, and by careful standardization, so that the people of England, who have evinced such confidence in our loyalty to the Empire during the war, will be equally confident, as the years go by, in the honest value of every product which leaves the shores of Canada.. We had before us for consideration the other evening the subject of the standardization of butter, cheese and dairy products. I am a thorough believer in standardization, and my firm conviction is that if we are to get the best results from flax we shall have to aim at higher standards in quality. If we do so we shall more quickly gain a permanent market than by any other method; and I submit to the minister, while I am on the subject the desirability of adding to the standard of seed that is already established, especially in regard to No. 1 extra which will germinate ninety-five per cent. It is quite possible that we have growers in this country who will produce seed of this standard, but while seed that will germinate ninety per cent is of good quality, the man who produces seed germinating ninety-five per cent is entitled to better and further consideration than the grower who produces at the lower standard. I do urge that the highest quality and reputaion that we can attain is a matter of the greatest importance and concern to us. In this resolution which is before the House, referring to what has been already done, I am not unmindful of the energy, the support and the boost which the Department of Agriculture has afforded; but I say—and I trust my remarks may not be misconstrued—that there has hardly been all the "pep" and all the boost which was justified under the very unusual conditions that have prevailed. In other words, I feel that after four years of propaganda and efforts in this matter, we are just about as far as we might reasonably have been expected to have been in one year. We are grateful for what has been accomplished, but we hope for greater accomplishment along the lines to which I have directed the attention of the House during the last few years. The standardization of seed is important, and one of the matters proposed in this resolution is the standardization of fibre. This is nothing new in this House, because it has been constantly urged upon the Government during the past four or five years.

We must have standardization of fibre if we are to build up a reputation in the markets of Europe. For the first time in the history of the industry we have had Belgian, French and Irish buyers right in our country going up amongst the mills and buying our product for the home market. With the reputation which these mills have attained in Belgium, France and Ireland, if we have been able to produce a raw material that meets the needs of these countries, can we not look forward with confidence to greater development and a larger increase in our production? The markets of these countries are literally starving to-day for flax which we should be able to supply. I desire to mention an incident which should be of great interest to farmers. I happened to have a conversation with Mr. Graham who lives in the township of Nepean in the county of Carleton, and who is a very successful farmer, farming two hundred acres of land. He informed me that the Department of Agriculture was anxious that someone in the locality should put in fifteen acres of flax last year, primarily to demonstrate that the peculiar climate, soil and conditions of this part of the country were adapted to the production of this crop. Before I proceed, I may say that there are two brothers Graham in partnership and the gentleman with whom I had the pleasure of conversing is Deputy Reeve of the township of Nepean, and a prominent man of enviable repute Yesterday he told me that he finally decided to put in fifteen acres of flax, the Department of Agriculture having proposed that if he would grow a crop, pull it and deliver it to the mill at the Experimental Farm, they would ret it—they do tank retting—scutch it, and prepare it for the market, charging him the cost of the operation and giving him the fibre. Now, after paying every cost to which he was liable, charging rent for the land used, paying for the seed, paying for all the labour of pulling and scutching and putting his fibre on the market, that fifteen acres produced a net profit of over $4,000. What was the result? Messrs. Graham Brothers made out of that fifteen acres more than they made out of the other hundred and sixty or hundred and seventy-five acres farmed altogether. They are now establishing a mill in the district of Bowmanville, renting an area of ground at some expense, and during the current year intend to develop about four hundred acres of flax for fibre. This suggestion, for purposes of demonstration, on the part of the Department of Agriculture has brought success to these men, shown them the possibilities of an industry, and stimulated them to get into a broader sphere of production, so that instead of fifteen acres they will this year have four hundred acres under flax. This is interesting. If such results can be attained in the way they have been attained in this district—and the same results are being repeated in western Ontario as well as around Oshawa, Bowmanville, Whitby, and all those districts—what would be the possibilities in economic wealth if under proper stimulus we grew an acreage of half a million acres instead of a paltry 13,000 or 15,000 acres?

Flax has many and varied uses. It must necessarily be used not only for textile purposes but for many other purposes. It will naturally become an important raw material in the industries of our country. Primarily, it is used for linen; that is the highest use to which it is put. Flax is used for spinning threads, for linen threads used for sewing shoes, sewing harness, and making fishing nets. The fishermen can use nothing else because no other fibre or twine of any description will stand the strain and the wear and tear. Flax is also used in upholstering in the form of the waste flax or the tow that comes from the fibre. There is a market for it in that way at a price that only the finest flax could bring a very few years ago. There is a large concern in Tonawanda, New York, which uses our Canadian-grown flax, to which nothing is done except breaking through a break and crushing the straw. They use it in manufacturing quilts, and the resiliency of these quilts is almost equal to that of the finest down. They also use it in making pillows and cushions. No amount of crushing can take away the resiliency that exists in this material. This shows that there are many and varied uses to which flax can be put. Mr. Archibald, the director of experimental farms, speaking in Toronto not long ago, discussed the question of flax. What did Mr. Archibald say? He is reported in the Globe to have said:

> "Undoubtedly. We can grow a quality of fibre equal to that produced in Ireland, and the pulling problem has been solved. The great difficulty in the past has been in getting labour for pulling. Hand labour is no longer necessary for that purpose. We have assisted an inventor in perfecting a mechanical flax-puller. That machine, capable of pulling four or five acres a day, is now being made in a commercial way, and it will simply revolutionize the whole flax-growing industry."

I am rather of the opinion that we have not given sufficiently forcible aid to the

development of machinery for the pulling of flax. It is even a question yet as to whether this machine has been brought to a state of perfection, but I understand that certain improvements have been made to the machine that has been on the market for three or four years, and it is likely that a successful machine will be in operation this year.

My hon. friend from West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) asked me a question a short while ago. I desire at this stage to refer to the conditions of flax production in the Empire of Great Britain. I have before me the interim report to the board of trade of the Empire flax growing committee on the general situation and immediate prospects of a supply of flax fibre. It is dated April, 1918. This is the last report presented to the Imperial Parliament, and some very interesting data appears in it. On the general position of the flax raising industry it says:

The problem of flax supply involves the consideration of two questions. The first question, that of the supply of fibre, is closely dependent on the second, namely, the provision of seed, but the considerations affecting the two questions are so different that it has been thought desirable throughout this report to treat them separately.

1. Fibre Supply.

The following table, based on normal pre-war figures supplied by the Board of Trade, gives the world's commercial crops (i.e., excluding domestic consumption), and the mill consumption of the chief flax manufacturing countries:

	*Commercial crop.	*Mill consumption.
Russia	400	80
United Kingdom	12	100
Belgium	24	130
France	20	48
Germany and Austria	36	140
Other countries	14	8
Total	506	506

*In thousands of tons.

It would not be safe to take these figures as anything more than rough approximation to the actual position, but the only further information available is that Russia's total pre-war product was normally about 500,000 tons, and of this about 250,000 tons was usually exported. About 80,000 to 100,000 tons was consumed in the Russian factories, so that in the absence of direct statistics we must infer that about 200,000 tons of the Russian crop was used up by domestic consumption.

It is estimated that of the annual requirements of the United Kingdom before the war, which as indicated above were normally about 100,000 tons, Ireland contributed some 10,000 tons, Belgium, France and Holland together about 10,000, and Russia about 70,000 to 80,000 tons.

It will be seen that even under the conditions prior to the war a very small amount of the supply was in Great Britain and Ireland and that a very small proportion of the world's production of fibre came from France and Belgium. About 80,000 tons came from Russia for spinners in Great Britain. The future is encouraging in this respect that Russia is so demoralized at the present time that there would seem to be no possibility of any return to normal conditions. But even if Russia could return to normal conditions the product of her mills prior to the war was so inferior to that which is being supplied by Canada and these other countries to-day that she would not be a strong competitor against the high quality, standardized fibre produced in this country. The report continues:

The effect of the war upon all these external sources of supply was nothing short of disastrous. The flax growing districts in Belgium and parts of Northern France were the first to be overrun by the enemy, and the collapse of Russia in 1917 practically removed the principal remaining source of supply. The Dutch crop has also been very seriously reduced by war conditions, while the share of that crop obtainable by the United Kingdom was reduced to a minimum. The districts where Russian flax is produced are still not freely accessible to the British industry, while the free export of flax from Belgium, Holland, and Northern France is unlikely to be resumed for some time to come. The question of obtaining supplies from other sources, therefore, became during the war, and still is, of the first importance for the British linen industry.

The committee goes on to say:

In Ireland, however, flax growing persisted on a much larger scale, not only because the climate seems to be peculiarly suited for it, but also because the spinning and weaving of the resultant fibre had there been developed on a large scale in the North;

I submit that statement would seem to justify the argument that I have presented to the House that if we are going to develop this industry we must develop the manufacturing of the fibre into yarns and the manufacturing of the yarns into cloth. Therefore the devolopment and encouragement of the spinning industry must necessarily go hand in hand with the development and increase of fibre production.

The report goes on to say:

In Ireland, however, flax growing persisted on a much larger scale, not only because the climate seems to be peculiarly suited for it, but also because the spinning and weaving of the resultant fibre had there been developed on a large scale in the North; principally, however, because the crop suited the small farmer class who form the majority of the Irish rural population. The highest point in the acreage was during the cotton famine in the sixties, when the abnormal conditions of the cotton industry naturally gave a great

impetus to the flax industry, but after that date the acreage declined considerably. This was mainly due to the low price at which common or medium flaxes were imported from Russia, and the superior quality of those imported from Belgium. Even before the war, therefore, the general situation of the trade with regard to the supply of its raw material was becoming unsatisfactory. Consumption had overtaken production, and manufacturers were faced with scarcity.

The committee soon realized that the problem of increasing the production of flax was not only an agricultural but an industrial one. Given a supply of seed, excellent flax can be grown in many parts of the Empire, and the United Kingdom itself is probably unsurpassed both in soil and climate for the growth of flax. The real difficulty arises from the fact that the harvesting of the crop and its preparation for the spinning mills involve a demand for labour which is difficult to meet under the present system of working in countries such as the United Kingdom, where labour is scarce and dear. No such difficulty arises in the production of seed, either for linseed or for sowing for fibre. Where no attempt is made to recover the fibre, as in Western Canada, the crop can be harvested and threshed by the ordinary machinery used for all cereal crops. It remains to be seen, however, whether it would be profitable to do so in the United Kingdom.

If there is to be any permanent increase of the acreage under flax in the United Kingdom, there will have to be an entire change in the system under which the crop has formerly been grown and handled. Under the system prevailing in Ireland, the farmer not only grows the flax but also puts it through the first manufacturing process, known as "retting." The next process, known as "scutching," is also done in small local scutching mills, generally on account of the farmer. Thus what the grower sells is not simply raw material, but a partly manufactured article, the trade being in this respect almost unique. The objection to this system is that in effect it limits the production and greatly restricts the possibility of improvement in the quality of the product. Where retting is done entirely under natural conditions, i.e., without artificial heating of the water, the process is necessarily limited to that portion of the year during which the natural temperature of the water is sufficiently high to allow of the retting being satisfactorily done. The desired temperature of between sixty and eighty degrees Fahrenheit can only be obtained naturally in Ireland during a very limited period in summer and autumn. This means that the amount of the crop that can be handled is restricted by the amount of labour available to rush the crop through the retting process in that limited period. This again reacts upon the quality of the crop. It is said that owing to the rush of the work, and also to the lack of scientific knowledge and expert skill which cannot be expected of small farmers, the quality of the product is seriously impaired. Again, the small scutching mills which have to be scattered all over the flax-growing districts, are probably far from perfect in their equipment and the skill of their labour, which results in a loss both of quantity and quality in the flax turned out, for bad handling means an undue proportion of tow, which, of course, means a corresponding loss of good flax.

It has now become generally accepted that to meet this difficulty it is necessary to introduce an entirely new method, which has already been instituted in various experimental areas, some of which date back considerably before the war. The new system is that the flax should be bought from the farmer "on foot," as it is called (i.e., as a standing crop in the field), or delivered pulled and dried, and that the whole process of retting and scutching should be undertaken by the purchaser, who, working on a large scale and at centralized points in well-equipped factories, would be able to have the best machinery and appliances of all kinds for the purpose. At the same time by introducing the process of controlled retting with artificial heating of the water, this system would get rid of the limitation of time imposed by the shortness of the season available for natural retting, so that a longer period would be available for the handling of the year's crop.

Probably the greatest permanent difficulty in securing an adequate production of flax in this country, either in Ireland or Great Britain, is the labour supply for the actual harvesting of the crop. Flax must, if possible, be pulled, not cut, and the difficulty of getting sufficient labour to handle the crop just at the time when other crops are ready for harvesting, has been so great as to require in England and Scotland special arrangements for imported temporary labour. The measures which have been adopted at considerable expense during war time would not be available, even if they were profitable in peace time; and it is greatly desired that some mechanical means of getting over this difficulty should be discovered. Several varieties of pulling machines have so far been produced, but all of them are apparently still more or less in the experimental stage. Complete success in this direction would, however, alter also the whole question with regard to flax growing, especially in Great Britain.

The point to which I wish to draw the attention of the House is that the conditions we find here are almost the same as they encounter in Great Britain and Ireland, and that the difficulties that present themselves over there to-day are the same difficulties that present themselves here. Old, as this industry is, dating back some two thousand years, it would seem as if man had not completely by his ingenuity developed a machine suitable for the pulling of this flax in the field. Now, as early as 1916 I saw a machine in operation; it was the one to which the minister referred last year towards the completion of which the Government were lending some assistance. I saw that machine working, and representatives were also present from the British, United States and other Governments, who were vitally interested in its development. At that time I wrote a letter to the Minister of Agriculture and urged that in my opinion it would be a good policy—seeing that the machine was so near a state of perfection and yet came short of it—that the best mechanical expert that could be secured in the Dominion should be sent to the locality to watch the machine at work in the field; to follow it round for a week or

two if necessary, and lend his mechanical skill to assist the inventor in overcoming the difficulties which rendered the machine imperfect. However nothing was done and matters went on until the next year. While some improvements were made and people were waiting for the completion of the pulling machine, it was still in an unsatisfactory and unfinished condition. That was the condition last year. I then saw the machine pulling in the field and thought it did marvellous work. There were certain mechanical difficulties attaching to its operation which rendered it not in any sense a perfect machine; but I am told, Sir, that a large concern in the town of Goderich, Ontario, has purchased all the patent rights of this machine and has improved it by the use of ball bearings to reduce the amount of friction. I am also told that in operating it this year a gasoline engine that will work independently is attached to the binder. I have the intimation, Sir, that that machine is now practically in a perfected state, and I am sure it will result in very great benefit to the whole world if such turns out to be the case.

The subject is a pretty broad one to cover in an address of this kind and while it is technical in its nature it is by no means devoid of interest to members generally. Take the county of Chambly-Vercheres. I have the assertion of the fibre expert of the Experimental Farm that the soil and the climatic conditions in that county are peculiarly favourable for the development of flax culture. I am told further that J. G. Crawford, a director of the Belfast Spinning Mills, Ireland, visited that section of the country some time ago, in conjunction with Mr. Hutchinson, and was so attracted by the possibilities of flax culture in that district that he has taken steps to organize the cultivation of, I am told, two thousand acres—at any rate, a large area. Well if our friends in Quebec were able to cultivate two thousand acres at a profit in the ratio of $4,000 from 15 acres, which was obtained by Graham Bros. in Carleton county, last year, it indicate the possibilities that underlie the cultivation of flax. The names I have mentioned are those of reliable and responsible men; and if this big concern, the Belfast Spinning Mills, the largest concern in the world, is extending its operations to the provinces of Quebec and Ontario with a view to securing the raw material necessary for its mills in Ireland, surely it must follow, as surely as night follows day, that it will be to the advantage of these mill-owners to have their spinning and their weaving mills working side by side in Canada. Then we shall see the flax fibre manufactured into the finished article in Canada and a consequent great economic advantage to this country. To-day one-half of the whole export of linen from Irish mills goes to the United States. If Canada is the market for the raw material, would not this naturally be the place for them to establish their mills?

The desirability of encouraging the spinning of yarn took up the attention of this House two years ago, and I wish to refer to the subject of bounties. We recommended that in order to get the industry started some encouragement should be given for the establishment of spinning mills in Canada. No changes in the tariff were considered at that time, but the strong pressure brought to bear by the Imperial War Board for us to produce linen for airplane wings was so urgent that the War Board of Canada recommended to the Privy Council the desirability of lending some encouragement for the spinning of yarn to meet the requirements of the Imperial War Board. On the third of September, 1918, this Order in Council was passed, and in quoting it I wish to point out what I think is its inherent weakness, in that it did not cover the needs of the situation. The order is in the following form:

Whereas it appears that no linen thread or yarn has come forward from Great Britain since the first of January, 1918, for the manufacture of fishing nets, or shoe hemp for military and agricultural harness, or for the manufacture of aeroplane cloth, linen thread for miltiary boots, machine thread for the manufacture of agricultural and military harness, or yarns and threads for civilian use in Canada;

And whereas, owing to war conditions it is unlikely that Canada will be able to secure adequate supplies of linen and linen threads and yarns from Great Britain during the continuation of the war;

And whereas flax of suitable quality and adequate quantity is being grown in Canada, and it is desirable that the Canadian farmers should be provided with a favourable and satisfactory market for this flax in Canada;

And whereas certain manufacturers of linens in Canada are disposed to undertake the spinning of linen threads and yarns from Canadian flax;

Therefore His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the recommendation of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, pursuant to the advice of the War Trade Board and under and by virtue of the powers vested in the Governor in Council by the War Measures Act, 1914, and otherwise, is pleased to order and it is hereby ordered as follows:—

That a bounty of three cents per pound be paid on linen yarns not coarser than twelve lea or finer than twenty lea, and six cents per pound on linen yarns twenty lea and finer, but

coarser than forty lea, and nine cents per pound on linen yarns forty lea and finer, spun in Canada from Canadian flax in the three years beginning first day of April, 1919, and ending thirty-first of March, 1922. Such bounty, however, not to exceed $25,000 in any one year or a total of $75,000 in the three years;

No bounty will be payable under this order on yarns spun in Canada from Canadian flax until the day following the declaration of peace, and payment of the bounty hereunder in no event to extend and apply to yarns spun in Canada subsequent to thirty-first day of March, 1922;

In case the amount of $25,000 is not sufficient in any one year to pay the bounty on all linen yarns of twelve lea or finer spun in Canada under the terms hereof, the said $25,000 payable in any one year shall be distributed pro rata amongst all spinners of linen yarns from Canadian flax in Canada in proportion to the amount of yarn as defined herein spun by each during that year. Said bounty being adjustable and payable at the end of each quarter during the time such bounty shall be properly payable;

The prices to be charged for the yarns above mentioned, shall be such as from time to time appear reasonable to the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

Pursuant to that Order in Council a spinning mill was established in Guelph, Ontario, at an expenditure of $300,000, and before the war closed its pro-

4 p.m. moters were in a position to guarantee, if necessary, the production of suitable airplane cloth. We have heard, Sir, a great deal about this airplane cloth, and I have here a sample which was produced under the direction of the Imperial War Board. I understand that this cloth, which is as soft as silk and almost as tough as leather, is of a fineness of about sixty lea. This linen was produced in hundreds of millions of yards for aircraft wings, and almost the whole available flax supply of the Empire was commandeered for its manufacture. The reason for its use was two-fold. I am told that this is the only cloth that will take the cellulose for chemical varnish with which it is treated to render it rain and fireproof, and it has also this quality, that if punctured by a bullet or piece of shell it does not rip. Therefore it was a most important article, and every encouragement was given to its production.

As I have said, a mill was established at Guelph, but I understaand that any bounty that may have been earned under the conditions of the Order in Council which I have quoted has not yet been paid, owing to some technicality, such as the non-completion of the Peace Treaty, and that the men concerned in that mill have not been receiving the consideration which is due them.

I have referred to what we call lea yarns, and for the information of the House I would like to state what is meant by the term. I do not know the origin of the Irish word "lea" as applied to yarn, but in a little book published by a Mr. Moore, a member of the Textile Institute of Ireland, is contained an explanation, and I shall now quote it:

> The yarn is now, so far as processes of manufacture are concerned, practically a finished article of commerce. So without any further treatment, save being unwound in the "reeling room" and being measured on the reels—60,000 yards making a bundle, which is subdivided into "hanks"' and "cuts." Each hank contains 12 cuts, or "leas," and each cut 300 yards; consequently 16⅔ hanks are equal to a bundle. The bundles are then tied up in bunches of 3, 6, 9 or 12, according to quality—and so, after being carefully dried by steam in the lofts, the yarn is ready for sale. The finest spun for commercial purposes is about 340 leas of 300 yards each to one pound weight, though it has been worked up to 700 leas for special purposes. The coarsest spun out of pure flax is about 20 leas to the pound.

Thus the fineness of linen yarns is designated by the counts—a lea contains 300 yards —and the count, grist, or number of lea yarns is reckoned by the number of leas contained in a pound avoirdupois. Thus if 15 leas containing 4,500 yards weigh 1 pound the count is 15 leas or 15s. If 20 leas containing 6,000 yards yarn weigh 1 pound, the count is 20s., and 60 leas containing 18,000 yards weigh 1 pound, the count is 60s. In other words as the yarn gets thinner and finer, the count gets higher.

Mr. Moore gives figures of the export of yarn in 1912, which shows what an enormous industry has been developed in Ireland. The total export of yarn from Ireland in 1912 amounted to 17,671,100 pounds, which was exported to Belgium, Denmark, Egypt, France, Germany, Netherlands, Italy, Japan, Russia, Spain, the United States and some other countries. Canada at that time was also quite an importer of yarn, and, of course, Ireland in her own textile industries consumes a large quantity.

Before concluding, I want to refer to the possibility of the development and utilization of straw in Western Canada. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Crerar) last year when he was speaking on the subject of flax made a statement as to the possibility of utilizing Western straw which up to the present time has been largely a waste. The Textile Journal of March 2, 1920, which I think hon. members will find on file in the reading room, has an article which I am sure they would be very much interested in. This article, referring to the shortage of paper and the demand for pulp, draws

attention to the possibility of utilizing and the economic value of the waste straw of Western Canada. The article continues:

Cotton rags are selling as high as 15 cents a pound, and high quality material from which paper can be made comparable with cotton rag content paper should readily command as much as $300 per ton. The United States daily consumes over 1,000 tons of high grade papers. Canada manufactures about 250,000 tons of high grade, bleached pulp, a large proportion of which is exported from the United States. It takes somewhat over one and a half cords of pulp wood to make one ton of pulp, and the demands on our forest consume over 20,000 acres of pulp wood limits per year, in which connection it is interesting to note that it takes from fifty to one hundred years to grow a spruce tree suitable for pulp production. Timber limits are rapidly increasing in value, and with the rapid depletion of the forests, lumbering operations must every year go further from transportation lines.

This situation is of direct interest to the Western farmer, because he is annually wasting about one million tons of raw material from which it has been proved that a paper pulp can be made convertible into a high grade paper comparing well with the linen rag product, for which price and demand are to-day higher than ever before. The material referred to is flax straw, at the present time burned and wasted wherever flax is grown for linseed, the straw crop therefore representing a dead loss to the farmer. In the 1919 issue of the Monthly Bulletin of Agricultural Statistics, published by the Dominion Government at Ottawa, we read; Another question of direct economic interest is the possibility of utilizing the linseed straw in Western Canada, which so far has been found useless, and is mostly burned. Any use that could be established for this by-product, which would increase even to a small extent the total money yield of the crop to the farmer would be a very important factor in extending the cultivation of flax throughout larger areas in Canada. It can now be definitely stated that such a use for flax straw has been demonstrated in the manufacture of pulp (bleached and unbleached half stuff) for conversion into high grade papers. All that is required is co-operation on the part of the farmers in the collection and delivery of straw, and interest of the necessary capital to organize a new industry which will revolutionize the flax-growing problem and at the same time stimulate the important paper industry of Canada with a supply of high quality pulp.

This is no question of experiment. That stage has been passed, and production on a semi-commercial scale has actually been accomplished. Over a ton of unbleached flax straw pulp has been manufactured, and then made into paper in two paper mills. This was submitted to various large paper manufacturers for their opinion, and from them it received the highest commendation. It is thought that the following points cannot fail to be of interest to the Western flax grower and also to the paper manufacturer.

The conditions essential to the successful manufacture of flax pulp are:—(1) Sufficient quantity of flax straw. (2) Suitable mill locations. (3) Suitable markets. Dealing with each of these headings, it is obvious that the first is of primary importance, the available supply of the basic raw material straw, the possibilities of collecting that supply, and the price at which it can be so collected, are factors on which depend the practical commercial possibilities of this development.

Taking first the available supply, we find that there has been in the past an enormous increase in flax acreage in the West. In 1870, the total Canadian crop was 118,044 bushels. In 1903, this had increased to 884,000 bushels, and this increase continued up to the enormous crop of 25,978,000 bushels in 1912. The fall in prices in the next few years was reflected in diminished production, but recovery has been rapid, and in 1918 a crop of 5,776,000 bushels was harvested in the Prairie Provinces, the estimated crop for 1919 was 7,117,000 bushels, of which Saskatchewan is credited with nearly 4,600,000 bushels. The following table gives acreage and yields for the Prairie Provinces during the past ten years, taken from volumes of Census and Statistics published by Department of Agriculture of the Dominion Government, Ottawa.

That shows the period from 1910 to 1919, but I shall not waste the time of the House in reading the table:

Crops such as those of 1918 and 1919, would each yield over 1,000,000 tons of straw, capable of producing over 100,000 tons of pulp. Canada to-day manufactures annually 250,000 tons of high grade pulp, practically all for export to the U.S.A.

Practically all of this flax is grown for linseed. It is well known that flax cultivation for this purpose is an entirely different farming proposition from growing flax for fibre. For fibre flax a special seed must be selected, and the crop is closely sown to encourage long slender growth of straw with small tops. Special cultivation harvesting methods and subsequent treatment of the straw must be resorted to.

The question of growing flax from fibre to replace the great shortage from which Europe is now suffering, though also a problem of first importance to the Canadian West, is an entirely different problem from that now under consideration, viz:—Utilization of the present supply of straw for paper pulp. With linseed flax, Canadian common seed is used sparsely sown to encourage plant to develop large tops; the flax is cut at a later stage of its growth, and threshed for its seed. The resulting straw is too short, broken and brittle for use in the textile trades and has hitherto been piled alongside the thresher and burnt.

The writer goes on to speak of the establishment of these mills. He says that it is necessary that these mills could be established at suitable districts convenient to the farmer, and in this article, which I will not waste the time of the House in reading, the writer shows that it is quite possible to have the "breakers," in which the straw is reduced to pulp and sent to the pulp mills, made movable so that they may be moved from place to place, and so that the farmer may have an opportunity of delivering the straw from convenient centres.

Arthur D. Little and Company, of Boston, who did a good deal of research work in

connection with the utilization of western straw were, it is to be regretted, compelled to discontinue their investigations, owing, as they say, to the establishment of the Scientific Research Board by the Dominion Government, they thought they were trespassing on the ground of work undertaken by the Government. Dr. Howe, who was chief of that organization, the Arthur D. Little Company, Chemists, Engineers of Boston, Mass., who has a branch in Canada, writing me on March 24, last, said:

> I was pleased to receive your letter of the 13th and also the publication in which your continued efforts to obtain government support are recorded.
>
> We investigated very carefully all that has been done in an effort to use seed flax straw for cordage and textile purposes and so far have had no reasons to change our opinion that such utilization is not economical. We still believe in our paper process and one of these days hope to find a satisfactory way for commercializing that work.

These are the conclusions of Dr. Howe after very careful investigation. Dr. Howe, at that time, also gave a sample of linen paper produced from that pulp, which paper is in quality suitable for the finest bond or bank note paper. Unbleached and in its natural condition and colour, it is a paper of very great tensile strength. It seems to me that with the knowledge already at hand there are very great possibilities for the development of the industry in the utilization of western flax straw. The article that I have just referred to from the Canadian Textile Journal appears to have the authority of the Agricultural Statistical Bulletin of the Dominion Government and therefore I conclude that the statements made therein carry the stamp of official approval.

In conclusion, we are very anxious to develop the industry more extensively in Canada. We have been able to show that the area in which flax can be grown is not limited to Western Ontario, where it has reached its greatest development of recent years. Splendid fibre has been grown in the Annapolis Valley in the province of Nova Scotia. Different districts of the province of Quebec, as well as British Columbia, in the Fraser Valley and other districts, have demonstrated that they also can grow a very fine quality of fibre, and in view of the enormous value of production at the present time it seems to me that now is the psychological moment to bend every effort towards attaining the maximum of production. In the resolution I point out the desirability of establishing demonstration stations in the areas where flax for fibre is grown. Surely if new and modern machinery is essential in the scutching mills, if new processes of retting by water tanks and other means is necessary to the better development of the industry, is it not incongruous that a demonstration mill should be established at the Experimental Farm three or four hundred miles away from the people whom it is going to serve. I do not know, but I do not think I am very far astray when I say that this demonstration mill has never cost this Government one cent. The profits accruing from a mill doing this work, even as it is doing, would be sufficient, I think, to cover the entire overhead cost. If the Government would establish a mill in the district where fibre is grown for the benefit of farmers and millers alike and try and improve the present methods of production, it would be a very great aid to the people who are now engaged in a very worthy industry. I do not think it would cost the Government anything, because the building of a mill of this kind is not a very expensive matter, and the machinery itself is likewise inexpensive. We want to apply the newest and most up-to-date methods so that we can put our fibre on the market in the very best condition. Individuals are not so well able to investigate new processes of this kind as the Government. It is really a research problem, and the Government of this country has already adopted a policy of research on very broad lines, and is lending considerable assistance to research work generally. It seems to me that the only way in which the industry can reach its proper development is by the Government assisting and co-operating with the producers and helping them to solve what are really research problems. Howard Fraleigh, of Forest, up in the county of Lambton, has been carrying on research work more or less for the past five or six years, and he would take a greater pride in producing a hank of fibre that could beat fibre growing in any other part of the world than in making $100,000. He lives and sleeps and dreams of flax. He is an enthusiast on the subject, and is well posted, but even his experiments have not been carried to the point where he can say to the growers: We will abandon dew retting in favour of tank retting, even though tank retting increases the value of fibre from $400 to $600 per ton. Suppose as a result of an investigation which might cost even $8,000 or $10,000, we were able to add $600 per ton to the value of the fibre produced in this country. That would mean an enormous economic gain to the country, and would be a tremendous

stimulus to increased production. The increased production we would get would justify very generous and sympathetic consideration of this question by the Government of this country. It is three years since I first brought this matter up. The Minister of Agriculture in his statement to the House last year said that he had listened with a very great deal of interest to my suggestion that demonstration mills should be placed in districts that were producing large quantities of fibre, but he was going to carry on experiments for another year at the mill at the Central Farm. I must say in all frankness and sincerity, so far as improved methods of retting are concerned we are not one whit further advanced to-day than we were a year ago. We knew just as much two years ago as we do at the present time, and no matter what information the mill may have gained, the people in the West have not got the benefit of it. It is unfortunate that at the present time there is not a proper appreciation of the value to the Civil Service and the country of technical men with scientific knowledge. I wanted a member of the Department of Agriculture the other day to attend a flax association meeting in London, and I called up Mr. Archibald at the Central Farm. I was told that Mr. Hutchinson, the Chief of the Fibre Department, had to be retained in Ottawa to attend a very important gathering last week of the deputy ministers of agriculture of the different provinces. I appreciated that it was more important that he should attend that meeting than the one at London, but nevertheless the London meeting was an important one too. Mr. Archibald told me that his assistant was leaving. I asked "What is the matter? Isn't he a good man?" "He is an A-1 man," he replied, "and has given good service." "Then why are you letting him go?" I asked. "We cannot hold him," he replied, "he has better inducements elsewhere." Here was an efficient man in this important department drawing a paltry salary of $1,500 or $1,600. He resigned his position to take employment in a little flax mill up in the town of Goderich, which mill had only 400 acres under cultivation, but was able to pay him a larger salary than his chief at the Farm was getting. How long shall we be able to hold our technical officers if this is to continue? These technical men are necessary to the development of the industries of this country, but the Civil Service Commission just fix what they think should be the maximum salary for the position, and I don't know but what the chances are that when they advertise for a chemist they get a blacksmith. There is not a proper appreciation of the importance of the technical chiefs of departments. I am not referring to the Department of Agriculture alone, but to the Mines and other departments. Day by day and week by week valuable men are being lost to the public service because private industry can afford to pay a better salary than the Government offers these technical men. This is a serious situation. Men with their knowledge and experience are not made in a day. It takes years of experience and training, and men with this knowledge and training are of incalculable value to the country at the present time. I direct the attention of the Government to the seriousness of the situation and urge upon them, before it is too late, to put a check upon this waste of important skilled and technical experts in the department. We should hold these men if we desire to make any progress.

I must apologize to the House for the length of time it has taken me to present this subject to hon. members. I am persistent in pressing this matter from year to year, and it seems that by degrees a few crumbs are being thrown out as a result of representations that were made by the flax growers some four years ago. There has not been a step taken by the Government in the development of this industry that was not recommended in 1915 by the flax growers of Ontario. Step by step the value of their recommendations is being realized, but in my opinion if the whole subject had been vigorously prosecuted in the year 1915 and adequate steps taken to develop this industry the economic value to this country in fibre produced would have represented hundreds of millions of dollars. Now, Sir, I do appeal to the Minister of Agriculture to discuss the matter seriously with those in his department in whom he reposes confidence and who advise him in these matters. The flax growers at a meeting last week in London pressed for the same thing for which I am here urging. Mr. Fraleigh, President of the Flax Growers' Association, in 1915 asked for precisely what I am now demanding. Although I do not say that we should do away with the existing mill, I submit that when ninety-five per cent of the fibre produced in Canada to-day is four hundred miles away from this mill, and some more than that distance, it is obvious that either the mill should be put to work where it can serve the interests of all, or another one should be established which would be an aid as well as a demon-

stration to the people elsewhere. If we desire this industry to be a success, and if we are anxious to have a large acreage under fibre cultivation, we must present the possibilities of development before the farmer in such a way as will secure his interest. The individual farmer cannot put up a mill of his own, and in no industry to-day is proper co-operation more essential than in the flax industry. Flax cannot be grown in successive years. In some countries it is grown in rotation of five years, and in others of seven years. But if a few farmers had each a small acreage under flax they could co-operatively put up a little mill costing fifteen hundred or two thousand dollars, and they would be in a position to grow flax and ret it, scutch it and put it on the market just as the farmer puts wool on the market. There should then be proper grading and standardization so that the grower would get the maximum profit from his crop. Under present conditions, however, the farmer does not get twenty per cent of the value of the crop, although there is no reason why he should not get a hundred per cent value; and there are ample possibilities in this industry to induce the farmers to develop the cultivation of flax very largely if the matter were only properly placed before them. The advantage of a demonstration station in the district to which I referred would be that farmers visiting it would get the technical and scientific information necessary in the cultivation of flax, and possibly in little groups in a community they could establish a flax mill. An important feature of the industry is the fact that it offers a solution of the year-the-round labour problem on the farm. The farmer who has fifteen or twenty acres of flax can profitably employ a hired man through the winter months, when otherwise he might not be able to find employment for him. I again appeal to the Government to give this subject their most serious consideration. The proposal I have made bears the stamp of approval of the Flax Growers' Association, which comprises men who have achieved success in the industry and who desire to see a portion of that success fall to the lot of others. I trust that at the earliest possible moment the minister, after consultation with those officials in his department who direct these particular branches of industry, will see his way to carry out the recommendations contained in my resolution.

Mr. PROULX: How many flax mills are there in Canada?

Mr. GLASS: There are sixty-four flax mills; in 1914 there were thirteen.

Mr. PROULX: Are most of them in Ontario?

Mr. GLASS: There are three mills in Quebec, and the rest are in Ontario.

Mr. J. F. FAFARD (L'Islet) (translation): Mr. Speaker, we have listened very attentively to the brief address made by the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat (Mr. Glass). His statements were the more interesting to us that this is the fourth time we are privileged to hear them. The only thing tha remains for him, and that is no doubt what he proposes to do, though I refrain from giving him such advice, is to have 500 copies of his speech printed and distributed in his county. However, I have no doubt that the people of his constituency will be able to judge him on his merits. Had he been in earnest I think it would have been far easier for him to go and see the Minister of Agricultural and to put his question directly to him, and that would have taken but a few minutes. As a matter of feet, the hon. member has a motion before this House, asking the Government to deal with the development of our natural resources; but he seems to think that flax alone makes up all the natural resources of this country. As far as I am concerned, surely I agree that we must help all our industries and the flax industry is undoubtedly one which requires great attention, but I would have liked to hear the hon. member speak also of the other natural resources of this Dominion.

Now that the war is over, Mr. Speaker, the commercial fight is going to start, and there is no better means to fight this battle than to develop our natural resources. Anyone who has seen the country we live in and who has lived here for a certain number of years cannot but like it, willingly makes sacrifices in its behalf and contributes to its progress. The natural resources of Canada, if we give the words their full meaning, include all our industries.

Canada has not only a very large area of unlimited wealth, but it is also a country which can support itself if we know how to develop our natural resources effectively. Agriculture is most prosperous; it is not only sufficient to feed our people, but it leaves also a surplus of several millions for export. Our immense and almost untouched forests, besides providing us with all

we need for building and other purposes, enable us to export every year several million dollars' worth.

Mr. Speaker, in 1918—I am speaking of the province of Quebec only—we had already eighty-one pulp factories, of which 31 were manufacturing pulp and paper, 26, paper only, and 24 paper and pulp combined. It is interesting for us to note that in this industry which is but a few years old, there is nearly $190,000,000 invested, and 23,000 workers are depending upon it.

These figures speak for themselves, and then we must consider that this industry which is but beginning has for its supply inexhaustible forests which are waiting for the woodcutter's axe to ring out the joyous jingle of silver. I spoke of our forests being inexhaustible. For instance if you take an average of five cords of wood per acre, and in view of the fact that two cords of wood yield a ton of pulp, the district of Lake St. John alone could supply one million tons of pulp every year during 50 years. Moreover, if you consider that it takes 25 to 30 years for spruce and balsam to develop, the conclusion is that, in spite of fires which might occur, the district of Lake St. John alone could supply our factories indefinitely with one million tons of pulp every year. The same may be stated and with greater emphasis, I think, of the country bordering on the river St. Maurice and the north shore of the St. Lawrence. Not only do these districts supply us with the raw material, that is wood, but they also afford us the requisite power for its development.

We have in this country the most wonderful water powers of the continent and these have contributed to a great extent to the progress of our industries. You don't need a very observing mind to notice that all our great industries are located in harbours where they can get cheaper power and greater shipping facilities. Three Rivers is a striking example of these industrial settlements.

The city of Three Rivers which was completely destroyed by fire some twenty years ago, is destined to become one of the chief industrial centres of our Province on account of its harbour and the power supplied by the Shawinigan Water and Power Company, and if I thought it would not displease the hon. member from Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau), I might add: thanks also to the initiative of its representative in the House of Commons.

[Mr. Fafard.]

Our water powers are as inexhaustible as our forests.

Suffice it o say that the Provincial engineers estimate that the Lake St. John basin could supply 700,000 horse-power, and, without any thought of being offensive to the hon. member for Lake St. John, there are not a few points along the north shore of the St. Lawrence river, which can supply as much.

Inasmuch as I am speaking of the water-powers of the Province of Quebec I may be allowed to say a few words and to place on record a few data about the works carried out on the St. Maurice river, at the Loutre portage, with a view to modifying the conditions of this river's water-flow. The information I am now giving to the House has been taken from the report of the water courses commission, and the accuracy of the figure is unquestionable.

The St. Maurice is a tributary of the St. Lawrence river into which it empties itself from the North at Three Rivers; it is about 360 miles long and it has a drainage basin of 17,000 square miles.

The main water falls one meets going upstream are: les Forges, les Grès, Shawinigan, Grand'Mère, La-Tuque, The Rapide-Blanc, the Grand-Cœur and the Chaudières. Of these three are already in operation. They are: Shawinigan, Grand'Mère and La-Tuque.

It was in 1909 that the Quebec Government undertook to consider the scheme of regulating the water-flow of this river, and it was finally carried out in December 1917.

This dam is built at a distance of 220 miles from the hydro-electric plant of Shawinigan, forming a storage of 300 square miles in area with a capacity of 160 billion cubic feet of water. This extraordinary mass of water is restrained by a dam 1,626 feet long, having a minimum width of 20 feet and a maximum of 72 feet. The height of the top reaches 57 feet above the natural low water flow of the St. Maurice river, at that point, and 1,335 feet above the sea level.

The weir is 840 feet in length and it can allow a flow of 15,000 cubic feet of water per second for a three-foot wave.

Into the construction of that dam there entered: 71,751 cubic yards of concrete masonry and 720 tons of steel.

The water can flow from the reservoir through ten gates, known as bottom-sluices. Every opening is rectangular measuring 12

feet high by 7½ feet wide. The gates are built of steel and they are operated by a powerful piece of mechanism installed on the top of the masonry.

The total cost of these works, including the construction of the hydro-electric plant and of the dams built along the Manouan river, did not exceed the sum of $2,500,000, and to-day they are giving the Provincial government an annual revenue of $191,000; but it should also be noticed that this revenue must increase with the development of the other water powers which shall be extended in a near future.

We have to-day at La-Loutre the largest reservoir in the world. It is almost twice the size of the reservoir established in the valley of the Nile, in Egypt, by the Assouan dam, the capacity of which is 82 billion cubic feet. The Gatun dam, built in connection with the Panama canal, indeed gives a reservoir of a total capacity of 183 billion cubic feet, but of the whole amount of water held back in this dam, there is only the upper stream that can be penned up without making the Culebra cut unnavigable; the reservoir's capacity that can be turned to account does not exceed from 35 to 40 billion cubic feet of water. We can therefore say with a justifiable national pride that we have the largest reservoir in the world.

Many advantages accrue from this most important piece of work. Besides insuring the workmen against unemployment throughout the year and necessarily contributing to reduce the cost for producing motive power, it does especially attain its main object which was to control the river's water-flow. That you may realize, Mr. Speaker, the full importance of the control of that water-flow, I beg leave to submit that 12 tons of coal are required to produce one horse-power, and, as the additional power supplied by the storage of water on the St. Maurice river amounts to 48,000 horse-power which can be sold to the manufacturers, we may readily draw the conclusion that this construction is now saving 600,000 tons of coal per annum, and three times that amount when all the falls will have been likewise developed.

Under natural conditions, the St. Maurice river's water-flow, at Shawinigan, was of 170,000 cubic feet per second during the flood period in the Spring, but of only 6,000 cubic feet per second, during the Summer and Winter seasons.

To-day we can guarantee these companies 12,000 cubic feet per second the whole year round, which is the power required by their industry. The increase given the Shawinigan Water and Power Co., when the water is low, is equal to 82,000 h.p., which means an average of 32,250 h.p. a year. The surplus power obtained when all the available falls are harnessed will be about 140,000 h.p. per year and 400,000 h.p. when the water is at its low level.

I have given, Mr. Speaker, according to the statistics I referred to, the necessary information about the water power of the Loutre river which is to be called after the name of the Prime Minister of the Province. I gave them out, not only because it is interesting to hear about the matter, but also to have the figures placed on Hansard. Now that I have given that information, let us see what conclusion we may draw. I said a moment ago that agriculture was progressing in the province of Quebec, but it did not do so itself. It required a campaign of education and we had to send agriculturists throughout the province to teach the farmers what they learned at school. We had to get also a minister well acquainted with agricultural matters and we found a very good one in the person of the hon. Joseph Edouard Caron who is as well known in Ottawa as he is in Quebec.

I spoke of our forests and I pointed out their development in recent years; but to obtain that result the government of the province of Quebec had to adopt a policy such as would show foresters that they were ready to help them. It is with that object in view that the government of sir Lomer Gouin created a new Department which is called the Department of Forest Management, to oversee the cutting of the wood and ensure the protection of our forests. The government is working hand in hand with the lumberers toward safeguarding our forests in the interest of the country. The new department will see to it that no undersized tree is cut. And all this, Mr. Speaker, required a lot of work and the provincial Government had to place at the head of the Departments men who were able to follow a definite policy.

As to water powers, it is about the same thing. They did not evolve spontaneously. A policy had to be drawn up. I remember the time when much power was wasted in the province of Quebec; we were selling water powers without even knowing their possibilities. What occurred in the meantime? The Government appointed a commission of running waters and to-day water powers are leased only after their capacity and industrial usefulness have been ascer-

tained. At the head of that commission, the Government put a most capable and highly appreciated business man and efficient administrator: the hon. S. N. Parent.

If this Government wish to obtain the results as pointed out in the motion introduced by the hon. member who has preceded me, they must do something more than talk about the development of our natural resources; they must act, devise and carry out a definite policy. In this like in any other policy, it is necessary that all the members of the Government be jointly liable and that they all agree to develop the resources of this country.

A conference was held recently in Buffalo by the International Commission and it is announced that on the 6th of April next another conference will be held in Washington to discuss the opportunity of building canals from Ottawa to the Great Lakes. I do not think that it is a purely federal matter. If other provinces want to establish water powers of 5,000 or 6,000 h.p., let them do what we have done in the province to which I belong, that is supply the companies with the necessary funds and bear the cost of the works.

I do not intend to dilate any further on the subject but let me say that I consider that it is the duty of this Government to adopt a clear cut policy. A single minister alone cannot be expected to deal with this matter; all the ministers, all the members of the Government should get together to promote the development of our natural resources.

Hon. S. F. TOLMIE (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the discussion of the flax industry by the hon. member for East Middlesex (Mr. Glass) and the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Fafard). I can assure them that the Government is keenly alive to the development of this valuable industry. At the present time, however, prices are extremely high—much higher than they were in 1914—and it is probable that there will be a certain amount of settling down when things begin to assume a normal condition. The Government, being seized with the importance of this industry, established at the Central Experimental Farm at Ottawa a mill for carrying on experiments in connection with the various processes connected with the preparation of flax for market. Ottawa was selected for the purpose because it was felt that the experiments could be kept more closely under the eye of the Department of Agriculture and of the director of the Experimental Farms. In connection with this work they are carrying on experiments in retting, breaking, scutching and also de-seeding. All this has resulted in securing a great deal of important and valuable information in connection with the industry. Samples are secured from all over the Dominion with the result that they are getting an excellent idea of the quality of the product from the various provinces. After looking at the industry from all angles, and after listening to the very excellent address of the hon. member for East Middlesex, we must all be convinced of the very great possibilities of the flax growing industry. The principal flax growing districts in Ontario are those around London, Chatham, taking in the counties of Kent, Middlesex, Huron, Perth and Waterloo. I have been informed by those in close touch with the work that Ottawa is not a first class district for this purpose. In some years it produces an excellent quality of flax, but it is found that if the summers are very dry the plant does not reach perfection. Quebec gives great promise as a flax-producing province. At Chambly-Vercheres flax grows very well indeed, although some of the very best quality is produced at Gaspé. The Maritime Provinces are also producing first class flax. In British Columbia in the delta land of the Fraser River valley first class flax can be produced.

Experiments are being carried on by the Government in connection with the various mechanical appliances for dealing with this crop. Pulling machines have been experimented with for several years, and I am assured now by one of the most prominent officials in the department that an improved type of this machine is expected to be ready by next year which will perform this operation. In all parts of the world pulling is performed by hand, and consequently in a country such as ours, where the cost of labour is very high, it is a serious handicap to the production of flax in competition with those countries where labour is very cheap. I sincerely hope, therefore, that his expectations will not be disappointed.

Experimental work has also been carried on in connection with de-seeding machines. The principal trouble with the ordinary de-seeder has been that it to a certain extent injured the seed, interfering very greatly with its germinating properties. This has now been overcome to a considerable extent, and we are producing seed that is

received very favourably in the markets of Europe.

Scutchers are also being tested out, and after going over the plant and discussing the work with the men who are thoroughly familiar with it, I am certain that what has been accomplished at the Experimental Farm will be of great benefit to the producers of flax all over the Dominion.

As was pointed out by the hon. mover of the resolution, our seed has been able to compete successfully in the markets of the world with the very best seed produced. He has also pointed out the fact that before the war about eighty or ninety per cent of the flax used in Europe was produced by Russia. If you take into consideration the new system of government which is in control of Russia, I think you will agree with me that it will probably be some time before that country need be regarded as a dangerous competitor in the flax market.

5 p.m.

We have a good market in the United States, only small sections of that great country having proved suitable for flax production; we also have a good market at home; and, in addition, we are selling our product in Belgium, France and Ireland. It is particularly creditable that we are able to sell in the markets of Europe, where the highest class of flax is produced and where some of the very finest linens are manufactured.

A large proportion of the seed exported has been carefully inspected, graded and tested as to its germinating qualities, and it has been found that this procedure secures for the grower a very much higher price than we used to receive for seed which was not so treated. I understand that at the meeting held in London last week a resolution was passed asking the Government to adopt two grades, one ninety per cent and the other ninety-two and a half per cent. I can assure our flax growers that when this resolution is received it will be given the very closest attention by this department.

The fibre is rather more difficult to grade, but we are keenly alive to any possibilities tending towards improvement along this line.

In 1918 an Order in Council was passed authorizing the distribution of $25,000 per year to encourage the manufacture of thread from flax grown in this country, but I have not full information as to whether any of this money has been paid, it being a matter dealt with by the Department of Trade and Commerce.

My hon. friend from East Middlesex (Mr. Glass) must not be disappointed at the slow development of our flax industry, for the reason that our agriculturists are already educated in the production of other crops very much easier to produce, and which during the war yielded very satisfactory returns. Consequently a campaign of education will take a little time to bring to our farmers a realization of the fact that flax-growing, although giving a good deal of trouble and requiring considerable labour, is a very profitable crop to raise.

With regard to the exhaustion of land as a result of flax growing, this, I think, can be overcome by having a proper rotation of crops. My department fully realizes the importance of flax production and I will see that it keeps in very close touch with its developments and will be glad to render all the aid I possibly can which promises to be of value to the industry. In this regard I wish to say to the hon. member who proposed the resolution that while attending to this matter I will keep in mind his suggestion concerning the "putting of more pep into the business."

Motion agreed to.

TRANSLATION OF FRENCH SPEECHES.

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Vercheres) moved:

That, in the opinion of the House, whereas the French language is one of the two official languages of the House of Commons of Canada and many of the members use the French language in addressing the said House of Commons and it is important that all members of the said House of Commons should have knowledge of the speeches so delivered; and whereas a very large majority of the English-speaking members do not understand the French language, and the speeches which are delivered in French do not appear in English in the Debates unless it be in the revised edition some six or seven months after they have been delivered, which is the opposite of what follows in connection with speeches which are delivered in English, the translation of same being published in French in the Debates of the following day; therefore the speeches delivered in French should be translated into English and so published in the Unrevised Debates and distributed the following day.

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly-Verchères) (translation): Mr. Speaker, it is very seldom that I address this House in french. The reason is very simple: A majority of my colleagues do not understand french and, as I wish, whenever I, rise, to make myself understood by all, I generally use the English language. This is

to be regretted, Mr. Speaker, but it's a fact. Therefore, in rising this afternoon, I trust that the hon. members who have so generously supported the resolution embodied in the various Peace Treaties, with a view to protect the Bulgarians and Czecho-Slovak minorities and all the Balkan minorities in respect to their language, should realize the importance of maintaining the two official languages in Canada and of making efforts to learn one of those two languages, that is to say French. It will be the surest means to promote unity and harmony between the two great races of Canada.

I do not propose to retain the House very long on the resolution which appears in my name on the orders of the day. The object of this resolution commends itself to the unanimous approbation of the members of the House and do not know any other proposal which could more efficiently promote the bonne entente.

Let me read the preamble. The first reason is as follows:

Whereas the French language is one of the two official languages of the House of Commons of Canada;

No one will venture to deny the truth of of that ground.

Section 133 of the British North America Act provides for the use of the French language in this House and foes even so far as to make such use imperative as regards the votes and proceedings, the journals and reports of the House. The second reason is the following:

Whereas a great many speeches are delivered in French.

I have notice with pleasure that many hon. members have availed themselves, this year, of the right which they had to speak French. I congratulate them and I believe that when the resolution now before the Chair has been adopted, they may use the French language much more freely, because the English-speaking members who do not understand our own language will be able to read the translation of their speeches the day after they have been delivered. The third consideration is the following:

Whereas it is important that all the hon. members should be made aware of everything said in Parliament.

It is obvious that, in order to properly follow the discussion of public matters within these precincts, all the hon. members must understand the suggestions made on both sides of this House. The forth reason is as follow:

Whereas a very large majority of the English-speaking members do not understand the French language.

Needless to dwell upon this. Many are the hon. members who not only do not understand French, but are unable to read it, and this leads occasionally to some very strange happenings. In the course of the session before last, for instance, the day after my hon. friend from Quebec East had spoken in French on the subject of the subsidy granted by the Government, to the Canadian agency in London, I met one of my colleagues, and here is what he told me in English. I shall repeat his very words, as they are so typical:

(Text.) It is too bad that Mr. Lapointe did not speak in English this afternoon, he is such an able speaker and it is always a pleasure for us to listen to him. He spoke in French and the only word I understand was an English word: "camouflage."

(Translation)—Well, Mr. Speaker, is it not obvious that the hon. member who not only did not understand Mr. Lapointe's speech but delivered himself of this ingenuous and candid statement that the word "camouflage" is English, is greatly in need that the French speeches be translated the day after they have been delivered, so that he may take cognizance of them?

May I be allowed, however, before I stop descanting as to whether the majority of the hon. members do understand French, to congratulate the acting Prime Minister (sir George Foster) on the magnificent speech which he delivered in French at the beginning of the session. I venture to hope that his colleagues will follow his example and that more speeches will be delivered in French on the other side of the House, as I realize that some of those hon. members are able to speak our beautiful language. We promise them, right now, to be considerate for the effort which they will make in delivering French speches. I now come to my conclusions which are the following:

In the opinion of this House, the speeches delivered in French should be immediately translated into English and so published in the Unrevised Edition of the Debates which immediately follows the sitting of the House.

There exists, as regards the issuing of Hansard, something anomalous which has probably escaped the notice of many hon. members. When speeches are delivered in English, the text appears on the day following in the report; and in the case of speeches delivered in French, we have the text also in that same report, the day following. Therefore, the first edition of the

Debates gives the original wording of the speeches delivered. The speeches are printed in the language in which they were delivered. A day or two after, we have a second issue reproducing, in French, all the speeches which have been delivered. So then, the speeches delivered in English on the eve are translated and reproduced in the second edition, and the speeches delivered in French are so reproduced a second time, two days after; but English translation of the speeches delivered in French and which it is of interest of the members of this House not conversant with our language to know are, are published only seven or eight months later, in the Revised Edition. Consequently, in order to know what was said by members who spoke in French, the members who do not understand French are obliged to wait seven or eight months and read those speeches in the Revised Edition of the Debates, which volumes are kept rather as source of reference and for the purpose of consultation.

Such is the untoward state of things which my motion intends suppressing and I wish to point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that even the public is aware of it. In an article which appeared in the issue of March 15 last under the heading: "French Speeches in Commons," the correspondent of "Le Devoir" advised the members to address the House in French; he granted that when debating important matters it might be better to speak English in order that every member might understand, but he went on:

> Excepting important occurrences when we must condescend to use the language of the Semi-Canadians, what harm could there be in not being understood or even listened to on the other side of the Table? On the day following those concerned would always be at liberty to refer to the French translation.

Well, such is not the case, Mr. Speaker. The official translation of French speeches is not to be found in Hansard of the day after or the following day; as I said a moment ago, it is only published in the revised edition of Hansard, that is, six or seven months after the speeches have been delivered.

I also contend that the immediate translation of French speeches would be useful to the people because you have no doubt been, like me, in a position to notice that the English papers very often impute to us statements altogether different from those we uttered in the House of Commons. I had myself occasion to notice in the English papers reports of speeches delivered in French in the House and very often those reports conveyed a different meaning.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move this resolution which will be primarily in the interests of the people and an incentive to those among us who wish to speak French; it will prompt us to use that language freely, knowing that our remarks will be correctly translated the day after and that we shall not be in danger of seeing the statements delivered upon the floor of this House distorted by journalists who are inimical to us and friendly to the Administration.

Mr. J. E. S. E. d'ANJOU (Rimouski) (translation): Mr. Speaker, I must first congratulate my excellent friend from Chambly-Verchères (Mr. Archambault) for having submitted his resolution which I am most pleased to second. I do not intend to speak at any great length, particularly after the spirited remarks my hon. friend has just uttered. Moreover, the resolution speaks for itself. No one can deny that French is one of the two official languages of this country. Consequently, we avail ourselves of a prerogative when we urge the Government to have French speeches translated together with English speeches.

For my part, without unduly boasting, I may sa that from the time I had the privilege of occupying a seat in this House, I have always been one of those who thought and still think that the French-speaking members should speak French in the House of Commons. Therefore this resolution is timely and the Government, I hope, will unhesitatingly pass it.

There is but one alternative. Both languages are official in this county; we are entitled to speak French and we avail ourselves of that privilege. But, unfortunately, as the hon. member from Chambly-Verchères said, the majority of the members on the right and some of our friends on the left do not understand French. Then, it is most important that speeches delivered in French shoud be translated into English the following day, so that our friends and the members on that side who do not understand that language may be acquainted with what we said the previous day.

Since we are upon that question, I intend seizing the opportunity to call the attention of the Government upon what goes on in the several branches of the administration. We notice every day in the newspapers that French has not the place it is entitled to. They refuse to deliver French forms; they even turn aside French correspondence. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is an abuse against which I feel bound to protest, and

the opportunity appears to me a favourable one.

At all events, by agreeing to the resolution of the hon. member for Chambly-Verchères, the Parliament of Canada and the Government would acknowledge that French is one of the official languages in this country and is entitled to be spoken in this House. It will be the means of furthering good will between the various elements of the population of Canada, the best means of getting well acquainted with one another and opening unity and concord throughout the country.

The CHAIRMAN (translation): Is it the pleasure of the House that this motion should be adopted?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I am not quite sure but what I could make a better fist at speaking French than I can in understanding it when it is spoken across the floor of the House. Therefore, I have not been able to follow all that my hon. friend has said. The gist of his motion is quite apparent, and the only point that arises in my mind is this: I would rather that my h n. friend would not press his motion to a conclusion until some inquiry was made into the possibility of carrying out what he proposes in his motion in exactly the way that he wishes it carried out. I am entirely in sympathy with the idea that these speeches should be translated and at the disposal of the members in a reasonable time; and if it be true that it runs to five, or six, or seven months before these translations appear, that is not a condition of things that ought to be continued. My sympathy then is entirely with the purpose of the motion, but this is a matter which pertains to the management of the translators and the publishing of the debates, and is under the Debates Committee, composed of members of both sides of the House. I am informed that to carry out the exact wording of the motion of my hon. friend is physically impossible. So my suggestion to him is that, having brought the matter before the House, as he has done in a very temporate and full manner, he shall not press his motion to a conclusion; that it stand if he pleases, or that he withdraw it, as may seem best to him, and I will undertake that the matter shall be taken up at once and that we shall come to a conclusion which will be fair and also which will be possible of being carried out.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Shelburne and Queen's): Mr. Speaker, this motion has been moved and seconded by two French-speaking members. As a matter of fact, it is the English-speaking members who should desire the improvement that my hon. friend is asking for. Of course, the better thing would be—and I wish it were so—that all members of this House could speak both French and English, and in that respect our French friends put most of us to shame. Every one of them can speak and understand both languages, whereas but a limited number of the English members of this House have that pleasure, although the number has been enlarged lately by the addition of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster.) The only good thing we have out of the Peace Conference is that my right hon. friend has learned to speak French. It is a rather expensive lesson, but it is a good thing that we have some favourable results. But if we cannot all understand the French language and have the pleasure of listening to and enjoying the addresses of our French friends, the next best thing is that we shall as early as possible afterwards have those addresses translated into English. I heartily sympathize with the motion which, as I have already said, should come from us who are English Canadian rather than from those who are French. The Minister of Trade and Commerce has suggested some difficulties in the matter; these are for the consideration of the hon. gentleman who has made the motion, but I desire to express my hearty sympathy with the object he has in view.

Mr. E. B. DEVLIN (Wright) (translation): Mr. Speaker, before this resolution carries, I would like to add a few words to the remarks made by hon. members who have already spoken.

I must confess that unfortunately I do not frequently enough speak French in this House; to-day I make use of that language intentionally, because I absolutely recognize that both languages are official in the Canadian Parliament.

I am very glad that the hon. member for Chambly and Verchères has introduced the resolution now under discussion. It is most important that every member and every voter in this country should have in hand the speeches as delivered both in English and French. If more translators are required, it would be false economy not to appoint a greater number.

I do not want to make any lengthy remarks on this question, but I wish to tell my French colleagues, as has just been

done by the hon. member for Queen's and Shelburne (Mr. Fielding) and the right hon. acting prime minister (Sir George Foster), that I am in sympathy with every thing contained in the resolution, and I trust the Government will see that there are no more complaints and that both language are recognised and put on an equal footing in this country.

Mr. O TURGEON (Gloucester) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I which to join my voice to that of the hon. members who have supported the resolution which has been so eloquently presented by my hon. friend from Chambly and Verchères (Mr. Archambault).

It is seldom I speak French in this Parliament and until now I had a good reason for so doing; it was because, when I addressed my colleagues as well as the minister then representing New-Brunswick in the Government, I was always speaking to members who would not have otherwise understood my arguments and who might have been led to believe that I was taking advantage of their ignorance of my own language by not addressing them in a way to be understood; but now that the province of New Brunswick has had no minister for almost a year, now that the hon. the acting Prime Minister speaks French better than I do, I hesitate no longer to use the French language in this House. I am also anxious to criticize a statement made by my young friend while speaking of the province of Quebec. I would not like to have Parliament or the country led to believe that there are no French Canadians or French in this House but those who hail from the province of Quebec. I take pleasure in having this House and the country remember that there are also other French Canadians than those who have remained in the home of the French language, who closely observe whatever may be of help or otherwise toward the maintenance of our language. We are here three of us from the province of New Brunswick, representing three counties largely Acadian-French. We are just as much attached to that language as are our colleagues of the province of Quebec; we are therefore in favour of anything that may serve to enhance the French language in public opinion, not only in Canada, but throughout the whole world, and particularly of having the French portion of the Debates of this House translated as promptly as the English, in order that throughout this country, as well as outside of it, the arguments submitted by the members may be known without being distorted by some newspaper men. That is why I heartily agree with the hon. member for Chambly-Verchères (Mr. Archambault) and the seconder of the motion, the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. d'Anjou) and I hope my hon. friend, the acting Premier, may find a way—and that is always easy where there is a will—to remedy the state of affairs now existing and that should not exist.

Mr. J. E. FONTAINE (Hull) (translation): Mr. Speaker, it is my duty to support the motion of the hon. member for Chambly-Verchères (Mr. Archambault). I think it is also the duty of all the French speaking members; the more so, as stated by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), because it is a good turn we wish to do to our English-speaking friends who have not the advantage of understanding and of speaking the French language.

Every member sitting in this House has the right, when rising to speak, to be understood, and if, unfortunately, some of his colleagues cannot understand what he says, it is surely the Government's duty to see that the words of such member, if he speaks French, be translated on the very next day, so that all may know what he did say. As states by one of the previous speakers, the French language is official and recognized in this Parliament, it must therefore enjoy the same privileges as the English. Although thankful to the hon. the Acting Prime Minister for his goodwill, I think he does not go far enough, and that he should immediately tell us that he will take the required means to do justice to every member of this House and especially to the English-speaking members, that they may be able to read on the very next day the French speeches translated into their own tongue. The Government now presided over by the hon. the Acting Prime Minister have, in my opinion, succeeded in overcoming difficulties far greater than that of finding a larger number of translators. I know, I am convinced, that much harder problems have had to be solved, and it would require ever so little good will on the part of the Government to settle this question. Circumstances are most favourable, every body is now talking of entente cordiale, every one wishes to have peace and union between the two races of this country; never was these a more propitious opportunity; let the Government set the good example and do an act, not of generosity, but of justice to an important por-

tion of this country's population and find the way to fulfil the demand submitted by the hon. member for Chambly-Verchères.

Once more, it seems to me that the Government through the hon. the Acting Premier, have no excuse for asking any delay; we should immediately be promised that the matter will be adjusted and every body satisfied. I am fully confident we shall obtain justice.

Mr. P. F. CASGRAIN (Charlevoix-Montmorency) (translation): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to detain the attention of the House very long, after the few speeches we have heard, and especially after the clear and precise remarks made by the hon. member for Chambly-Verchères (Mr. Archambault), supported by the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. D'Anjou), there is nothing for me to do but to endorse and subscribe fully to every one of the statements contained in the motion before the House. If I do not often speak in French in the House, the reason is that, as my hon. friend the member for Chambly-Verchères stated, in many cases the members of the Government and those who support them cannot understand us when we speak in that language and that the speeches made in French are not translated immediately, with the result that our claims cannot have the same effect when only made known to the hon. members of the right four, five or six months later.

I believe that the Government should not rest content with only saying "we will remedy this state of things by making an investigation and finding out what can be done." That is a pretty vague and evasive answer; and it is the one which is very frequently given us in this House. I would prefer to hear the leader of the Government tell us now what he intends to do. With an investigation, with a commission, it will mean further delays, and we will reach the end of the session, and perhaps the end of this Parliament, before anything is done. I would therefore ask the Government to fully consider the question and tell us presently what we are to expect.

Mr. C. P. POWER (Quebec-South): Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to join the hon. members for Chambly-Verchères (Mr. Archambault), and for Rimouski (Mr. d'Anjou) as well as the other French Canadian and Acadian hon. members, who have asked that in this Canadian House of Commons the beautiful French language be treated with equity. Their claims I consider to be just and reasonable.

[Mr. Fontaine.]

Mr. Speaker, as a citizen of the province of Quebec, as one of those who have always lived among the people of the same origin as these gentlemen, I desire to express my most thorough sympathy with resolution of the hon. member for Chambly-Verchères. As was stated a moment ago by the hon. member for Queens-Shelburne (Mr. Fielding), it should rather belong to us, the English speaking members of this House, to claim the right to read—since we cannot always understand—what is said so well and sometimes with so much eloquence by our French-speaking colleagues.

I understand that beside the reasons given by my hon. friend the Acting Prime Minister (Sir George Foster), there may be legitimate excuses for the failure of the Government and the ministers to have the remarks made in the French language in this House printed on the following day.

I trust that the Acting Prime Minister and those having charge of the matter will attend to it as soon as possible, in order that in future the speeches delivered in French be immediately translated, and that the English-speaking members may as early as possible appreciate the intelligence, the eloquence and I would say the erudition of our French-speaking colleagues.

Mr. R. L. RICHARDSON (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I very much regret that my command of the beautiful French language is not sufficient to enable me to reply to some of the very able deliverances that we have listened to this afternoon, but as chairman of the Debates Committee I shall be very glad to call a meeting to discuss the merits of the suggestion made by my hon. friend from Chambly and Vercheres (Mr. Archambault) if the matter is referred to the committee as suggested by the Acting Prime Minister (Sir George Foster). It must be evident, however, to hon. members that if the resolution were adopted and put into force immediately, it would be impossible to publish the Unrevised edition of Hansard at the time it is now published. It now reaches hon. members about ten o'clock in the morning, but if all the speeches were to be translated, and especially if during a debate a number of hon. members spoke in the French language, it would be impossible to have the unrevised edition placed in the hands of hon. members at ten o'clock the following morning. However, the members of the Debates Committee—I am sure I can speak for them—will give the matter careful consideration when it comes before them.

I was struck the other day by the report made to the Board of Internal Economy of the House of Commons by Mr. Achille Frechette. I presume he was authorized to make that report by the Internal Economy Committee. I understand that he was connected with the Translation Branch of the House of Commons, and that he proceeded to Belgium and Switzerland to make some investigations, the results of which are embodied in his report. I shall read only one or two very brief extracts as I do not want to prolong this debate unduly. He said, referring to the Debates:

As is the case in Canada, the debates may be carried on in Belgium and in Switzerland in either or any of the official languages of the country.

In Belgium, where the House is composed of 152 Representatives, and sits from 2 to 5 o'clock p.m., a synoptic report of the debates is published on the same evening. On the third day thereafter, at 8 a.m., a stenographic report is published under the name of Annales Parlementaires. These Annales contain the speeches in extenso, but only in the language in which they were made. If a member has not furnished his corrections of the stenographic report of his speech within 48 hours, the latter, instead of being published verbatim in the Annales, is only inserted in the condensed form as found in the synoptic report, with mention of the fact.

Further on he says:

In Switzerland the stenographers take down only the debates on federal laws, and certain federal arrêtés (a term about corresponding to our Orders in Council). These speeches are published, in their own text only, in a Bulletin Stenographique, which hardly forms 600 pages at the end of the session. As to the rest, a translator sums up, verbally, in the House, in French if the speech was in German, and in German if it was in French, the conclusions of the different speeches.

It only remains, under this head, to state that the Belgium system, which is much more expeditious than ours, must also be, it seems to me, much less costly, inasmuch as the speeches are published in extenso in their original language only, and that only a resumé thereof is translated for the needs of the day.

When the matter comes before the committee it will be in a position to consider any suggestions made in this report, and I am sure if any hon. gentlemen who are not members of the committee have any representations to make we shall be delighted to have them attend the meetings of the committee, and I can promise, as chairman, that any such representations will be given the most careful consideration.

Mr. A. M. DECHENE (Montmagny): Mr. Speaker, the motion proposed by the hon. member for Chambly-Verchères deserves the attention of both sides of the House. Complaints and whispers very often come to our ears, but with no effective results. In spite of the acting Premier's good will, we are sorry to state that the French language, under any and every form, is being driven out of the Parliament of Canada and from the different Departments. Wherever we find a French civil servant, whether he speaks the language or he is called upon to either translate or transcribe it, he is left in the lurch or he is most unfairly treated.

This question, Mr Speaker, requires to be much enlarged upon and I would like to discuss it at a greater length; but, as it is now six o'clock, I would move the House do adjourn.

On the motion of Mr. Déchêne the debate was adjourned.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before calling it six o'clock I desire to point out that resolution No. 12 standing in the name of the hon. member for St. Johns and Iberville (Mr. Demers) was not called owing to the fact that he wished to have it placed on the Order Paper for to-morrow, under the heading "Notices of Motions for Production of Papers." The hon. member is in the House and desires to make his motion now.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PRODUCTION OF PAPERS.

Mr. DEMERS:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, correspondence, and other papers in the possession of the Government, in connection with the transfer of mail bags from the C.P.R. mail car to the mail car of the Quebec, Montreal and Southern Railway Company, and from the latter to the former, at Iberville Junction, during the period extending from the month of November, 1917, to the month of April, 1918.

At six o'clock the House adjourned, without question being put, pursuant to rule.

Thursday, March 25, 1920.

The House met at Three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill No. 33, to incorporate International Loan Company.—Mr. Blake.

Bill No. 34, respecting The Montreal and Southern Counties Railway Company.—Mr. Archambault.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

Statement re the Naval Forces of Canada laid on the Table in accordance with the provisions of section 47, chapter 43, 9-10, Edward VII.—Hon. Mr. Ballantyne.

Copy of Order in Council P.C. 1961, dated September 29, 1919, covering the appointment of an Advisory Board as prescribed in the Act to amend the Proprietary or Patent Medicine Act, chapter 66, 9-10, George V.—Hon. Mr. Rowell.

Copy of an Order in Council P.C. 2079, dated October 8, 1919, covering the appointment of the Dominion Council of Health.—Hon. Mr. Rowell.

Copy of Order in Council P.C. 328, dated February 11, 1920, accepting the resignation of the Hon. Walter R. Rollo as a member of the Dominion Council of Health and appointing in his place Mr. H. J. Halford, of Hamilton, Ont., Vice-President of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada.—Hon. Mr. Rowell.

FRANCHISE ACT.

ADDITIONAL COPIES ORDERED PRINTED.

Hon. HUGH GUTHRIE (Acting Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker with the unanimous consent of the House I beg to move:

That 1,000 additional copies in English and 250 additional copies in French of Bill No. 12, an Act respecting the Election of Members of the House of Commons and the Electoral Franchise, be printed, and that Rule 74 be suspended in connection therewith.

Motion agreed to.

DOMINION LANDS ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Minister of the Interior) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 35 to amend the Dominion Lands Act.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING: Explain please.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This Bill is not of an important character. It provides for the acquirement of land earned under homestead by those who are refused naturalization only because they are unable to speak the English or the French language. There are one or two other minor provisions.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INDIAN ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Minister of the Interior) moved:

That Bill No. 14 to amend the Indian Act be referred to a special committee composed of Messrs. Boys, Charlton, Davidson, Ethier, Lapointe, Lanctôt, Reid (Mackenzie), Stacey and Wilson (Saskatoon), for consideration thereof and all matters pertaining thereto, with power to call for papers, persons and records, to examine witnesses under oath, and to report from time to time, and for that purpose that Rule No. 11 be suspended.

Motion agreed to.

[Mr. Ballantyne.]

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

COST OF STEFANSSON EXPEDITION.

Mr. THOMPSON (Yukon):

What was the total cost to the Government of the exploration expedition sent to the Arctic Ocean with V. Stefansson and party, including the cost of ships, supplies and all amounts for any and all purposes?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: $519,370.97.

PURCHASE OF SCREENINGS.

Mr. BLAIR:

1. What are the names of the elevators or companies from whom screenings were bought between November 1, 1917, and August 31, 1919, by the Department of Agriculture?

2. What quantity was purchased from each elevator or company and what were the prices paid to each?

Hon. Mr. TOLMIE:

1. Bole Grain Company, Fort William, Ont.; Canadian Feed Mfg. Co., Fort William, Ont.; Canadian Government Elevators, Fort William, Ont.; Canadian Pacific Railway Co., Fort William, Ont.; Consolidated Elevator Co., Winnipeg, Man.; Davidson and Smith, Fort William, Ont.; Eastern Terminal Elevator Co., Winnipeg, Man.; Empire Elevator Co., Winnipeg, Man.; Grand Trunk Pacific Elevator Co., Winnipeg, Man.; Mutual Elevator Co., Winnipeg, Man.; National Elevator Co., Winnipeg, Man.; North Western Elevator Co., Winnipeg, Man.; Ogilvie Flour Mills Co., Fort William, Ont.; Port Arthur Terminal Elevator Co., Winnipeg, Man.; Robin Hood Mills Co., Medicine Hat, Alta.; Saskatchewan Co-operative Elevator Co., Winnipeg, Man.; M. Sellers & Sons, Fort William, Ont.; Thunder Bay Elevator Co., Winnipeg, Man.; Western Terminal Elevator Co., Winnipeg, Man.

2.

Elevator.	Quantity tons.	Quantity lbs.	Price per ton.
Bole Grain Co.	33	....	$35.00
Canadian Feed Mfg. Co.	317	140	35.00
Canadian Government Elevator Co.	794	490	35.00
Can. Pacific Rail. Co.	66	....	35.00
Consolidated Elevator Co.	1,117	1,730	35.00
Davidson & Smith	927	200	35.00
Eastern Terminal Elev. Co.	361	1,142	35.00
Empire Elevator Co. ..	899	160	35.00
Grand Trunk Pacific Elevator Co.	2,514	570	35.00
Mutual Elevator Co. ..	548	160	35.00
National Elevator Co. ..	38	770	35.00
North Western Elev. Co.	814	650	35.00
Ogilvie Flour Mills Co.	869	980	35.00

Elevator.	Quantity tons.	lbs.	Price per ton.
Port Arthur Terminal Elevator Co.	2,012	1,410	35.00
Robin Hood Mills Co.	65	1,860	35.00
Saskatchewan Co-operative Elevator Co. ..	1,616	1,280	35.00
M. Sellers & Sons	173	1,490	35.00
Thunder Bay Elevator Co.	565	60	35.00
Western Terminal Elevator Co.	1,075	1,510	35.00

GRASSHOPPER PLAGUE EXPECTED IN THE WEST.

Mr. GOULD:

1. Have any representations, petitions or other correspondence been received by the Government from representatives of various municipalities in South-eastern Saskatchewan, pointing out that from present indications there will in all probability be serious grasshopper plagues in districts overrun last year?

2. If so, what action has been taken to avoid a repetition of the destruction caused by the said plague?

3. Will the Department of Agriculture take immediate steps to investigate the advisability of sowing flax in the districts so infested, and if necessary supply flax seed in place of the wheat and oat seed now held?

Hon. Mr. TOLMIE:

1. We have had no petitions or other correspondence from representatives of any municipalities in South-eastern Saskatchewan regarding the expected outbreak of locusts in 1920. Our own officers, however, have personally investigated many districts in South-eastern Saskatchewan as well as portions of Manitoba and have found large numbers of eggs of destructive species, which certainly point to the probability of another outbreak occurring in 1920.

2. In order to meet any threatened outbreak of locusts in the Prairie Provinces in 1920 officers of the Entomological Branch, working in close co-operation with provincial officials, will conduct a vigorous educational campaign so that farmers in infested districts will know exactly what remedial measures to adopt. In this latter connection the importance of widespread community action will be specially emphasized. A special circular dealing with the locust pest is now in press and will soon be available.

3. The advisability of sowing flax in infested districts is of questionable value. The point has been previously raised that if flax is sown in soil infested areas, the land would be kept clear for a definite period in spring during which time the young hoppers would be starved owing to lack of food. The reply to this of course is that in addition to the fields which had been prepared for crop, all stubble fields, roadways and pastures as well as unoccupied areas would also have to be kept free of vegetation. This latter of course is impossible.

A valuable consideration in locust infested districts is to obtain a vigorous growth of the crop before it is attacked and to sow crops that are best able to withstand the attacks of these insects. In this connection rye being of quicker growth and more hardy, would doubtless be the best of all cereals to sow. Flax, on the other hand being sown late and having far less resisting power than cereals would suffer far more seriously were it to be attacked by locusts. Taking into consideration all these circumstances we could not consider the abandoning of cereals in favour of flax to be a wise policy.

MATERIAL IN NEW PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS.

Mr. COPP:

1. Was any of the material used in the construction of the new Parliament Buildings imported from the United States?

2. If so, what different kinds of material was so imported, what amount of each, and at what cost?

3. How much has been paid contractors for the construction of said buildings under their contract on the percentage basis?

4. Have said contractors been paid in full? If not, how much is still due them?

5. How much has been paid the architects on said buildings to date?

6. To what architects were amounts paid and how much to each?

7. Have they been paid in full? If not, how much is still due them?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Yes.

2. 4,859 cu. ft. Indiana limestone, W. McMillan & Son, Chicago, $2,455.66; 84,229 cu. ft. Ohio sandstone, G. P. Sherwood & Co., Montreal, $103,649.63; 1,000 brls. Atlas cement, Bremner, Ltd., Montreal, $5,477; 400 brls. Atlas cement, Barrett Bros., Ottawa, $2,439.36; 11,500 brls. fire brick, Barrett Bros., Ottawa, $576.50; 147,000 ft. conduit, Can. General Electric Co., Ottawa, $27,221.52; 19,025 conduit bushings, Can. General Electric Co., Ottawa, $632.68; 4,520 conduit couplings, Can. General Electric Co., Ottawa, $855.89; 36,263 conduit locknuts, Can. General Electric Co., Ottawa $549.32; 441 conduit elbows, Can. General Electric Co., Ottawa, $1,389.36; 18,000 enamel brick, Dartnell, Ltd., Montreal, $1,949.50; 260 Auth terminal and battery stop, Eclipse Plating & Sales Co., Ottawa, $1,776.68; 645 Auth connectors, Eclipse Plating & Sales Co., Ottawa, $9,908.86; 260 bronze nipples, Eclipse Plating & Sales Co., Ottawa, $588; 1 annunciator, Eclipse Plating & Sales Co., Ottawa, $3,571; Miss. electrical mtl.

Northern Electric Co., Ottawa, $5,481.01; ray reflectors, Northern Electric Co., Ottawa, $4,047.64; filters, N. Y. Continental Jewell Filtration Co., Montreal, $3,012; 1,068 Galo stone backing, B. & S. H. Thompson, Ltd., Montreal, $3,425.75; 325 brls. Atlas cement, Webster & Sons, Ltd., Montreal, $1,980; 18,220 Roman fire brick, Webster & Sons, Ltd., Montreal, $1,557.40; 5,000 fire brick, Wright & Co., Hull $270; 30,000 fire brick, Barrett Bros., Ottawa, $1,380; 6,500 feet fibre conduit, Can. General Electric Co., Ottawa, and 20 socket bands, Can. General Electric Co., $763.10; 2,500 feet conduit, Can. General Electric Co., Ottawa, $521.25.

All quarter cut oak for panelling and teakwood for floors was purchased in the United States by various sub-contractors, but do not know what was paid for such material. The majority of the large pipe and fixtures for the heating and plumbing installation and boiler plate for boilers, etc., was purchased in the United States, and there are several other materials which we know must have been purchased in the States as they could not be procured in Canada by the various sub-contractors, but no record of this material or the prices paid for it, as contracts were made with the various sub-contractors for the different parts of the work erected complete.

By resolution of the Joint Committee held May 12, 1916, it was decided that all materials entering into the construction of the building must be Canadian, wherever possible.

3. $314,805.26, but no payment made since 17th March, 1919.

4. Under the terms of the agreement $75,-194.74 is still due, as the contractors are to receive eight per cent on cost up to four millions and seven per cent on cost in excess of that amount up to five millions.

5. $255,354.24, but no payment made since 28th April, 1919.

6. Mr. J. A. Pearson, $214,729.72; Mr. J. O. Marchand, $40,624.52.

7. (a) No; (b) $19,645.76.

REPAIRS TO HICKEY'S WHARF, P.E.I.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queens):

1. What was the nature of the repairs made to Hickey's Wharf, Prince Edward Island, during 1919?

2. Were the said repairs made by contract or by day work?

3. If by day work, who was the foreman, how much was he paid per day and how many days did he work?

4. What are names of all those who were employed at this work, the number of days worked by each man and the respective amounts paid?

5. What are the names of those who supplied the material, the amount supplied by each person, the price paid to them for plank per thousand and for stone per load or per yard?

6. What was the total amount received by each of said persons?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Renewal of covering of floor stringers on the block situated between the outer two spans.

2. Day labour.

3. (a) Patrick McGuirk; (b) $3.50 per day; (c) 16 days.

4.

Patrick McGuirk, Foreman, 16 days	$ 56.00
Henry A. McGuirk, Labourer, 7 days	17.50
Henry A. McGuirk, Carter with team, 3 days	9.00
Jas E. Smith, 2 days	5.00
Jos. McGuirk, Labourer, 2 days	5.00
Jos. McGuirk, Carter with team, 1 day	3.00
Jas. A. McDonald, Labourer, 2 days	5.00
Jas. A. McDonald, Carter with team, 1 day	3.00
Geo. Brogan, 3 days	7.50
F. Cummiskey, Labourer, 1 day	2.50
F. Cummiskey, Carter with team, ½ day	1.75
Eug. Callaghan, Carter with team, 2 days	6.00
	121.25

5 and 6.

L. M. Poole & Co., 3,014 ft. hemlock plank at $35	105.49
Henry A. McGuirk, 630 ft. spruce at $16	10.08
Jos. McGuirk, 7 yds. stone at $1.20 c.y.	8.40
Norman McDonald, 6 yds. stone at $1.20 c.y.	7.20
Smith Bros, 1 keg spikes	6.00
Lusious Kelly, 1½ yds. stone at $1.20 c.y.	1.80
	$260.22

DUTY ON STEEL PLATES.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

What is the duty on steel plates for shipbuilding imported (a) from the United States, and (b) from England?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL: Iron and steel plates for wooden, iron, steel or composite ships and vessels are free of duty and exempt from war tax, under Tariff Item 470, irrespective of country from which imported.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer):

How many houses have been commenced, and how many fininshed, under the legislation of a year ago?

ELECTION IN ST. JAMES, MONTREAL.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. PIERRE FRANCOIS CASGRAIN (Charlevoix-Montmorency): Before the Orders of the Day are called, Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the Government if there is any truth in a statement published last night in La Patrie, to the effect that the election in St. James Division, Montreal, may be delayed owing to certain difficulties in getting the voters' list ready at the proper time?

Rt. Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): I saw the article in La Patrie to which the hon. gentleman refers, and have caused inquiry to be made as to what foundation there is in fact for the statements it contains, and that is all I can say at the present moment. I am not aware whether the statements are accurate or not, and in the absence of definite information in the matter it is impossible for me to form an opinion as to what effect might be on the election if those statements were true.

NAVAL POLICY OF THE GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT BY HON. MR. BALLANTYNE, MINISTER OF NAVAL SERVICE.

Hon. C. C. BALLANTYNE (Minister of Naval Service): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called I desire to make a statement on the Government's policy in regard to naval affairs:

The Government has had under consideration for some time the question of the naval defence of Canada and the suggestion of Admiral Viscount Jellicoe in reference thereto.

In view of Canada's heavy financial commitments and of the fact that Great Britain has not as yet decided on her permanent naval policy, and of the approaching Imperial Conference at which the question of naval defence of the Empire will come up for discussion between the Home Government and the Overseas Dominions, it has been decided to defer in the meantime action in regard to the adoption of a permanent naval policy for Canada.

The Government has decided to carry on the Canadian Naval Service along pre-war lines and has accepted the offer of Great Britain of one light cruiser and two torpedo boat destroyers to take the place of the present obsolete and useless training ships, the Niobe and Rainbow.

The Minister of Naval Service, in order to be free to thoroughly reorganize and place the present service on an economical and efficient basis, has issued orders for the demobilization of all officers and naval ratings and for the discontinuance of civilian help at headquarters and at the Naval Dockyards in Esquimalt and Halifax. The Canadian officers who are in the Imperial fleet and who are now being paid by the Canadian Government will be recalled and placed on duty with the Canadian Naval Service. The Naval College will also be continued. After reorganization has been completed, only those officers and other ratings and civilians will be taken on who are absolutely necessary and possess the qualifications desired.

In addition to this announcement, Mr. Speaker, I beg to inform the House that the Director of Naval Service, Admiral Sir Charles Kingsmill, has retired. He has been Director of Naval Service since the inception of the Canadian Navy in 1910, and he has performed his duties in a most satisfactory manner. I therefore wish to tender him now, on the floor of this House, my thanks as Minister of Naval Service, as well as the thanks of the Canadian Government. An officer of a junior rank will shortly be appointed.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Leader of the Opposition): I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that all hon. gentlemen on this side of the House will join with the minister in expressing our thanks to Admiral Kingsmill for the manner in which he has discharged his duties as Director of the Canadian Naval Service. May I ask the minister whether I was right in understanding him to say at the beginning of his remarks that the Government at the present time has no naval policy? I took that interpretation from his utterance. Possibly he used the words "permanent naval policy." But does that give us to understand that the Government has no permanent naval policy?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Mr. Speaker, I stated the position of the Government in very clear and precise terms. I shall be glad indeed to send across the floor of the House to the leader of the Opposition a typewritten copy of precisely what I did say.

Mr. E. B. DEVLIN: I should like to ask the minister whether, before a permanent naval policy is entered upon, the Government will consult the electors of Canada.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Mr. Speaker, I have nothing to add to what I have already stated on behalf of the Government.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is rather important that the position should be made perfectly clear. I read from the statement which the minister has been kind enough to submit to me the following words:

> In view of Canada's heavy financial commitments and of the fact that Britain has not as yet decided on her permanent naval policy, and of the approaching Imperial Conference at which the question of naval defence of the Empire will come up for discussion between the Home Government and the Overseas Dominions, it has been decided to defer in the meantime action in regard to the adoption of a permanent naval policy for Canada.

If these words mean anything they mean that at the present time the Government has no policy and proposes—

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Well, let me repeat the words: "It has been decided to defer in the meantime"—that is, until this conference is held in the summer or whenever it is the intention to hold it. It has been decided, until that time, to defer action in regard to the adoption of a permanent naval policy for Canada. Surely this must mean that at the present time there is no permanent policy and that the Government intends to wait until after some Imperial conference has been held. In view of this fact, I think that the question asked by my hon. friend (Mr. Devlin) a moment ago is quite pertinent. I think that this House has a right to know whether the Government intends to consult Parliament on the policy which it purposes to adopt, also whether the Government intends to make any intimation to the House as to what policy it proposes to lay before the Imperial Conference for consideration.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): I may say that I endorse, so far as I can catch them, some of the remarks of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. I do not know how far I am in order in saying anything upon the statement which has been made to the House by the minister, but if I am out of order the minister was equally so. I think I am clear on that point.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is customary for ministerial announcements to be made upon the Orders of the Day. The hon. member himself will recall many instances in which such was done. That being so, it does not, however, open the subject for general discussion. But in view of the undoubted importance of the subject, it would be quite competent for the hon. member to put a question to the minister, although he may not enter into a discussion.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: The announcement we have heard is one of the most extraordinary statements that have ever been presented to Parliament. As the leader of the Opposition has said, it avows that the Government have no policy—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, no.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: —no permanent policy; and it goes on to say at the end of the statement, that nevertheless they have a policy which has been intimated to the British Admiralty. They have accepted the ships which have been offered by the British Admiralty in the place of others which are described as "useless and obsolete." As I may not discuss the subject, I shall put my views in the form of a question, and I would ask the Minister of Naval Service how long he thinks it will be before the ships he has now got will be useless and obsolete.

Mr. DEVLIN: In view of the importance of the subject and of the fact that it may not be debated, I should also like to ask a question or two of the minister. Have the Government been instructed in any way or informed by the Home authorities of the advisability of the action which the Government is now about to take?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The Government and the Parliament of Canada decide all issues of that character on their own responsibility.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE: But they do not decide anything now.

Mr. DEVLIN: Why, then, is the minister waiting for the Imperial Conference?

Mr. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

Mr. DEVLIN: I have not finished, Mr. Speaker, I have another question.

Rt. Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The minister has made a statement which is before the House, and I think it would be advisable, seeing the different renderings which have been given it so far, that members should have the answer before them and see exactly what it is, so that they may not be led into making mistakes as to its interpretation. The Government has made its statement in reference to the policy; it

is there and speaks for itself. At the opportune time the Government is quite ready to take up the question and debate it with hon. gentlemen on the other side.

Mr. DEVLIN: I want to bow right away to the suggestion of my right hon. friend, inasmuch as that suggestion helps out the Government; but we are representing the people here, and we intend to have the people's rights respected.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The rule is well established in this House: That there can be no debate on this subject at the present stage because there is nothing before the House. I am sure the House will agree with me that I have been quite lenient in not preventing the putting of questions. I hope there will be no further attempt at debate under the disguise of an interrogation.

Mr. DEVLIN: This is the question I would like to ask the minister: "Did the Prime Minister, upon a certain occasion in or near the city of Ottawa, make the statement that the Government would follow the advice of the Admiralty in forming a naval policy for Canada?" I speak of the occasion when Lord Jellicoe made a statement of the needs——

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. DEVLIN: It is perfectly in order; I am giving the circumstances to remind the minister.

Mr. BUREAU: Just to refresh his memory.

Mr. DEVLIN: I am simply refreshing the memory of the Government.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I submit that that is a proper question for the hon. member to place upon the Order Paper.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The policy is to have no policy.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

MILITARY CANTEEN PROFITS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly-Verchères) (translation): Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to see the hon. the Overseas Minister of Militia back in his seat, he having returned safe and sound from the exterior belt of the war, where he had remained for five years.

Last year, I put two questions, the one of which had reference to the profits of the military canteens of the Canadian Expeditionary Forces, and the other dealt about the damages relating to the Kimmel Camp riots.

The hon. member for Hamilton, who was then Minister of Militia, told me that he would cable the Overseas Minister for an answer. I do not know whether the answer has arrived, but as I do not see the Overseas Minister in his seat, I would like the hon. member to answer those questions.

The Right Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER (translation): I wish to say, in answer to my hon. friend the member for Chambly-Verchères, that I got some information with respect to the three questions which he put the other day: As for the Siberian Force, all the documents are ready to be brought down, and as far as the Sainte-Anne-de-Bellevue military hospital is concerned, the papers are under preparation and will be brought down within a few days. I may say, with reference to the Grand Trunk shareholders' list, that information must be obtained from London; it is being sought just at present, and is expected from day to day.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT (translation): Mr. Speaker, I have congratulated the acting prime minister yesterday on the progress he had made in the French language. May he allow me to say, however, that he has not quite understood the remarks which I have just submitted. His answer has reference to three questions which I have put yesterday or the day before. When I rose, this afternoon, I put questions quite different from those, and if my hon. friend will allow me, I shall now put them in English.

I stated in French that I was very glad to see the hon. the Overseas Minister of Militia (Sir Edward Kemp) back in his seat. Last year I put some questions to the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Mewburn), who was then Minister of Militia, with reference to the profits of the military canteens of the Canadian Expeditionary Forces and also in relation to the damages at Camp Kimmel. My hon. friend answered me that he was going to cable overseas and get the information. As the cable was probably sent, as I have no answer yet, and as the Overseas Minister of Militia is in his seat now, I would like him to answer this question.

Sir EDWARD KEMP (Overseas Minister of Militia): Replying to my hon. friend (Mr. Archambault), I may say that there is a question on the Order Paper which covers the information that he wants. The ques-

tion was called to-day, but the answer is not ready. It will be ready at the next sitting of the House. The question is so wide that it covers not only the information that my hon. friend desires, but other information dealing with the same subject. I think he coupled with the statement he made the expression of a desire for certain information regarding some canteen fund that has reference to Canada. If so, that information would not be in the answer; it will have to be added by the Department of Militia and Defence.

RUMOURED CLOSING OF DISTRICT PENSION OFFICES.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. C. G. POWER (Quebec South): I should like to direct the attention of the Government to a rumour which has been widely prevalent to the effect that certain district offices of the Board of Pension Commissioners have recently been closed and that others are about to be closed within the next few days, notably, Regina, Victoria, Charlottetown, Sydney, Quebec, North Bay, and seven or eight others. Is the Government aware that by closing these district offices they will seriously inconvenience—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member should be content with putting his question.

Hon. Mr. ROWELL: I will make inquiries and ascertain whether there is any foundation for the rumour. Undoubtedly the Board of Pension Commissioners wish to keep the expenses of administration within as reasonable limits as possible consistent with giving due care to the pensioners.

DOMINION FRANCHISE ACT.

SECOND READING OF BILL NO. 12 MOVED BY HON. HUGH GUTHRIE.

Hon. HUGH GUTHRIE (Minister of Militia and Acting Solicitor General) moved the second reading of Bill No. 12, respecting the election of members of the House of Commons and the Electoral Franchise. He said: In moving the second reading of this Bill may I be permitted to say at the outset that it is somewhat doubtful at the present moment whether we have any valid and subsisting law of this Parliament under which the will of the electors of Canada might be recorded, or otherwise made known at the polls, through the medium of a general election, if at any time a dissolution of Parliament were to take place by law, or if perchance for any other reason it might be deemed appropriate and expedient to dissolve the House. As the House is aware there is a special Act in force at the present time which makes provision both for the franchise and for the conduct of an election, but that special Act is by its own terms expressly limited in its application to by-elections. It is known as the Dominion By-Elections Act, and under the terms of that special Act certain by-elections are now being held in Canada. That Act, however, has no application whatever to the case of a general election. Consequently if a dissolution of Parliament should take place—either by the expiration of the time limited under the British North America Act, or if for any other reason the Government should see fit at any time to tender advice to His Excellency to the end that Parliament should be earlier dissolved—we might find ourselves in rather an awkward predicament. We certainly should find ourselves in rather an uncertain situation as to whether we had at this time in Canada any adequate and subsisting law either to fix the franchise or to govern the conduct of a general election. To avoid that uncertainty and that unsatisfactory condition of the law in the future, and to render definite and certain what might otherwise be uncertain, this Bill is brought before the House at the present time.

When I mention the matter of doubt in regard to the present status of our election laws, may I be permitted to explain that any doubt which may exist upon the subject, exists by reason of certain contingencies and the happening of certain events upon which certain important portions of our legislation, which were passed under rather extraordinary conditions, were made dependent. The Dominion Elections Act of 1908, with amendments passed from time to time, continued in force down to the year 1917. During the year 1917 somewhat radical amendments were introduced into the law—

Mr. LAPOINTE: Hear, hear.

Mr. GUTHRIE:—under the provisions of a certain Act passed in that session and known as the War-time Elections Act, and further amendments were made to the Dominion Elections Act during that session under the provisions of another Act known as the Military Voters' Act. Both of these last mentioned enactments were undoubtedly in the nature of war measures. Each of them was duly approved by this Parliament with

a full knowledge and realization of the extraordinary and somewhat critical war situation which then prevailed, not only throughout Canada but throughout the world. However, at this time no good end is to be achieved by a discussion of these Acts, I only mention them to show their bearing and application under the present situation.

It will be remembered that the War-time Elections Act in express terms suspended altogether the operation of Part 1 of the Dominion Elections Act, being that part of the Dominion Elections Act which provided for the franchise, for the voters' list and also for polling divisions. The War-time Elections Act also amended Part 2 of the Dominion Elections Act by providing, among other things, that the wives, mothers, sisters and daughters of persons serving in the military and naval forces of Canada overseas should be entitled to vote. These were rather radical changes in our law. In addition to these, however, the Military Voters' Act made other important changes in regard to the votes of soldiers, and the terms upon which the franchise should be granted to and exercised by them, and the Military Voters' Act itself was incorporated as Part 4 of the Dominion Elections Act. By section 1 of the War-time Elections Act it was provided:

> During the present war, and until demobilization after the conclusion of peace, the operation of Part 1 of the Dominion Elections Act shall be suspended.

Then in regard to Part 2 of the Dominion Elections Act the provision was as follows:

> That Part 2 of the Dominion Elections Act shall, during the present war and until demobilization after the conclusion of peace, "operate and apply as if amended," and shall be deemed to be amended, as follows.

Then follow the amendments, while the qualification in the Military Voters' Act which became Part 4 of the Dominion Elections Act was in the following language:

> This part of this Act shall apply only to a general election held during the present war or after the conclusion of peace but before demobilization.

From the summary of our election law as it stands, which I have just given, the House will see that there may be some substantial ground for uncertainty as to the correct and legal position to-day. In the first place the question will arise: Have we reached that particular period of time mentioned in the War-time Elections Act, and that particular period of time mentioned in the Military Voters' Act? Do the words "during the present war" apply at the present time? Have we reached that particular moment of time which could legally be described as "after the conclusion of peace"? It is true that peace has been proclaimed in so far as it concerns Germany and Austria, but is it not equally true—technically true at least—that we are still at war with Turkey and Bulgaria? That is the first question. The next question is: Has demobilization yet taken place? Demobilization has taken place for all practical purposes, yet technically demobilization has not fully taken place. There are still some members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force who are not yet demobilized—some men who are still employed, and men in hospitals and the like. However the question of demobilization, so far as it relates to the War-time Elections Act, has probably been settled by an Order in Council passed on the 16th day of July last, which provided that on the first day of August, 1919, demobilization shall be deemed to be completed in so far as the operation of the War-time Elections Act is concerned. It will be noted, however, that there is no mention whatever in the Order in Council of the Military Voters' Act.

Now, from the circumstances I have just related I think the House will readily understand that it is very essential for us to have some definite legislation upon the subject of general elections; to set at rest for all time to come whatever doubts and uncertainties might possibly arise by expressly repealing every Dominion Election Act heretofore passed as detailed in the schedule to the Bill, and by providing a simple and comprehensive system which, it is hoped, will afford both a just and satisfactory franchise and an expeditious and convenient means of conducting elections for this House of Commons.

The object of the present Bill is threefold: In the first place, to provide a uniform franchise; in the second place, to provide a uniform method for the preparation of voters' lists; and, in the third place, to provide uniform election machinery. The importance of all three objects, though combined in a single Bill, will, I think, be readily appreciated by the House.

In endeavouring to establish a basis of franchise of uniform application throughout the nine provinces, upon foundations of absolute equality and fairness to every section of the community, one is met at the outset with problems of great difficulty and diversity; in endeavouring to formulate and perfect a system for the prepara-

tion, revision and final completion of voters' lists in a territory so vast and scattered as that contained in this broad country, in order to ensure the legal right to vote with the least possible degree of inconvenience to the voter, one is met with a situation of great complexity and great magnitude; and, furthermore, in endeavouring to formulate from the broadest principle down to the minutest detail a set of rules and regulations for the safe, sure and just conduct of a general election under such diverse circumstances for a population unevenly distributed over such a vast territory, at some points dense and at other points scattered, one is brought to a full realization of the imperfection of all human productions, be the effort of the individual or of the Government to achieve perfection ever so great and ever so honest.

This Bill is naturally bulky. It is designed, as I have said, to have universal operation without, or almost without, any special limitations or exceptions. When one considers the vastness of the proposal, the conclusion is rather forced upon one that while standards may be established and principles adopted, to set forth within the four corners of a measure the general scope and application of the proposal as settled and intended as a pronouncement of Government policy, yet in a matter of such great national importance and complexity and of such vital consequence, directly or indirectly, to the rights, the interests, the welfare and the convenience of the whole community,—under such circumstances the Government has a right to expect that the industry, the intelligence, and the most mature judgment of every hon. member shall be placed at its disposal in the consideration of this measure, so that, when we have reached the end of our labours, we may be able to present to the electors an election law which is the product of the combined experience and intelligence of every section of the House, and which hereafter may prove to be a model of its kind in fairness and simplicity.

It is in this spirit, Mr. Speaker, that the Government brings this Bill forward on motion for the second reading. I realize that the Bill as drafted, while it has been considered and revised, and reconsidered and again revised, and while in its present form it expresses the policy of the Government in regard to the matters set forth therein, yet in one respect I can assure the House that it bears no resemblance to the law of the Medes and Persians. The Government will not hesitate to carefully consider and, if necessary, adopt any amendment that may be offered from any quarter of the House which in the opinion of the House will render the Bill more safe, more sure and more convenient in its operation than it may be in its present form.

Now, Mr. Speaker, after this general statement as to the present position of our election law and as to the policy and attitude of the Government in regard to this Bill, may I be permitted to touch very briefly upon what one might call the history of our franchise legislation?

I desire to mention this matter chiefly on account of a paragraph which I read the other day in a Liberal newspaper, to the effect that Parliament and the country would insist upon the principle of the adoption of provincial franchises and provincial lists; and because I noticed upon the opening day of this session that my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) dropped rather a plain intimation in the course of his remarks to the effect that the Opposition would expect the Government "to adopt provincial voters' lists in accordance with the spirit of our constitution."

Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps at this distance of time, after we have had over half a century of experience under the British North America Act,—which is the governing Act in regard both to Dominion and Provincial legislation,—it might be considered somewhat of a waste of time to attempt to justify the right of this Parliament to pass legislation for the creation of voters' lists and for the conduct of elections which pertain exclusively to the election of members to this Parliament. We all know that during the early years after Confederation a rather heated discussion was waged throughout Canada in regard to that very question.

It was very strongly and very ably urged in the early days that as Canada had been federated upon the theory and principle of a pure federation, as it was called, as opposed to a legislative union, the right was inherent in the provinces to fix the franchise and establish the voters' lists which should be used in the election of their representatives to the Federal Parliament. That question never really came before Parliament until that interesting period in our history about the year 1885, when the Conservative Administration, under the leadership of the late Sir John A. Macdonald, introduced into this House a Franchise Act based entirely upon the constitutional right of this Parliament to legislate in respect to the franchise, to voters' lists, and to rules

of elections. A contest then took place on the floor of this House, one of the mightiest debates that ever took place in the political history of Canada. If one turns back the pages of Hansard, refers to the proceedings of Parliament thirty-five years ago, and reads the arguments that were used and the speeches that were delivered pro and con in regard to that question, one is bound to conclude, having regard to the men who took part in that great debate, that there must have been "giants in the world in those days." It was an able debate, sometimes bitter and acrimonious, sometimes even turbulent. But comparing that debate with our debates of the present day, one is bound to say that it was conducted upon a very high plane, and that that characteristic was very well sustained throughout.

Well, what was the argument? The argument of the Hon. Edward Blake, then leader of the Liberal Opposition, and undoubtedly one of the greatest lawyers that this country has ever produced, was briefly this: Among provinces joined together upon a federal principle, on a federal theory, it is absolutely necessary in order to carry out the true theory of federation, that each province should alone be asked in what manner it desired to send its own delegates or representatives to the Federal House. Mr. Blake argued that it was not for Ontario to say in what manner the representatives of the province of Quebec should be sent to this Parliament; that it was not the business of representatives from the province of Quebec to say by what method the representatives from Nova Scotia should be elected. Mr. Blake argued that the most outstanding example of the principle which he advocated was to be found in United States—I think he called it the most glorious and the most outstanding example of the federal principle. He demonstrated to this House that every State in the United States had the right to determine its own franchise and to make and revise its own voters' lists used in the election of members of Congress. That certainly was then and is now the right of every State in the United States. But I think there is an inclination on the part of many people who make a comparison between the constitution of this country and that of the United States to overlook this important fact: That while the United States was founded upon the federal principle, and the federation of the Canadian provinces was likewise founded on the federal principle, but upon principles in one material respect very different from the principles adopted in the United States. In 1776 the States which subsequently formed the United States sent their representatives to Philadelphia and there they laid down certain principles. One principle which they laid down was that each State should surrender a certain part of its sovereign power to the federal authority, that sovereign power to be exercised by the federal authority for the benefit of all the States which should form the Union. It was not so in the case of the formation of the Canadian federation. When the delegates of the various provinces assembled in the conference which led to Confederation, they worked out their agreement upon the principle that the federal or central government should have all legislative power which should thereafter pertain to the Dominion as a whole, and that only the residue (what was left), and only that which was of a local and private or provincial nature, should belong to the provinces. Now, the result of these two modes has been this: In the United States the national Government has jurisdiction only over those matters which were expressly handed over to it by the States themselves; all other legislative power and authority remains with the State Governments. But in Canada the provinces have jurisdiction only in respect of those particular matters which were expressly handed over to them by our Confederation Act, the Dominion having exclusive jurisdiction in regard to all other matters. That is a very opposite result as between the two countries, but it is arrived at by a logical process of reasoning, having regard to the principles which guided our respective forefathers when they came to their original agreement.

There is a very simple means of testing the question whether this Parliament or the provincial legislatures have jurisdiction in regard to the franchise so far as respects the election of members to this House. Under the scheme which was adopted when the British North America Act was passed there is one section which is well known to all lawyers, section 92. Under that section are gathered together all the subjects upon which the provinces have the exclusive right to legislate. There are only sixteen of them, sixteen subparagraphs, and with regard to those sixteen subjects the legislatures of our provinces have exclusive rights to legislate; apart from those sixteen there are only one or two other subjects in which

4 p.m.

there can be any possible conflict of jurisdiction—that is, in regard to education, dealt with by section 93, and the subjects of agriculture and immigration, dealt with by section 95,—I have said that there is a simple way of applying a test in these matters. If in section 92, among the sixteen subjects therein mentioned, you find a particular subject regarding which you are making inquiry, broadly speaking, you will know at once it is a matter of provincial jurisdiction. But if the subject concerning which you make inquiry is omitted from among the sixteen subjects enumerated in that section, you may take it as absolute that the provinces have no jurisdiction in regard to it. Now, I challenge any one to find in section 92 of the British North America Act, after going over it paragraph by paragraph, a hint, a suggestion, an insinuation in respect to a Dominion franchise, a Dominion election, Dominion voters' lists, or anything of that kind. So as a result of that simple test you are forced to the conclusion that this Parliament has complete and absolute jurisdiction on that subject.

But the matter does not rest there, by any means. When Parliament first met after Confederation, in July, 1867, some means had to be devised whereby elections could be held. The British North America Act did not provide the means, except for the first meeting of Parliament. The British North America Act was more a declaration of principle than anything else. It did not attempt to go into details. It left much of the detailed matter to be worked out by subsequent legislation, and it left a good deal of it likewise to be decided by the appellate courts of the British Empire. But section 41 did provide that until this Parliament should otherwise declare, the provincial franchises and the provincial lists should be used and the provincial election methods adopted. But the first words of section 41, I think, tell the whole story in regard to jurisdiction.

Section 41—I will not read the unnecessary portions—reads as follows:

> Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides, all laws in force in the several provinces at the union relative to the following matters or any of them, namely: the qualifications and disqualifications of persons to be elected or to sit or vote as members of the House of Assembly or Legislative Assembly in the several provinces, the voters at elections of such members * * * * shall respectively apply to elections of members to serve in the House of Commons for the same several provinces.

That settled the question for the first election to this House, and that section commences with these words "Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides." That is almost an express enactment that this Parliament has the jurisdiction. Certainly the only implication from that language is that we have that jurisdiction, and that jurisdiction is the jurisdiction which was maintained in the Act which was presented to this House in 1885. I must say that the late Mr. Blake made a very forceful argument in support of his contention on that occasion; but Mr. Blake had in support of his argument the special conditions which actually existed in Canada at that time. He was able to point to the situation which had developed in the seven provinces which at that time made up Confederation in this country. He was able to tell Parliament that there was the greatest diversity in those provinces in regard to the franchise; that was true. Why, he said, in the most westerly province of Confederation, British Columbia, they have manhood franchise, while every other province has a property qualification, and in no two of those provinces is the qualification the same. Consequently, he said, there is the greatest diversity, and only confusion and trouble will ensue if you adopt a dual system. I am satisfied, however, that if Mr. Blake's life had been spared to this period of time, if he had been able to watch the development that has taken place in regard to this matter in the provinces of Canada, he would have been the first to admit that the foundation of his argument had been taken away.

What have we to-day? We have nine provinces in the Dominion, and in six of those provinces we have practically a single franchise—manhood and womanhood suffrage. In only three provinces is there any distinction made, and in those three, Quebec, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, I think there is still a slight property qualification, but with all due deference to those provinces I submit that the property qualification where it exists is so slight as to be absoltuely insignificant. There would be very little difference between a provincial list in Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, based upon manhood franchise, and a list in the same provinces prepared having regard to the property qualifications which exist in those provinces to-day. So for practical purposes one may well say that throughout the length and breadth of Canada there is an established franchise, certainly an approximate franchise, which has uniform

operation throughout the nine provinces. There is no diversity practically, and there would be no difficulty now in a uniform system. The danger of confusion has been removed, and that was the great danger that Mr. Blake foresaw. He did not on that occasion direct his argument very strongly towards voters' lists. He had very little to say about them. What he pointed out, and what the Liberal party pointed out in 1885, as any one can see by reading the debates, was that the Conservative Administration of that day was asking the House to adopt a measure which, in the opinion of the Liberal party, was nothing short of a political iniquity on account of the partisanship contained in its sections. The chief fight on behalf of the Liberal party was against the proposal to establish in this country a system of revising barristers, with power both to prepare and to revise the lists, and without any provision in the Bill for the right of appeal from the revising barrister. Every Liberal in the House pointed out the iniquity of such a proposal as that, and after a long and hard fight modifications were made, and the right of appeal was granted. That removed some of the difficulties, but as a matter of fact the question of provincial voters' lists per se hardly arose during the debate. The fight was on the method which the Bill proposed under which voters' lists should be prepared and revised by men who might be absolutely partisan, creatures of the Government of the day, with no right of appeal being given against them. Subsequently that proposal was very much modified, and the Bill passed the House. It was a most interesting debate, and I would commend it to the attention of every man in this House even at this late day. It was a fine argument and a rare fight. But I must confess that one cannot read these old pages of Hansard without some tinge of regret, some tinge even of sorrow. When you see in the list of those who participated in that debate the names of Macdonald, Laurier, Blake, Langevin, Mackenzie, Chapleau, Davies, Cartwright, Edgar, Weldon, White and Foster, one recalls with a feeling of sorrow that all the great parliamentarians of that day have passed to another sphere save two, one of whom now occupies the highest judicial position in this country, the other being my right hon. friend the Acting Prime Minister of this country (Sir George Foster). I am sure it is a matter of the greatest gratification and pride to us all to find him here at this distance of time, after a career of well nigh forty years in this Parliament, and over half that time, I believe, as a member of the Government. We have him with us to-day, rich in vigour of body and mind, his intellect, not dulled, but rather sharpened by the passage of years, his temper, I think, on the whole improved, his vision increased, and his parliamentary experience far above that of any other member of this House. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, I voice the unanimous wish of all the members of this House when I say that we hope he will be able for many, many years to say to himself,

> For men may come and men may go,
> But I go on forever.

The Act of 1885 went into operation despite the protests of the Liberal party, and it continued to be the law of this country for the next thirteen years. Speaking as one who had some actual experience under the operation of that Act, I did not like it. It was burdensome, troublesome, costly, and above all, dilatory. No one, I think, realized these features of that legislation more keenly than the Conservative party who passed it. The Act, before it was repealed, had not a friend in the country. Everybody wanted it changed. What I personally most complained of in regard to that law was that it was so dilatory that we never had an up-to-date voters' list during its whole operation. In the general election of 1891 we had to vote upon lists certified three years before election day.

In the election of 1896 the lists were over two years old. The thing was so expensive that you could not ask to have the list revised every year; the treasury would not stand it. I think the late Sir John Thompson realized the difficulty in 1894 when he was Prime Minister, for in that year he introduced a new Bill into the House. It only got to the second reading, having never passed the House. But in introducing the Bill Sir John Thompson was pretty guarded in his language. If I may be permitted to quote from his speech, he said:

> The number of differences which existed between the provincial franchises and the Dominion franchise as established by our own Act are so few as not to be worth the contest and expense which are involved in keeping them up, and the adoption of a general system which will apply to the local and Dominion legislatures has recommendations as regards simplicity and facilities for economy which cannot exist under a dual system which we have been keeping up for the past few years.

Later on in the same speech he said:

> The great principle which underlay the Franchise Act of 1885 was controlled by this

Parliament over matters connected with the franchise.

And further on in the same speech:

We adhere to the principle that this House, and the electors who return members to this House, ought not to be under the control, as regards the exercise of their franchise, of the officers of any other Government or Legislature whatever in the country.

So that, from these statements taken from the speech of Sir John Thompson in this House when he introduced a new measure in 1894, we may conclude, I think, that he had seen and appreciated the development that had been going on in Canada and perceived that a uniform system was the correct system, and that there was not much use in holding out on the old principles. He was prepared to surrender one of them at least. However, the Act did not go through, and until 1898 we had no other franchise Act in this country, but the Act of 1885.

We all know that the Liberal party was in power in 1908, when they brought in a Franchise Bill and declared it to be founded on the principle they had so long advocated in this House and in the country, namely, the true federal theory or principle. They made many declarations to that effect, but I purpose to show that in the course of time they practically abandoned that theory. I happened to be a member of that party on one occasion during the session of 1908, when we absolutely negatived such a principle. When Alexander Mackenzie came into power he passed a Franchise Act in 1874, and it was the first Franchise Act passed after Confederation, he absolutely adopted the provincial franchise, without any qualifications or any conditions. He absolutely adopted the provincial voters' lists, and likewise without qualifications or exceptions. When the Laurier administration passed their first Franchise Act in 1898, if my memory serves me rightly in regard to its sections, it said by section 5: "We will adopt the provincial voters' lists"; and by sections 6, 7, and 8, "We will vary them and make certain voters' lists to suit ourselves." Then by subsequent sections it was decided to hand over these lists when made to the control of an officer of this Government. We said by that Act: "Here they will stay, and here they will be printed, and we will control them." That was not the Mackenzie Act of 1874 by any manner of means. Then by section 10 it was decided to adopt the provincial franchise, but by section 11 the Government said: "We will not adopt the provincial disqualifications." Practically they adopted it in so far as it suited them, and where it did not suit them they did not adopt it. However, I maintain that they had the absolute constitutional right to do so if they saw fit. This Parliament was not bound by any provincial Franchise Act and there was no custom in this country at that time that made it proper that we should accept or adopt provincial franchises. Certainly the Liberal Government did not adopt them. We passed amendment after amendment to the Act of 1898, but the decisive reasons for amendment arose in 1908. Mr. Speaker, I may be giving a little inside history, but I do not suppose it will hurt any one. I am not doing this by way of recrimination, nor yet by way of exultation, but solely for the purpose of justifying what the Liberal party did and what I supported them in doing in 1908. You remember, Sir, that there was a time when every provincial legislature in this country was controlled by a Liberal government; that was when the Act of 1898 was passed. From one end of the country to the other we had provincial Liberal governments. But there was a time when these administrations began to disappear one by one. Now, the election of 1900 was carried by the Liberal Government under the Election Act of 1898 practically unamended. Prior to 1904 we had only very slight amendments. But by 1904 one Richard McBride got into power in British Columbia, and a man named Roblin in Manitoba; and in January of 1905 one Sir James Whitney, obtained the reins of government in Ontario. That created rather an awkward situation at Ottawa. It made us look around to see what we could do. We had the constitutional right to legislate in regard to elections, and we were prepared to exercise it. We could survey the scene from the Atlantic to the Pacific to see where legislation or amendment was necessary. Looking out upon the province of Alberta, we did not foresee much difficulty. There lived in the land of Alberta a man named Sifton. I do not know whether the House has heard of this name, but I think the Liberal administration at Ottawa had every confidence that so long as a man by that name had control of the Government of Alberta no iniquity would be permitted in the voters' lists of that province.

Mr. W. H. WHITE: If the minister will pardon me I should like to correct him. No man named Sifton had charge of the Government of Alberta at the time of which he speaks.

Hon. Mr. GUTHRIE: I should have said Rutherford, and Sifton subsequently. Well,

the Administration had no fears so long as they knew that a man by the name of Rutherford controlled affairs there. Then, when we looked at the adjoining province of Saskatchewan, every one knew there was there a man named Jim Calder. I do not know whether the House knows the man or not, but the Liberal administration of that day in Ottawa had every confidence that so long as Jim Calder had anything to do with the Government of Saskatchewan the people of Saskatchewan would have a fair and square deal in election matters. As regards Quebec, you could go down there by day or night and find a perfectly satisfactory situation prevailing; all through the silent watches of the night the word would come back: "All's Well." We knew that the people of Quebec would be assured of a fair and honest voters' list. Little difficulty arose in New Brunswick, because, although there was in that province an administration known as the Hazen Government, that government wisely did not tamper with the old Liberal voters' list, and we were assured by men in the House—well-known men they were—that the situation was satisfactory in New Brunswick. In Nova Scotia we were doubly assured. The grand old Prime Minister there, the veteran who still occupies the distinguished position he has so long held—God bless him, and may he long be there—was in power in those days, and we knew that his name was a guarantee of fair dealing in regard to the voters' list in that part of the country. It did not matter so much in Prince Edward Island, because they had no provision for voters' lists in that province. The awkward places were British Columbia, Manitoba and Ontario, and the most awkward thing of the whole situation was what we considered to be an act of supreme impudence on the part of the Tory Prime Ministers of those three provinces, when they undertook to change the old standard voters' lists of the Liberal governments. That created a situation down here in Ottawa. It was bound to do so. We had to think the matter out and we began to think that the best way to meet it was by boldly declaring that we had the power to regulate the franchise in this country, that it was not a provincial matter at all, that it was a Dominion matter. I maintained that then and I maintain it now.

In June 1908 a Bill to amend the Election Act came before Parliament. I am not so familiar with what transpired in regard to British Columbia or Manitoba as I am in regard to Ontario. I know that it was suggested that these Acts of the McBride Administration and of the Roblin Administration were most iniquitous. I fancy they were as bad as they could be made. That was the excuse we offered for interference with their provincial voter's lists. I think we had found cases of overlapping, and that the Dominion constituencies and the provincial constituencies did not exactly conform and for that reason that there was necessity for our interference. In Ontario a very marked situation arose. The Government of Sir James Whitney came into power in Ontario in the spring of 1905. It will be remembered that for thirty-five years before that we had had in Ontario a Liberal Administration, Liberal voters' lists, and Liberal election laws had prevailed. For some reason best known to Sir James Whitney and his Government, they undertook to change that system and in 1908 they passed an Act which made provision for voters' lists in the unorganized districts of Ontario—that is where there were no municipal organizations, that northern tier in Ontario that used to send six members to this House constituting what we called New Ontario. I have no doubt that the proposal of Sir James Whitney was a very bad one. It did not suit the Government in power in Canada at that time. It was a very deliberate thing, I admit, but the Government of that day, with my support, passed an Act to say that for certain portions of these three provinces we would set aside the provincial lists and make lists for ourselves. There are men in this House like myself who supported the Government on that Bill and I am prepared to justify that vote, which I gave on principle, on the same principle that obtains now, and that is, that the Parliament of Canada has the full right to make its own franchise.

It is true that the hon. the leader of the Oposition (Mr. King) did not have a seat in this House in the spring of 1908. It may be that he was not then fighting in the front ranks but I will guarantee that by reason of his intimate knowledge of political matters at that time he had a position for himself on the headquarters staff. He knew what was going on, his party knew what was going on and it ill becomes a man who knows the situation which existed in 1908 and the law which we passed, and passed on principle I maintain, to say now, on the first day of the assembling of this session that the House will expect the Government to carry out

the well known constitutional principle of provincial voters' lists.

The truth is that the Liberal Administration contained able men; it contained probably the ablest men that were ever gathered in a Canadian Government. They knew they had the right and they knew how to exercise that right which the law gave them. Sir Allen Aylesworth, the greatest lawyer, next to Edward Blake who has ever sat in this House, explained that law on the floor of Parliament. He said: "We have that right and we are going to exercise it." Why? He said that while on general grounds we might adopt the provincial franchise yet in this special case if Parliament thought it best not to adopt the provincial franchise it was perfectly within its right. Since that date I take it that the matter has been settled. I do not think the question can arise again. It would have remained settled as far as I am concerned but for the statement of my hon. friend (Mr. King) in regard to provincial lists and the statements I have seen in the Liberal press to the effect that the country would expect that we should follow the provincial lists and the provincial franchise in this new Bill.

I am free to say that the Liberal Government's Act of 1908 was a disappointment to many of us. I know it was a disappointment to myself in one respect. I believe that one of the first essentials of an election law is that it shall provide modern, up to date lists and that is what the Act of the Liberal Government did not at all do. I became a candidate for this House late in the fall of 1899 and I set to work on the lists in the rural municipalities and worked many weary weeks and many weary months in order that the names of all those who had a vote might be on the list. It was a different matter in the cities because you could register up to thirty days before the election. That is a principle that I, personally would like to apply to the whole country, to all municipalities, whether rural or urban. I knew there was a provision in the Act of 1898 which said that lists which were revised and in the hands of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery sixty days before nomination day should be the lists for election. These lists for my constituency were finally revised and in the hands of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery on the 15th August and the election was on the 3rd, or 6th November—I forget which. After all my work, after I had gone to the township courts of revision and to the judges courts of revision, what was my surprise when I received from the clerk of the Crown in Chancery, twenty, or it might have been forty copies of the lists of the year previous. I posted down to Ottawa and saw the Government about it. They said: "Why, your lists are all right, the lists for the counties of Waterloo and Halton are not finally revised for 1900, consequently you will have to take the old lists of 1899." the lists for the election of 1898 were probably eighteen or twenty months old. They were just about the same age in 1904 and were not quite so bad in 1908. The one fault I had to find with the Act of 1898 was that neither in its operation nor result did it give us an up to date list, a last moment list before the elections.

That is one aim that we have had before us in the preparation of this Bill. That is one of the most important things about a franchise Act. Every representative from the province of Ontario knows this fact in regard to our elections: that there are a large number of our people disqualified in respect of every election and they are among the very best people we have in the country. Take country schoolmasters; they change about every two or three years; we bring on an election in the Fall or at another time of the year, teachers' contracts have expired, they have gone to the next county and they have no vote in that county. That also applies to ministers and principally to those of the Methodist church in which the itinerant system prevails. A man becomes disqualified because while his name is on the old list he has moved away and he cannot get on the new list, there is no opportunity given to him to vote. These are things on account of which I always took exception to the old Act of 1898. The object of the present Bill is to give to the public an up to date, last minute Franchise Act, in so far as that is possible. Having regard to the conditions which exist in Canada, having regard to the practical unanimity which there is in the various provinces on the question of the franchise, realising that the whole trend of modern opinion, the whole trend of development in this country and in every other country during the past forty or fifty years has been toward a loosening and a lessening of all property conditions in regard to the franchise, to make the franchise something which pertains to the person and not something pertaining to property; that the whole tendency of modern thought is to make the right to the franchise a right in personam and not a right in rem, the tendency of modern ideas being to treat the franchise as a human thing and not a

property right at all; and that theory having been adopted in six provinces and almost adopted in three other provinces, when we boldly make a Franchise Act based on manhood and womanhood suffrage I submit that we are reaching as nearly as can be, under our law and institutions, the proper ideal.

Now my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition may take this ground: He may say that he will contend for the federal principle and the right of the provinces to fix the law. I may contend on the other hand that it is the undoubted right of the Dominion Government to do so. I do not believe that in the final analysis or conclusion it is going to matter very much which ground we take; I believe the result is going to be practically the same whichever line of argument we take. My hon. friend may argue for the provincial principle and provincial control, and I think he will come back to manhood and womanhood franchise for Canada. I may argue it out on the principle of Dominion control, and the manhood and womanhood franchise laid down in this measure is the view of the Government and of myself as representing the Government.

So it is in regard to the voters' list; it does not matter very much what the argument may be. The Government say: "We realize that this Government has the undoubted right to pass laws for the preparation, revision and control of the lists. We can adopt, or not adopt, provincial lists as we see fit; for the sake of convenience, for the lessening of expense, we have decided to adopt provincial lists provided those lists are not more than a year old and provided an opportunity is given to make those lists conform to our franchise requirements." That is the proposal of the Bill. There is no other proposal in it, in regard to the voters' lists, that is the proposal and that is the result; and if the Bill in its present form is adopted it will have this effect in Canada; that in every province if there is in existence a provincial list, a regular provincial list, which is not more than one year old at the issue of a writ for an election, that prima facie will be the electoral list at the general election, and an opportunity is given to add to that list the names of all persons properly qualified to go upon it, and strike from it the names of persons that should be stricken from it. I do not know that I need elaborate that point any more.

In regard to the franchise I submit we are imposing no new, or impossible, or wrongful conditions upon any province. We are imposing the principle of manhood suffrage and womanhood suffrage on the provinces of Quebec, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island where they still maintain property qualifications, but as I pointed out a minute ago the property qualifications are so minor——

Mr. CANNON: There are no property qualifications in Quebec.

Mr. GUTHRIE: None in Quebec? Then the remark applies to the provinces of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island; I thought property qualifications were required in Quebec too. But the property qualifications in those two provinces, excluding Quebec, are so minor and so insignificant as to amount to practically nothing. They have practically manhood franchise in Nova Scotia and in Prince Edward Island, and I think if we adopt it throughout the whole length and breadth of the country we will have both a uniform and a satisfactory franchise.

There is one other question which I should mention. It will be remembered that about a year ago this Parliament adopted the principle of woman suffrage. We did not adopt it in regard to this province, that province or the other province, but we made it as a law of this Parliament, apply to every province in Canada. I do not think objection was taken at the time to our constitutional right to do so. We did it and I think if objection was taken the House certainly never was divided on the principle. Within my recollection it was practically the unanimous wish of Parliament that that law should be passed though I remember some individuals in the House at the time did offer objections. Well, by the present Bill we will impose upon Quebec and Prince Edward Island womanhood suffrage. I have heard it said that that is very much against the will of the people in these two provinces. But after all isn't it merely an opportunity that we are giving them. There is no compulsion in the way of voting under this Bill. It has been suggested that there should be a compulsory voting clause incorporated, but by this Bill we are not imposing any duty upon the people of the province to do anything: We are not asking them to refrain from doing anything, we are not penalizing them if they do not do anything; all we say to the provinces of Quebec and Prince Edward Island, where womanhood suffrage has not been adopted in provincial matters, is "Here is the opportunity. If you see fit to avail yourselves of it well and good. Your women have a right to vote, but there is no compulsion in the matter, it is merely

an invitation to take it or reject it as you see fit." The law was passed by Parliament to apply to every province. More than that we amended the law of this country to provide that women should sit in the Dominion Parliament. A woman from the province of Quebec can sit in the Parliament of Canada as a representative of a Quebec constituency even at the present moment—she has that right under our Dominion law. Surely it will be grossly anomalous and worse than that, to say that a woman may sit in this Parliament as a representative from Quebec and yet the women of that province shall not have the right to vote. That anomaly would be overcome by the proposition contained in this Bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to dwell at too great length upon the provisions of this Bill. I am afraid I have already occupied too much time of the House. There are, however, one or two points I would like to allude to before resuming my seat, and one of them is in regard to a criticism which I heard a few days ago by a member of the House, who said he had read the Bill from beginning to end and his first suggestion was that it was too fair to be honest—"that there must be something lurking within the provisions of the Bill, or something at present unseen; it is absolutely too fair." The next criticism he offered is the one I intend to deal with for a moment. He said: "The only tinge or taint of partisanship I find in the whole Bill is in regard to the appointment of returning officers." Well, in regard to the appointment of returning officers, we have adopted the course which has been in vogue here ever since Confederation, and is in vogue to-day in the majority of the provinces, though not in all of them. That is that in His Majesty's writ, in the writ of His Excellency the Governor General, the Governor in Council shall name the man who is to be returning officer. That system is still continued. There has been a great deal of discussion upon that point by the Government. I can assure the House that this Bill has received very serious consideration in respect to all of its clauses and all of its proposals. The clause dealing with returning officers was one of those most seriously considered, and we concluded there was no better system which we knew of or could devise, no safer system in the interest of the public, than that provided for here. The Government of the day must be responsible for the elections, and if an unfair election takes place the responsibility must be upon their shoulders. They must be answerable to the people, you cannot place the responsibility on His Excellency the Governor General; he only speaks through his Cabinet, or through the Prime Minister, the mouthpiece of his Cabinet. The Prime Minister must recommend to His Excellency the name to be put in the writ as returning officer. Now that returning officer is the appointee of the Government, and has the power, under this Bill, to appoint deputy returning officers and registrars, both rural and urban; and my friend in discussing that question said to me, "That leaves open the door to all kinds of partisanship and corruption." Now, I deny that suggestion, and I believe that anybody who examines the clauses of this Bill as they apply to deputy returning officers and to registrars will see that the measure has been drawn in such a way as absolutely to preclude dishonesty, no matter how evilly disposed the returning officer may be. He has the power to appoint deputy returning officers; he has the power to appoint the registrar in the city, town or village and also the registrar in the rural district. Yet no man can be deprived of his vote by the partisan act of the registrar—it is impossible. If the voter goes to the registrar and the registrar refuses him, he asks for a certificate of refusal. Suppose the registrar is really a corrupt and dishonest man and says: "No, I will not give you a certificate." In that event the applicant can appeal to the judge without certificate. Suppose the man does not go to register at all, and it is well known that where there is a limited time to do a certain thing there are a great many people inclined to leave it to the last minute of the last day. Suppose there are a good many there at the last moment of the last day, and some of them are left off the list through lack of time; that does not deprive them of their votes. They may still go to the judge without reference to the registrar at all, without taking a certificate of refusal, without giving notice of appeal, and obtain relief, for the judge has such absolutely unfettered discretion in the matter that no man can be deprived of his right to vote.

Mr. DEMERS: Is there in every case a right of appeal from the decision of the registrar?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes.

Mr. DEMERS: Even in the rural polling division?

Mr. GUTHRIE: No, there is no appeal at all in the rural polling division; there

the elector has the right to vote under section 63. I am referring now only to urban divisions. If under this Bill a man does not vote at an election, it is purely his own fault. I do not care how partisan or corrupt an officer may be, the man's right to vote is there, and he can vote.

In a rural division the registrar has to make up the list and sit for five days thereafter to hear complaints. Let us assume that he is a man of evil disposition, is thoroughly partisan, and intends, if possible, to be a wrong-doer. A man in the rural section comes to have his name put on the voters' list and is refused. That is the worst that can happen to him there. He may still on election day go to the poll, take the oath, mark the ballot, and vote just the same as an ordinary elector. If under the provisions of this Bill any man loses his vote he has no one to blame but himself, because no amount of partisanship or wrong-doing can deprive him of exercising his right to vote if he insists on doing so.

The Government has been criticised on the ground that this is rather an open door method. Prominent members of the Opposition have said to me, "I do not like that; it is too open." My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition was not in the House when the War-time Elections Act was under discussion. Had he been here he would have heard my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Maclean), and the then member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Carvell) denouncing the Government of that day because it would not adopt this system, but preferred the system of the ""tied ballot." Under that Act a man could not get his vote in the ballot box; he could only tender his vote, but it would be kept in an envelope and not counted. But this is the open system, whereby every man and woman is absolutely assured of the right to vote; nothing can deprive them of that right but their own inactivity.

I have heard the suggestion made that it would enable a party of automobilists to go out of a city like Toronto into an adjoining rural constituency and plump in their votes by merely taking the oath under section 63. If that objection has any merit at all the Government does not insist upon this particular system. The Government is not adopting it for anything it can gain by it; it was inserted for the protection of hon. members opposite.

An hon. MEMBER: Thank you; that was very kind of the Government.

Mr. GUTHRIE: If the Government wanted to take an unfair advantage it could do so far more effectively, but the Government is trying to be absolutely fair, and if any hon. member by searching this Bill line by line, and clause by clause, can discover the so-called joker or Ethiopian in the wood-pile, I can assure him that if he points it out it will be removed. But I challenge any hon. member to point out any opportunity for wrong-doing under this measure.

I would further say that if my hon. friends ask to have deleted that clause which gives the elector in rural districts the right to cast his vote upon taking the oath under section 63, it will be stricken out. It is not put in for the protection of the Government, but for the protection of those who do not control elections.

In regard to the appointment of returning officers, it will be remembered that a committee of this House held an investigation some years ago to devise some better means of making such appointments. That committee could devise no better means. We had thought of having the House make the appointments of returning officers, but when that proposal comes down to the final analysis it again is appointment by the Government. It has been said that we should allow these appointments to be made by the judges.

Mr. ROSS: Hear, hear.

Mr. GUTHRIE: My hon. friend from West Middlesex says, "Hear, hear." I take distinct issue with him. I agree that a judge is the proper man under an election Act to settle legal rights if disputes take place; but I would emphasize the desirability of keeping the judiciary of this country away from the ordinary machinery of elections. What would happen is this—and it will happen in Ontario if the present proposal of the Ontario Government is carried out, as I understand it from the newspaper reports of yesterday—if you give to a judge power to appoint returning officers, be he ever so fair and judicial in his appointments, a mistake will happen at some place, there will be wrong-doing some time or other, and the first man to be blamed will be the judge, with the result that you will have the judicial robes trailed through the political mire. So far as I view it—and it is no business of mine to criticise a measure introduced by the Ontario Government—the weakest point in their proposed system is that they make the county judge the president of the Election Board and that board appoints the returning

officers. The experience in this House in regard to the conduct of returning officers at elections has not been bad; it has been good. Personally I have never heard of misconduct by a returning officer; I have heard of it in the Ontario elections where they have another system. I think in a number of the provinces they appoint sheriffs, registrars and other public officials. Now, there is something to be said in favour of that system.

Mr. POWER: Will the hon. gentleman permit me a question? Is it not a fact that under the proposed Act the judges appoint the revising officers?

Mr. GUTHRIE: The judges are the revising officers, and they may appoint such fit and suitable additional revising officers as may be necessary in any particular locality.

Mr. POWER: What is the difference between the appointment of a revising officer and the appointment of a returning officer?

Mr. GUTHRIE: A revising officer is in the nature of a judge. Let me point this out to my hon. friend. For the city of Quebec and the city of Montreal there is a registrar, and any one dissatisfied with his action may appeal to a judge, who is the Chief Justice of the Superior Court of that district. Now, it is not to be supposed that in a riding like West Quebec one Appellate judge can do all the work. He might be able to attend to it, but I doubt it very much, and in case he can not, he has the same power as a High Court judge of Ontario to call in a County Court judge.

Mr. POWER: Not necessarily a barrister or——

Mr. GUTHRIE: No. If my hon. friend considers that such a provision should be inserted in this Bill, personally I see no objection to it; if such a qualification is desired I think it might well go in. But if we recognize that the judges are the proper body to decide these matters, and we have more appeals than we have judges, who should appoint others to help them? Remember, they occupy judicial positions. I think the best provision is that made by the Bill which allows the judges to make additional appointments.

Now, in regard to the system of appointment of public officers, I am going to discuss it from the standpoint of Ontario, because for a long time there the law provided that sheriffs and registrars should be the returning officers. At this distance of time we might as well be candid and admit that that was a good, safe and satisfactory law for the old Liberal Governments of that province. Why, it was really committing the duties of returning officers to their best friends—they must have been good friends or they would never have got those positions. Not only that, but they were officials who could be removed by the Government at any time. There was therefore a double objection to that system. As far back as my memory goes the first sheriff I remember in the county of Wellington was the Hon. Peter Gow, at one time provincial secretary in the Government of Sir Oliver Mowat. He later became sheriff. Well, it was quite safe to trust the duties of returning officer to that man. When he died, he was followed by the late Robert McKim, who was the sitting member of the Legislature supporting the Government; the Government could quite safely trust the affairs of an election to Sheriff McKim. When Robert McKim died he was followed by the present incumbent, Sheriff Allan, also sitting member of the Legislature and supporter of the Liberal administration; it was quite safe to appoint him returning officer. Then, take the matter of registrar. The earliest date to which my memory takes me is the time when this appointment went to James Massie, sitting member for South Wellington, a supporter of the Government. When he died, Colonel Higginbotham was appointed, for many years a Liberal member of this House, supporting the Liberal Opposition. When he died, Henry Hortop was appointed; he was not a sitting member, but had been a candidate in the local election. All of these men were of the highest character and standing in the community, but they were all political partisans prior to their appointment. So that throughout the whole length and breadth of Ontario I do not know that there have been more than five or six sheriffs and registrars who were not appointees of the late Liberal Government; in 1905, when it went out of office, in fact, the majority of them had sat in the Legislature of Ontario as supporters of the Government. Now, do you think that is a good system? The only outstanding case of electoral irregularity that I know of was the case of West Elgin, where the sheriff had been appointed returning officer. There may have been others, but that is the only one I can recall at the moment. I have never in my experience heard of a single instance where electoral corruption has been charged against the returning officer in my district. For these reasons, and be-

cause it is right and proper that the responsibility should rest upon some shoulders for this appointment, the Government is determined to accept that responsibility. They have determined to accept it because no better system, no fairer system, has yet been devised, and until a better system is devised the Government will appoint returning officers under the provisions of this Bill.

There are a great many details in the Bill, Mr. Speaker, which I shall not now make an attempt to cover; indeed, I should not touch upon details on the motion for second reading. I have already spoken at far too great length, but possibly it will be found that the time I have taken up this afternoon will not have been wasted; that in the end it may prove to have effected a certain amount of economy in the further discussion of the Bill. I beg to move that the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING: (leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I immediately congratulate my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Guthrie) upon the exceptionally clear, lucid and comprehensive statement which he has just given to the House? His concluding remarks to the effect that the length of time he had taken in delivering his address would in the end possibly prove of advantage to the House may, I think, be concurred in. His statement, with one exception, which I shall mention, has been from beginning to end helpful and most illuminating. Particularly do we thank my hon. friend for having at the commencement of this debate gone so fully in historical outline into past legislation pertaining to the franchise and also into the constitutional aspect and the question of the right of this Parliament and the right of the provinces respectively to legislate with regard to this matter.

I am sorry to have to say to my hon. friend that in that part of his argument which had to do with the constitutional aspect, and which constituted the major portion of his address, he was beside the mark in one respect: he led the House to believe that in some way or another I had questioned the right of this Parliament to legislate regarding the franchise. I challenge my hon. friend to point to any remark of mine, in Hansard or elsewhere, which has ever questioned the right of this Parliament to enact a federal franchise law. I am not fortunate in possessing the legal training that my hon. friend has had, but I have some little knowledge of constitutional law and of the constitution of this country, and I know as well as he does that as between the provinces and the Dominion, where no powers are specified other than those mentioned in Section 92 of the British North America Act as belonging to the provinces, the residue of power rests with the Federal Parliament and that this Parliament has full and complete jurisdiction in the matter of enacting a law pertaining to the federal franchise. As I proceed I shall take occasion to refer to the remarks which I made in the debate on the Address, to which my hon. friend alluded, and to show just what was the purport of the reference which I made to provincial lists on that occasion. Everything I said at that time I am prepared to repeat at this. I made the remark I did then in order that the Government, and my hon. friend in particular, might have it in mind when he should speak on this occasion. He has not, I think, met the point that I then raised, but, as he has said, there will be opportunity throughout the debate to do so, and doubtless he will give his reasons later if he takes exception to it.

But while I congratulate my hon. friend on the lucidity of his exposition, I congratulate him still more upon the spirit in which the Government, according to his statement, is prepared to meet Parliament with respect to the legislation which they are bringing down. He has made it clear that so far as the Bill before the House at the moment is concerned, the Government do not propose to view its provisions as being like the laws of the Medes and Persians; that, on the other hand, the Government will be ready to accept any suggestion that appeals to the wisdom of the House; ready to accept any amendment which may tend to make this Act in the nature of a model and a guide for all future laws dealing with the question of the franchise. Well, I am happy to assure my hon. friend and the Government that we are only too ready to meet them in that spirit. We have no desire to make of this measure a political football, a matter of party gain or loss one way or the other.

Mr. Speaker, the measure now before us is not only the most important measure which will come before Parliament this session; it is one of the most important measures that can come before Parliament at any time. The considerations which we have to take into account in discussing this measure are much larger than those of the fortunes of any member of the House, or of any party in the House, or of any Government. We have been passing through

5 p.m.

periods of great change in the world's history. Society, from many points of view, has been torn up by the roots. We have suffered through the war great loss not only in wealth and in human life, but, as I said once before in this House, also in the institutions of our country. Our political institutions have suffered along with everything else; public confidence, to a certain extent, has been shaken in the institution of Government itself. That has been inevitable through the effect war has upon Government and its actions, but there is, therefore, a double reason why at this time, having before us a measure which is fundamental and sacred as respects the rights of citizenship, and which lies at the very foundation of self government in all free communities, we should seek as far as we can to restore that confidence in political institutions which has been impaired, if not indeed largely shattered, as one of the consequences of the war. It is in that spirit that we on this side are prepared to meet the Government in considering this legislation, to see if we cannot, through joint action, take part in the work of reconstruction and restore, not faith in the Government, not faith in the Opposition nor in any party or section, but faith in our political institutions as the best thus far devised by man for the government of man.

It is important in regard to any measure of franchise that may be brought down that it should, above all, give to the people of the country a feeling of confidence that through that instrument their will in regard to matters pertaining to Government will find free and full expression and not be frustrated by any electoral or other device.

My hon. friend gave the best of reasons why some legislation should be introduced when he referred to the fact that even he himself, and the Government of which he is a member, are unable to say at this moment just what position the country would be in as respects the franchise should a dissolution of Parliament take place. That, from one point of view, is something of a reflection upon the Government itself. My hon. friend said that legislation now being repealed had to be introduced in consequence of conditions which arose during the war. Well, that may be an excuse for the obnoxious legislation that was introduced, but it is no excuse for the fact that there should ever come a time in this country when the Government would have to admit to the people that they were unable to say what law would govern in the event of an appeal being made to the people, and the people being given an opportunity to express their will. But what my hon. friend has said is altogether too true. The right hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), who I am sorry is not here at the moment, was interviewed a short time ago on this very matter. I quote from the Montreal Star of January 13, 1920:

> "Suppose that before a new franchise is passed there should be a general election, what Act would apply?" was asked of the minister. "That," he said, "is somewhat of a conundrum, but I should say we might have to go back to the old Dominion Elections Act."

My hon. friend the Acting Solicitor General (Mr. Guthrie) intimated this afternoon that instead of having to go back to the old Dominion Elections Act, we might have to have an election under the War-time Elections Act and the Military Voters' Act—that we had not yet reached a time of peace, and that therefore these Acts still govern. I am prepared to leave the grounds for the introduction of a new Act at this time just where the minister himself has placed them. I think they do constitute the strongest of reasons why at the earliest possible moment, as I suggested in the early days of this session, a Bill should be placed before this House which would remove all doubt and uncertainty in regard to the franchise of this country. My hon. friend's words, as I took them down, were "at the present time it is doubtful if there is any valid and subsisting franchise law governing the conduct of elections by which the will of electors could be expressed," also "if we had an election we would be in rather an awkward predicament"; further that the Bill had been introduced "for the purpose of rendering definite and certain what otherwise might be indefinite and uncertain." Well, Mr. Speaker, as I have just said, we welcome this opportunity of getting back to some basis of certainty and definiteness with regard to the all important question of the franchise.

Let me say that first and foremost we welcome the feature of this Act, that proposes to repeal at one stroke all the legislation which this Government has enacted respecting the franchise since the time it took office. In Schedule Four of the Act will be found a reference to the different measures which have been enacted by this Parliament in regard to the franchise and which it is proposed to repeal in their entirety: An Act to amend the Dominion Elections Act (Statutes 1915), the Military Voters' Act, 1917, the War-time Elections

Act (Statutes 1917), An Act to Confer the Electoral Franchise upon Women (Statutes 1918), An Act to amend Chapter Thirty-nine of the Statutes of 1917 (Statutes 1918), An Act respecting the Election held in the Electoral District of Yukon, 1918 (Statutes 1918), the Dominion By-Election Act, 1919, and An Act to amend the Dominion By-Election Act, 1919 (Statutes 1919, 2nd Session). The Government, by this legislation, proposes to clean the slate of all these measures. I congratulate the Government upon giving evidence of its desire to clean the slate entirely of legislation which, to use the expressive language of my hon. friend the member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean), a former member of the Administration, constitutes a blot upon our national career. We cannot but be too glad that this stain is to be wiped off the records of this Parliament in so far as that can be done by legislative enactment.

So far as this Act is symbolical of the Government's intention to wipe out their own iniquities, to forget the past, and forgive, as well as to forget, we congratulate them upon the decision they are taking, and we heartily offer to unite with them in an endeavour to put upon the Statutes in the place of the legislation they are removing, an Act which, as my hon. friend has said, may be a model to the whole of Canada. I am prepared, Mr. Speaker, to believe that the purpose of the Government in effacing the legislation to which I have referred and bringing a fresh Bill before Parliament, is to do what they can in this post-war period, through the medium of this legislation, to unite the people of this country in good-will and good works as respect matters pertaining to the work of Parliament and the Government of the country. In that spirit we are only too happy to join in rendering whatever assistance we can from this side of the House to perfect the Act in every particular.

That leads me to speak of the attitude of the Opposition in regard to the second reading of this Bill. So far as any principle involved in this legislation is concerned, it can only be that of the desirability of having a Franchise Act which will be definite, known, just and fair. To that principle we can take no exception; it has our hearty endorsation, and we shall be only too glad to see the Government proceed with all the expedition possible, not only to get such legislation on the Statutes, but also to give the people of the country an opportunity to express their will under its provisions and have returned a Parliament which will be truly representative.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that while we acquiesce heartily in the principle of the Bill in so far as it means a new franchise, there are in the measure itself many provisions which we should like to see modified; and when it reaches the committee stage we on this side of the House will offer amendments or suggestions in regard to some of the sections, and we trust that when the Government hears what is to be said from the point of view we shall then put forward they will see the wisdom of amending the Bill accordingly.

My hon. friend in introducing this measure outlined its main provisions, and in his address to-day he repeated the outline in much the same form. I will take up what he said, just in a few words, and refer to the main features of the Bill.

Let me take the features of the Bill as my hon. friend has stated them. He points out, in the first place, that the purpose of the Bill is to fix a uniform franchise throughout the Dominion. With that purpose we are in entire accord. In the second place, it is proposed to provide a uniform method for the preparation of voters' lists. As to the provision of a uniform method, that depends in large measure upon just what the particular method is for which the Government desires uniformity. I think there is room for improvement in the Bill in that particular. In the third place, it aims to provide a simple and satisfactory method for the conduct of elections. We all wish to see a simple and satisfactory method provided as soon as possible, and there can be no question that any means that will achieve that end is eminently desirable.

The franchise, my hon. friend says, is to be established upon very broad principles. The only requirements in regard to qualifications will be, he informs us, those of British citizenship, residence in Canada for one year, and in the particular constituency for two months, and attainment of the age of twenty-one years; these requirements to apply in the cases of male and female voters alike. Now, Mr. Speaker, nothing could be fairer than that, and all that we ask, as respects the qualifications there set out, is that the Government shall not profess one thing and do another; that it shall not give with one hand and withhold with the other as respects the provisions of this enactment, or its relation to any other statutes which have been enacted in the past or which may be enacted in the future by this Parliament. It was for that reason

that I asked my right hon. friend the Acting Prime Minister (Sir George Foster) the other day, whether the Government had any intention of introducing a disfranchising act at this session or any subsequent session of this Parliament. In the Bill before the House there is mention of a disfranchising act. That I understand has reference to an act so-named already on the statutes, and does not refer to some act that is contemplated and that does not as yet appear. I am glad to see my right hon. friend nods his concurrence, and is prepared to approve that statement.

In regard to one other matter, there is an exception to this requirement of British citizenship. It is an exception which was mentioned by my hon. friend, the Acting Solicitor General (Hon. Mr. Guthrie) at the time of introducing the Bill, in answer to a question I put to him on that occasion. He then drew my attention to a section in the Act with respect to provisions in provincial legislation regarding the rights of voters where considerations of race were concerned. Speaking generally, I imagine that every member of this House will feel that there should be no exceptions with reference to the rights which may accrue in virtue of British citizenship. On the other hand, as I read in the Act the exception I refer to, I am inclined to believe it is not so much an exception on any ground of race, as in the nature of a recognition of the problems of which a province may have to take account, and that in this respect it is only in accord with the federal spirit of our constitution which recognizes that while we may have one franchise for the Dominion of Canada as a whole we should at all times be prepared to consider, in matters which may involve international as well as national questions, the special concerns of particular provinces. While my hon. friend made a long speech to the House on ignoring provincial considerations, I should like to point out to him that in his own legislation in this particular he has recognized the very factor of provincial consideration, of which in any remarks I have made I have sought to have some account taken.

So much for the first main provision of the Bill. The second relates to the preparation of the voters' lists. And here, Mr. Speaker, I could not but be surprised at my hon. friend's taking exception to some statement which he said I had made in reference to provincial lists, inasmuch as, explaining this part of the Act, the very first sentence he uses is to the effect that one of the principles of the Act is the adoption o

provincial lists in certain particulars. Let me read my hon. friend's words, which will be found in Hansard of March 11, at page 353:

> In regard to the preparation of voters' lists, the principle adopted is that the existing lists in any province—

Surely that is a recognition of provincial lists—

> —the existing lists in any province which are authorized by law for use in provincial elections shall be utilized in Dominion elections.

I have never intimated at any time that more than that should be done. Let me read from the speech which I made in this House, and to which my hon. friend has referred, exactly what I said in reference to provincial lists. I am sorry to take up the time of the House in quoting anything that has already been said; but I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that my hon. friends will agree that it is necessary to do so at this moment. On March 1, 1920, at page 29 of Hansard, I spoke as follows:

> Speaking on the subject of the franchise, perhaps I might at this moment say a word in reference to the Government's promise in the speech from the Throne to bring in a new Franchise Bill. It is unfortunate for the country that the Bill referred to will owe its origin in part to some whose names have been associated with the kind of legislation I have just described.

I had been speaking then in reference to the War-time Elections Act and the Military Voters' Act.

> But let me assure the Government that if it will bring in a Bill which will help to restore public confidence in our political institutions; if it will bring in a Bill which will be honest and fair and true to the rights of the people, it will find the Opposition ready to assist and to expedite the passage of that measure. But, Sir, if a Franchise Bill is to be introduced in a form which will constitute another blot on our country's name and fame, whatever means the Government adopts to pass it, they must expect to find hon. gentlemen on this side prepared to resist to the utmost of their power legislation prejudicial to the fundamental rights of the people.
>
> The first question we would like to ask the Administration is why should there be a new Franchise Act at all? The old Dominion Elections Act has been on the Statutes for twenty-five years and in succession a majority of both political parties has been returned under its provisions. Why then do we need another Act? Why should anything more be necessary than to amend the provisions of the present statute and bring them into conformity with the needs of the country? The Government may have reasons for its proposals and we will await those reasons.

I direct my hon. friend's attention to the following words:

But I point out to the Government now so that they may take due notice of it, that if there is any endeavour to substitute a system of Dominion enumeration for the provincial lists which have been followed in accordance with the spirit of our constitution, the Government will have to give a pretty clear and satisfactory explanation before a measure of that kind will meet with the approval of the House and of the country. After the experience the country has had with Dominion enumerators, care will be taken before the freedom of our people is once again placed in the hands of the Administration for manipulation as it may see best by its own creatures. So much, Sir, in reference to the franchise and what it stands for.

I submit, Sir, that there is not a line in the foregoing statement which can be interpreted as meaning that in any way I have questioned the authority of this Parliament to pass a federal Act.

The only reference I made to provincial lists was to say that if the Government proposed to depart from the use of provincial lists and to extend the system of enumeration, the Government would have to give some very clear and satisfactory reason for so doing. I regret that my hon. friend, in his remarks, did not give us a satisfactory reason in that regard, but we shall doubtless have an opportunity as the debate goes on to have that particular point discussed.

What does the Bill propose?

According to the speech of the Acting Solicitor General when introducing the Bill:

In regard to the preparation of voters' lists, the principle adopted is that the existing lists in any province which are authorized by law for use in provincial elections shall be utilized in Dominion elections provided that they are not more than one year old or that not longer than twelve months has elapsed between the completion of such lists and the issue of a writ for the Dominion elections.

May I follow the example of my hon. friend and refer more particularly to Ontario. The voters' lists for Ontario were made up prior to the last provincial election in the month of November last year. The new Government that has come into power in Ontario has decided, to use the words of their own Attorney General, to scrap all the legislation that had to do with the system of enumeration. They have thought it well to do that because they believe that the system of enumeration does not give satisfaction, or lend confidence to any franchise law. But were we to have an election today on the last provincial list, what position would we be in? It has been disclosed since that list was prepared, to give only two examples, that in this very city—the city of Ottawa—some 8,000 names were left off, that the enumeration was so badly managed that 8,000 electors in this city did not have their names on the lists although they were entitled to have them there and in the city of Toronto something like 25,000 names were left off.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: Does my hon. friend not know that these names can be added?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am quite aware that under this Bill these names can be added, but the point I wish to draw my hon. friend's attention to is that a system of enumeration which results in leaving off 8,000 names in one place and 25,000 in another at any particular election cannot be a satisfactory one. If such a thing happened on that occasion the same result is apt to happen at any other time, and in seeking to enact by Parliament a law that will be satisfactory and which will serve to give full expression to the people's will we should endeavour to avoid the possible dissatisfaction and limitations which have been so patent in the instances I have pointed out.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Such an error would not necessarily follow.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Let me draw my right hon. friend's attention to this. In the last provincial election, in addition to the election of members, there was a prohibition referendum. My right hon. friend, who is an old temperance advocate, knows very well that in that particular election there was an effort made on the part of those who were supporting temperance legislation to get names on the lists much greater than would have been the case had the referendum not been one of the features of that particular election. Instead of 8,000 names in one case and 25,000 in another having been left off the numbers would have been considerably greater. That they were not was due to the energy of the men and women who sought to have as many names as possible put upon the lists despite the system of enumeration that was followed. What we on this side advocate is that where you have organized districts in which lists are already prepared by the constituted authorities, these lists should be made the basis of the lists on which the election is to be held, and that if it is necessary to appoint enumerators to make up lists, the enumerators should begin with the lists that are already prepared and take these lists as a basis. If a man has been put on the municipal list by an assessor in a city or in a rural district, and his name is there, that should be sufficient to guarantee to him the right to a vote at

an election. Why, after all this work has been once done, after the constituted authorities both of the cities and rural districts have prepared lists, not for any partisan purpose but for public use in connection with municipal matters, should all that work be duplicated at great cost to the State? It is a question whether the Government, in its desire for uniformity has not sacrificed considerations of even greater importance, namely, security, efficiency and economy.

My hon. friend said he was anxious to introduce a law which would be not only expeditious but also economical. At the last federal election this system of enumeration was adopted. Let me give to the House the figures on the cost of the last election compared with the cost of other general elections that have taken place in the Dominion. In this House on March 22, the hon. the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) gave the following statement as to the cost of elections in the Dominion from 1896 to 1917. The figures were as follows:

1896	$ 197,103 35
1900	232,911 20
1904	307,995 60
1908	391,960 32
1911	507,353 55
1917	1,678,139 99

Look at the enormous increase from $507,353.55 in 1911 to $1,678,139.99 in 1917. When I saw those figures I thought that possibly the enormous cost had been due to the fact that they included the expenses of taking the soldiers' vote as well as the cost of enumeration of the voters' lists, and so I undertook to get the figures for those two groups separately—the cost of the election so far as the taking of the soldiers' vote was concerned, and the cost of the election in Canada apart from the soldiers' vote. Here are the figures, and I do not think they will be disputed. The cost of taking the soldiers' votes came to $251,613.09. The total expenditure was $1,678,139.99, making a cost, so far as Canada alone was concerned, of over $1,400,000. Now that increase of cost is to be ascribed almost wholly to the adoption of this system of employing enumerators by the thousands, and paying them for duplicating work that has already been performed in large part, in the preparation of municipal lists. If there is one thing above another which at this time we have reason to be careful of, it is the matter of large expenditures in the administration of public business; if we can save a million dollars and at the same time give to the electors a greater sense of security when they exercise the franchise than they otherwise would have, I think we are bound to do so. That is what I would urge upon my hon. friends opposite.

This legislation, as I read it, instead of seeking to confine the system of enumeration seeks to extend it. The Government in that particular is undoubtedly going in the wrong direction. The Government should seek to restrict the work of enumeration as much as possible, and so far as practicable take lists that are approved and accepted locally, or approved provincially. Those lists I contend should be used as largely as possible for the purposes of a general election.

Just one further word in reference to the two main provisions respecting voters' lists. In introducing the Bill my hon. friend said that where no provincial lists existed, the principle adopted by the Bill was, in urban municipalities, that of registration and, in rural municipalities, that of registration by way of enumeration. Urban municipalities are described in the Bill as cities, towns, and incorporated villages with populations of not less than 1,000. In such municipalities the principle of registration is very simple: All persons, male and female, will be required to register within the time prescribed by the Bill. When the registration period has expired appeals are permitted either by those whose names are not upon the lists, or against those whose names have been placed thereon. Those appeals, in all provinces where there are what we know as County Judges, are to such judges who are appointed revising officers. In provinces where there are District Judges, as opposed to County Judges, the appeals are to the District Judges.

Sir, there is one feature in this connection not mentioned by my hon. friend, to which I should like to draw the attention of the Government, and that is the time within which this work of preparing the lists is to be carried out. As I read the Bill, the preparation of the lists, either in the cities or in the rural districts, is not to be commenced until after the writ for the election has been issued. In other words, under this legislation as drafted, once the writ for an election is issued, at a time when candidates should be discussing the public questions on the different platforms, they will be beset from all sides by electors raising questions as to whether their names are or are not upon the lists, and as to how they can be put there. I think my hon. friends opposite need only to realize what

the Bill as drafted means in that regard to see the wisdom of bringing about some change. Indeed, as one reads the Bill it would appear that in so far as the cities are concerned the revising officers are not obliged to furnish a candidate with the names of those who are entitled to vote until within four days of the voting itself. That gives no opportunity at all to a candidate to make sure that the lists are anything like as complete as they should be. It brings added confusion at a time when every effort should be made to avoid confusion. It leaves room for all kinds of irregularities and mistakes, and the time left to correct, or remedy, any of these errors is so short that there is absolutely no opportunity to have a satisfactory adjustment. When we come to consider the Bill in Committee that is one aspect which we would like the Government to reconsider.

But let me draw the attention of the House to yet other features. So far as the cities are concerned, the Bill recognizes the principle, in addition to registration, of having some court of appeal and some finality in the matter of the preparation of lists. There is a court of appeal, and the appeal is to constituted judicial authorities —authorities who are not appointed by the Government itself but who belong to the judiciary of the province. Those principles are good. But if they are good so far as cities are concerned, why should not similar principles be adopted in regard to the rural districts? That is the point above all others that we would like the Government to consider most carefully when we come to deal with the Bill in Committee.

What we feel is this: In regard to rural municipalities the Bill as now drafted opens the door to all kinds of possible irregularities. One has only to state the provisions of the law, for any person to see in a moment the possible evil consequences which may flow from their adoption. Here is the machinery: The Government appoints the returning officers; the returning officers appoint deputy returning officers and also appoint what are called "registrars." Now the registrars are simply enumerators. The Government has changed the name "enumerator" because it has an objectionable flavour in consequence of the abuses of that system as they were experienced under the War-time Elections Act; but despite their caution in place of the word "registrar" the word "enumerator" has slipped three different times into the Bill as it has been brought down. The system of enumerators is adopted. These enumerators, as mentioned, are appointed by the appointees of the Government, and what happens then? The enumerator is made all-powerful in the preparation and revision of the lists. There is no appeal whatever from his decision one way or the other. The Solicitor General spoke about what he termed "the iniquity" of the old system of revising barristers. He was very strong and emphatic in the protest he made against the system of leaving the preparation of lists to revising barristers. But, Mr. Speaker, this is exactly the same thing. The only difference is, that instead of having for the purpose of revising the lists, men of the intelligence that revising barristers might be expected to have, the Government is prepared to leave it to the type of men sometimes described as "ward heelers" to prepare the lists, and allows them the final say as to whether a name is to be added to a list or to be stricken from it.

Now, we think that feature of the Act is thoroughly objectionable; and, as I have said, one has only to consider what it may mean to realize how extremely objectionable it is. These enumerators, or registrars as the Act calls them, appointed by appointees of the Government, prepare whatever lists they like. They can omit whole streets of houses if they wish, no appeal can be made against their action; they can put on whoever they please and leave off whoever they please, and there is no remedy. Then on the day after nomination they furnish the candidate with the lists they have prepared, and the Bill requires that during the next five or six days they are to specify certain hours during which they may be waited upon by different persons who wish to have their names added to or other names stricken off the lists. But the Bill does not require that they must add the names, nor are they prevented from striking off any names they please. They have their place of residence for receiving whoever may turn up, and it may be any place that they themselves choose. In the last election I remember very well that some of the men who were selected as enumerators in the riding in which I was a candidate, had their offices in back kitchens, and half the time it was only with the greatest difficulty that electors could find them at all. The system under this Bill is exactly the same. It means haste in the preparation of lists by an army of enumerators, with arbitrary powers, no useful checks, and opportunity for all kinds of errors, confusion and frauds.

But that is not all, the lists having been prepared in the way I have described, the

Bill requires that on the day of polling the enumerators shall hand their lists to whoever is in charge of the poll, but after the lists have been handed to the deputy returning officer, any man or woman, notwithstanding that his or her name is not on the list, can, if willing to take the prescribed oath, exercise the right to vote, and that ballot is put into the ballot box along with other ballots to be counted along with the rest, and there is no way of distinguishing it from any of the others. I am sure that my hon. friends, when they stop to think what that procedure means, will hesitate to give it permanent expression in any legislation. I confess that it made me feel sad at heart when I read that particular provision.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Buck up.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: "Buck up" my right hon. friend says. I shall "buck up," my hon. friend need have no fear. But I was sad at heart for the reason that if there is one purpose above another we should seek to accomplish in legislation of this kind it is to find a means above suspicion to give to the people the right to exercise the franchise fairly and honestly, and I despaired of that when I saw this provision.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: When we come to those details—and of course they are details—then we can thresh them out.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am glad to hear my right hon. friend say that we can thresh out those details, because I am sure he is already feeling that it is a great mistake to have ever had the Bill drafted in that form—

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am not saying that.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: —for it certainly shakes confidence not only in the legislation as it will be when finally enacted, should these provisions stand, but to a certain extent in the Government's intentions, when it brings down a measure of that kind. I desire to be the last to entertain distrust of the Government's intention to do other than what it has professed to be its wish, namely, to put an Act on the statutes which will be above suspicion.

Before I leave this particular feature of the Bill I wish to point out that as the Bill now stands any group of men could go into any rural riding, demand at one poll the right to vote, be given that right by the returning officer, exercise that right, and then go on to the next poll, and the next, and so on, for as many polls as they are willing to attempt, and vote in every one. They might be men of no character, men brought from the country to the south out of quarters of cities where only men prepared to perjure themselves could be found. The Bill as it is drawn invites irregularities of that kind, because it makes possible through the act of perjury the winning of any riding in a rural district where the opposing parties are at all evenly matched. We should be the last to pass any measure which will tend not only to destroy the confidence of the electorate in the machinery of elections, but which will also tend to foster irregularities and crime. There should be finality in the matter of the preparation of the voters' lists and the possibility of revision before some regularly constituted authorities.

Now, Sir, apart from the features of the Bill which I have already dealt with, the only other general feature mentioned by my hon. friend is the machinery provided for the conduct of elections. I think in that respect the Bill follows pretty much along the lines of the legislation we are accustomed to, and in so far as that is the case, no exception can be taken to it.

There are a few innovations in the Bill, such as the provision for the appointment of a general electoral officer, the separation of nomination and polling days by an interval of fourteen days instead of the customary seven, and one or two other minor features. Doubtless the Government has reasons for introducing these innovations and will give them when the Bill is in Committee.

With the exceptions and possibilities I have pointed out, there are features of the Bill which all will be prepared to commend, and I have only to repeat what I said at the outset, that in discussing this measure at the present time we of the Opposition wish to approach the Government in the spirit in which the hon. Acting Solicitor General (Mr. Guthrie) has said he is desirous of having the Bill considered. All we want is a fair Bill, a Bill that will be effective and make the machinery of elections economical, a Bill which when it is upon the statutes will help to restore on the part of the electorate confidence that their will is being expressed and not frustrated by any electoral device—a Bill that will be honest and just. If we can get that we will be not only doing a service to the

people of our own country, but we will be helping the cause of good government everywhere.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. F. F. PARDEE (West Lambton): Mr. Speaker, after the very able presentation which the Minister of Militia (Hon. Mr. Guthrie) gave us this afternoon of the proposed Franchise Act one would imagine—and it may be so; further inquiry will, perhaps, clear up that point—that all that this House and the Canadian people had to do was to fall down and worship and thank Heaven that such a fair Franchise Act had been introduced. I say, Sir, that perhaps they will, but perhaps they will not. In the few remarks that I have to make I shall take up the suggestion made by the minister that both the Opposition and hon. gentlemen on the Government side should give their very best judgment and their very best thought to the consideration of this Bill, and that the Government would be content to accept any amendments which in their opinion might be deemed proper. The minister asked for suggestions and amendments in order that the whole matter might be made just as clear and just as fair as possible. In fact, he used the word "fairness"; he said that the Government desired only to submit to the country an Act that was absolutely fair; that, he said, was all they wanted to do. I shall confine myself to one phase of this proposed Act, Sir, reserving to myself, of course, the right to suggest in committee what in my opinion and in the opinion of this side of the House may be for the better working of the Act.

As long as I have been in public life, the one thing that has done more to divide the Canadian people and to make Canada more difficult to govern than any country that I know of has been the continual raising of racial and religious questions, day in and day out, month in and month out, year in and year out. There has never been a time during the course of my public life that I have not had to contend against this: There has never been a time, Sir, that I have not deprecated it with all the force that was in me. To my mind it is the greatest curse that has descended upon this fair country. It is the one thing that keeps Canada from being what it ought to be. In my opinion, members of this House ought to sink absolutely such considerations; ought to look upon themselves as Canadians and as Canadians only and come to the conclusion that no distinctions shall be made of class or creed. Could that be done, it would be for the benefit of Canada as a nation and would tend in the very greatest degree, more than anything else could tend, to the building up of our country to what it ought to be.

Sir, we had the war, and things were more or less abnormal. Ideas rather ran amuck; we were more or less carried away, and perhaps we did some things which in more sober moments we would not do. Section 30 of this Bill which has been brought down says:

> The respective persons hereunder mentioned shall for the time specified as to each such person be disqualified and incompetent to vote at an election.

And subsection (d) of this section says: "Persons disfranchised under the Disfranchising Act".

The Disfranchising Act is really the Naturalization Act of 1919. By Chapter 38, section 8, subsection 4, paragraph (b), the Naturalization Act of 1919 says:

> No certificate of naturalization shall, before the expiration of a period of ten years after the termination of the present war, be granted in Canada to any subject of a country who at the time of the passing of this Act was at war with His Majesty, but this provision shall not apply to a person who—

Then it goes to refer to those who served in His Majesty's forces, and so on. When you come to consider this section and read it in conjunction with section 30 of the proposed Bill, what does it mean? It means that any person who, by reason of being an alien enemy, is not now entitled to apply for naturalization, or who cannot be naturalized under the law as it stands at present, cannot vote for a period of ten years.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. PARDEE: I hear some hon. gentlemen opposite say, "Hear, hear". I will put a question to them. Now that the war is over, should we continue to manifest the spirit that prevailed while the war was in progress? Should we not forget our differences and proceed to build ourselves up into a big, strong nation? Should we for ten long years keep open the old sores by putting a man in such a position that it may be said of him: That man, although he adds to the wealth of Canada; although he pays taxes; although he is a friend of this country, shall not have the right to vote; shall not have the slightest thing to

do with the Government of this country? I ask any man in this House whether that tends to the upbuilding of Canada; whether it will make of this a united country? In my opinion it is the one thing Canada can do to perpetuate and keep open the old sore of race and religion which has cursed this country for years past, and I say to the members of this House and to every man, woman and child in Canada that if they wish to have immigration come to these shores and to see this country grow great and become what she ought to become, the sooner we get rid of that spirit the better.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: How does the hon. member come to associate religion with the disqualification of an alien enemy?

Mr. PARDEE: I was not associating religion with it. I said that was the cry in times past, and that this is nothing more or less than an attempt to perpetuate that cry. The Act, so far as this section is concerned, is bad, and against the best interests of the people of this country. It is not such an Act as will redound to the credit of Canada. Why, the War-times Election Act is not a patch on this Act for disqualifying citizens, when we read these two sections in conjunction. Even the mother of a son who went to the war and fought with the Allies and was killed may not be entitled to vote under this Act; the younger son in a family may vote, and the older son may not vote. Reading these two sections in conjunction, and taking into consideration all their ramifications, I say without fear of successful contradiction that there will be more people disfranchised under this Act as it stands to-day than were disfranchised under the War-times Election Act. Do we want that? Canada is a young country, with between 8,000,000 and 9,000,000 of people, and in what does Canada's hope lie? How can this country become prosperous? Only in one way, and that is by having people come to our shores and tilling our land and engaging in our industries. Only in that way will you get out of Canada the real stuff that is in it. It is the only way in which we can develop our potential resources. Will people come to our shores with that section of the Act barring them for ten long years from a voice in the government of this country, as to who shall or shall not rule? They will not. Where will Canada be then? Where will the great West be, with its millions of acres crying for people to come and till them? Will you get these people? Not at all. I say that no one considers himself a citizen who does not feel that he has a right to a voice in the government of his country. If the sections I have quoted are to be retained in the Act, disfranchising these people and keeping open the old sore, the Act will not redound to the credit of Canada, but will be absolutely to its detriment. If there is one thing we have preached, and we have preached it more of late since the League of Nations came into being, it is that Canada is a nation. Canada is a nation. Then let us be big enough to put on nationhood's clothes and stand as a nation. If we propose to do otherwise, the world, which now has its eyes upon us, will turn them in another direction. No man or woman of alien birth will come to Canada unless they know they will have a right to a voice in Canada's affairs.

Mr. EDWARDS: Do we want them?

Mr. PARDEE: We want them.

Mr. EDWARDS: That is your opinion; it is not mine.

Mr. PARDEE: My hon. friend may have his opinion, and I may have mine.

Mr. EDWARDS: Just so.

Mr. PARDEE: I say that no country can prosper or become great or develop its potential wealth without people. Where are the people to come from?

Mr. EDWARDS: No country ever became great by suckling traitors.

Mr. PARDEE: There is the old sore. That is what is keeping Canada where she is to-day. I say there are thousands of people in Canada to-day who will be disfranchised under this Act, who, though of alien birth, are just as loyal as any man that sits in this House to-day. If we are going to keep that old sore open, if a section of our population is going to continue preaching that doctrine, Canada's last state will be worse than her first.

Mr. CURRIE: We will get along all right.

Mr. PARDEE: Speaking for myself, I say that the shutting out of an alien population is not British. My hon. friend the Acting Solicitor General (Mr. Guthrie) to-day referred to the United States. The United States took a long time to get into the war, but now the war is over; they went into it, and they have come out of it, and do you hear any rumblings in the United States about shutting out alien voters?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Yes.

Mr. PARDEE: No such thing. They are American citizens entitled to take the oath of allegiance, and as such are entitled to a voice in the government of the country, and such voice they have. But we here in Canada, in our splendid isolation, with our 8,000,000 of people on the biggest part of the North American continent, are so intensely ultra-loyal that we say that no matter how loyal these people may be, no matter how much regard they may have for the constitution of Canada, no matter whether they came here to the land of the free to escape the thraldom of the old land, they shall not be allowed to vote for a period of ten years, but shall be segregated and kept apart from the ordinary citizen, and shall have the finger of scorn pointed at them. For what? The only accusation you can bring against them, loyal and Canadian and all as they are, is that their mother was an alien. Why, Mr. Speaker, birth is simply a matter of accident. If we are born to a nation or to a religion, there it is. It is not my fault or your fault or the fault of any one; it is simply an accident, that is all. Are we, Sir, to damn the people that come to this country on that account?

Mr. BURNHAM: May I ask the hon. gentleman—

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: It was an accident for you too.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. BURNHAM: I am inclined to think there will be a fatal accident up North to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Wait and see.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order

Mr. BURNHAM: I want to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pardee) if he would do away with the precautions taken for the acquirement of citizenship under the Naturalization Act, and under all naturalization acts.

Mr. PARDEE: I did not say so. It is all right to take the precautions, but why in the name of Heaven keep them open for ten years? I have naturalized many men, and women too, and I know that precautions are necessary; but why you should keep that sore open for ten long years, almost a generation, is beyond my humble capacity to understand. Sir, along these lines I have the greatest objection to this Act. I say that so far as we here in this House are concerned, there is only one thing for us to do, and that is to attempt in every way possible, with sane mind and level conception, to unite all the peoples in the Dominion of Canada into one great whole. We should bring them to the idea, and that idea only, that they are Canadians first and members of the British Empire, and that only as Canadians can we go on and make for the great destiny that is open to us. Along these lines legislation ought to go, and if it does not, then I say we are not true to ourselves as Canadian citizens. As I said before, there are other portions of the Act with which I have some fault to find. I shall not go into them now; I shall take the opportunity to do so in committee of the whole house. In the meantime, however, I say most earnestly,—whether this opinion be popular or unpopular I care not a button—that what I have stated is the only way to make Canada what she ought to be. To my mind it is the only way to make Canada a nation of which we can rightly boast. If we are derelict in our duty in doing this, then I say it will redound to the discredit of the country, and will point to the fact that the legislators of the great Dominion of Canada have not that broad vision of nationhood which they ought to have. It will so lower us in the eyes of the world that under those conditions emigration will go from our shores.

Mr. JOHN WESLEY EDWARDS (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to intervene in this debate on the second reading of the Bill; any comments I have to make I had intended to withhold until the Bill was in committee. However, while I shall not take up very much time, I desire to make a few observations on the remarks which have just fallen from the lips of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Pardee). The hon. gentleman is very bold and very courageous in stating to this House and to the country that he does not care a button whether his course is popular or unpopular. Just a short time ago he was perfectly willing, when he was seeking election in 1917, to avail himself of the measure disfranchising some people whom to-day he says it would be a crying shame to disfranchise.

Mr. PARDEE: Mr. Speaker, may I say that although I supported the Union Government, at every stage of the War-time Elections Act I voted against it.

Mr. EDWARDS: The hon. gentleman, I repeat—

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Of course.

Mr. EDWARDS: Yes, of course. That remark came from the hon. member for Quebec, and I may say—

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: It did, and it does again; narrowness true to itself.

Mr. EDWARDS: I shall have something to say to the hon. gentleman before I sit down.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. EDWARDS: The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Pardee) in the election of 1917 was not only perfectly willing, but anxious to avail himself of the Act which was passed enabling him to get his seat in the House.

Mr. PARDEE: He was not anxious.

Mr. EDWARDS: I repeat that the hon. gentleman was perfectly willing, nay eager, to avail himself of the Act which gave the vote to the soldiers overseas, a share of which vote he got.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. PARDEE: Not at all.

Mr. EDWARDS: Does the hon. gentleman say "no" to that statement?

Mr. PARDEE: Yes.

Mr. EDWARDS: The hon. gentleman informs us, then, that he did not want the soldiers' vote. Well, I do not think that on cool reflection he will again deny that the statement I made is correct.

Mr. PARDEE: Yes, I will.

Mr. EDWARDS: The hon. gentleman tells us he did not want the soldiers' vote. Well—

Mr. PARDEE: I did not say so, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BUREAU: Let him proceed; he must get rid of his bile.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: He has a good deal of it.

Mr. EDWARDS: I did not catch the remarks of the hon. member for Three Rivers.

Mr. BUREAU: I said you had to spill your bile. Go on.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. EDWARDS: There is a possibility, Mr. Speaker, of my getting rid of all the bile I may have; but—

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Oh, no.

[Mr. E. Lapointe.]

Mr. EDWARDS: But there is no possibility of the hon. member for Three Rivers getting rid of his.

Mr. BUREAU: He has not got any bile; that is the difference between us.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I must appeal to hon. members, if they desire to address the House, to do the House the courtesy of rising in their seats, and I must also point out that the hon. member who has the floor may not be interrupted except on a point of order or to be asked a question.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Some men rise and do not know what courtesy is.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. EDWARDS: I do not expect court esy from certain hon. members on the other side of the House, especially I may say, the hon. member for Quebec.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: That is something the hon. gentleman knows nothing about.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I trust the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) will bear in mind that we are debating the principles involved in the second reading of the Franchise Bill.

Mr. EDWARDS: That fact, Mr. Speaker, I shall endeavour to keep in mind, but I presume I shall have your sympathy when I say that it is somewhat difficult to keep the subject matter of the debate rigidly in mind in the face of the interruptions which have been levelled at me from the other side of the House and which, I venture to say, have neither been warranted nor courteous. The hon. gentleman who has taken his seat (Mr. Pardee) waxed very eloquent and somewhat violent in his statement that he wanted to see done away with entirely this curse of race and religion, which had divided every country in times past. He hoped to see no more of it. I can cordially join with the hon. gentleman in that wish, but I can hardly understand the gentleman who occupies the seat immediately to his right (Mr. E. Lapointe) saying "hear, hear" to that expression of opinion, for I have a distinct recollection, as I am sure many hon. members have, of that hon. gentleman, who then represented Kamouraska, moving a resolution in this House, when this country was at war, that could have no other effect than to divide the people.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. EDWARDS: That, I presume, is a pertinent remark.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member who has the floor is quite in order in rebutting any argument of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Pardee). He is not in order, however, in referring to the attitude of the hon. member for Quebec, who has not spoken and in discussing a matter which is not germane to the subject before the House.

Mr. EDWARDS: Perhaps I was in error, Mr. Speaker, in supposing that the remarks made by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Pardee) were added to in strength by the endorsing "hear, hear" of the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Lapointe). It was on the supposition that the hon. member's expression endorsing the remark of the hon. member for Lambton justified me in directing some remarks to my hon. friend from Quebec that I adverted to that gentleman. Undoubtedly your ruling is correct, Sir, and it was unnecessary for me to refer to the hon. gentleman's "hear, hear" which I am sure added absolutely nothing to the arguments of his colleagues on his left.

The hon. member for Lambton asks us to return to the pre-war spirit, to forget the differences that divided us, to build ourselves into a strong nation, and so on. It is all very well to forget our differences, but in forgetting our differences we should not forget those people who forgot their country when it needed their support. It is all very well for my hon. friend to say: Let us forget our differences and bury the past; let us forget all those people whose sympathies, actively and otherwise, were turned against the men who went overseas prepared to give their lives for their country; it is all very well for him to say forget these things but we cannot remember the sacrifices that were made by our boys overseas and not remember the attitude of these people.

My hon. friend (Mr. Pardee) thinks that an alien enemy population of this kind will be the greatest asset of this country. He asks us whether we wish to stop immigration and he answers this question with an emphatic "no." I just as emphatically tell him that I do wish to stop that kind of immigration into this country. If you could get the opinion of the people of Canada generally I am convinced that ninety per cent would say that the country can get along and build itself up for the next ten years at least without the assistance of any Austrian or German immigrants. We want immigrants in Canada, but, as it has been intimated to us on more than one occasion in this House since the session started, we should in the future have regard to the quality rather than the quantity of the immigrants we get. Will the hon. member for Lambton tell me if his view is that we should throw the doors of this country wide open to the people of Germany, Austria and Turkey and let them come in and take part in making our laws? That apparently is what he wants.

We would be untrue to the men who sacrificed their lives, we would be forgetting those who had been fighting for four or five years and pouring out their blood on the battlefields of Europe if we opened our doors and allowed that class of immigrants to come into this country and have the privileges of other men who fought our battles or whose sons gave up their lives in the war. In that respect I am perfectly prepared to differ from the hon. member from Lambton just as widely as one pole is separated from the other. I believe the people of Canada will endorse my attitude rather than the attitude of the hon. gentleman.

I want to repeat with the utmost emphasis that in my judgment in framing this Franchise Act we must have regard to the quality of our citizens. If we are to be fair to those who have the privileges of citizenship and who bore unflinchingly the duties of citizenship we cannot regard in the same light those who had the privileges of citizenship but who refused disloyally to bear their share of the responsibilities of citizenship. The hon. member for Lambton and those who sit about him would amend this Franchise Act so that when polling day came in Canada we would have this spectacle: Here is a man back from the front who served several years overseas, he is minus a leg or an arm and otherwise shattered by the war, and here is an Austrian or a German who fought against him, whose sympathies were against him, who was doing everything he could to make it hard for him over there and to prevent his coming back, elbowing him to one side in order that he might put his ballot in the box. I will not endorse such an attitude as that on the part of this or any other government. To place these people on an equality with the men who have made sacrifices in the late war is to cast a slur

on every man who made a sacrifice in that war. The attitude of the hon. member for Lambton and its endorsation by hon. members on that side of the House weakens his argument rather than strengthens it in my opinion.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. EDWARDS: In my opinion the endorsation of what was stated by my hon. friend from Lambton by hon. gentlemen on that side of the House sitting about him weakens his argument rather than strengthens it.

Mr. CANNON: Will the hon. gentleman allow me one question?

Mr. EDWARDS: Not from you.

Mr. CANNON: Is the hon. gentleman expressing simply his personal opinion? If it is only the hon. gentleman's personal opinion it does not count for much.

Mr. EDWARDS: In regard to my personal opinion whether it counts much or little, at all events I believe it will count for just as much in the estimation of the country as any opinion offered by the hon. gentleman who just got up (Mr. Cannon). In the course of his remarks the hon. gentleman for Lambton asked: "Would Britain shut out any alien; would that be the policy of Britain; would Britain do anything of that kind?" He characterized this particular portion of the Act as being un-British and I heard "hear, hear" from the hon. gentleman who sits immediately at his right and another "hear, hear" from the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) and another from that volatile young gentleman who rose just a few moments ago. When I heard the hon. member for Dorchester say, "hear, hear," I thought that it suited his purpose to say that this Act was un-British—that hon. gentleman who, in the course of an election campaign asked: "What do we owe to England,"? who replied: "We owe nothing to England," and whose whole stand when he was appealing for votes for himself was most shamelessly anti-British.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Sevigny said that.

Mr. EDWARDS: It is extremely pleasant to me to get beneath the hides of these hon. gentlemen. In no way could they give greater satisfaction to me than by showing their dissent. If, Mr. Speaker, I received the endorsation of these hon. gentlemen I would be sure that I was wrong. It is because they endorsed the hon. member for Lambton that I said that his argument and the conclusion from his argument must be wrong. These gentlemen talked about British institutions and British fair play. What was their attitude when British institutions, the British constitution and the British Empire were at stake?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. EDWARDS: All through the war what was their attitude?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. EDWARDS: Hon. gentlemen opposite may answer by saying "Oh, oh." In that respect they represent by the aritmetical character of "O" which is naught, what they have done to maintain British institutions. They are using the proper term because it accurately represents their attitude during the war. According to the principles they enunciated during the war, their attitude would be represented by a cypher and therefore they ought to say "O" and say it with very good grace and very properly when referring to their attitude at that particular time. If it means that their consciences are beginning to work, well even I shall be very pleased indeed.

Mr. GAUVREAU: How does the Franchise Bill come into all this?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Censored by the lodge.

Mr. EDWARDS: As I said upon rising I do not intend to discuss this Bill very fully.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, no.

Mr. EDWARDS: I was going to follow the example set by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pardee) and confine myself to one particular phase of it. I want to assure hon. gentlemen opposite, several of whom have asked me questions on different points that in the limited time at my disposal I am not going to undertake to fill the void in their craniums which needs filling in order to afford them the information which they desire. But if these hon. gentlemen some time during the recess will come to me for information, I will endeavour to the best of my ability to fill the vacuum which I know is there.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. EDWARDS: I will do what I can to help them out and give them the information which they so much desire.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the expression of the hon. member is hardly in keeping with the dignity or decorum of the House.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is all right from him.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Take it back.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. EDWARDS: To what particular expression, Mr. Speaker, do you refer?

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member used an expression with reference to members of this House which is not in keeping with the dignity or decorum of the House, and I think the hon. member would be well advised if he would withdraw it. The expression in question was the reference to certain hon. gentlemen as "having a void in their craniums."

An hon. MEMBER: It is all right.

Mr. EDWARDS: I did not notice at the time that I was saying anything that might be regarded as contrary to the rules. If I did so, I will withdraw the remark.

An hon. MEMBER: The hon. member does not know any better.

Mr. EDWARDS: I am very glad, indeed, to know and to have it demonstrated to me beyond any doubt that the statement I made in regard to the unfurnished condition of their mental attics was incorrect.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Don't be too witty now.

Mr. EDWARDS: There are gentlemen on the other side of the House——

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Do not try to be human.

Mr. EDWARDS: My hon. friend——

An hon. MEMBER: Say it in French.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must put it to hon. members, whether a debate can be rightly and properly conducted under such conditions as have prevailed for the last three or four minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS: Do I understand, Mr. Speaker, that your remarks in that particular instance are directed to this side of the House?

Mr. SPEAKER: To the whole House.

Mr. EDWARDS: With all due deference, I see no particular reason for the application of your warning to hon. gentlemen on this side. My hon. friend from Chambly and Vercheres asked me not to be humourous——

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I said "human."

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. EDWARDS: I would not presume to undertake to play the part of a humourist or clown so long as my hon. friend is in the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. EDWARDS: I know that I should only run a poor second to my hon. friend in that regard, and therefore I will leave him a clear field.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: An also-ran.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, we will have a further opportunity of discussing this particular clause in committee. Once more, allow me to say that I disassociate myself entirely from the remarks made by the hon. member (Mr. Pardee) that we should lay aside all of those things which had their influence when the War-time Elections Act and the Military Voters' Act were passed. In considering the future of Canada may I be permitted to say that in my judgment we should be more particular in handing out the franchise than we have ever been in the past? May I say that in my judgment one of the great weaknesses in our Franchise Acts in this country is that we have opened the door too wide. We have cared nothing whether a man understood a word of the English language or not, or whether he understood anything of British principles or of our constitution. So long as he was twenty-one years of age he was allowed to vote and so enjoyed as free an exercise of the franchise as a man who thoroughly understood the principles of Government under which we live.

In my judgment that is wrong and I think it has been a weakness in our legislation in this country. If those people come to Canada from other countries they do so because they believe the conditions here are better than the conditions in the country of their birth. That being the case I say that they should in some way show that they possess some knowledge of our country and of our principles of government before they are put on an equal footing with people who were born and raised in Canada and upon whom in a time of crisis the responsibility of "carrying on" devolves. I say, Sir, with respect to any person or to any class of people in Canada who during the last four or five years proved by their attitude that they were not prepared to assume all the responsibilities of citizenship, that I am not ready for one, simply because the war is over, to tell them that they can come in and have as much voice in the administration of the affairs of this country for the next five or ten

years as those persons who assumed and worthily bore their full share of responsibility. That is my attitude and I believe it will appeal with greater force to the people of Canada than the attitude which has been stated by my hon. friend (Mr. Pardee) and so vigorously endorsed by those who sit around him.

Mr. A. R. McMASTER (Brome): I will not attempt, Mr. Speaker, to answer bitter words with bitter words. The occasion which calls us together this evening is of far too great importance for us to take up the country's time in bandying doubtful compliments across the floor of the Chamber. I rise for the purpose of supporting the spirit of the remarks offered by the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) and I would like to draw the attention of hon. members to the manner in which other countries that have suffered just as much as we have—aye, and far more—in the conflict which has closed are treating this subject of after the war reconstruction. This Bill is a part of after the war reconstruction, for what we are discussing to-night is the charter under which Canadian society shall operate in the future.

Let us turn for a moment to Italy. I suppose there are few nations in the world that have suffered as Italy has suffered under the awful tyranny imposed upon her for generations by Austria. During the war Italy suffered frightfully; her northern provinces, some of the fairest she possesses, were overwhelmed by Austrian and German troops. A poor country with a tremendous debt before the war, her debt is now of crushing magnitude. Life will be harder and more bitter on account of the war for the population of Italy for years to come. But what is Italy doing to-day, Mr. Speaker? Italy in her poverty is taking tens of thousands of starving Austrian children and entertaining them in her own homes. That is the spirit in which the world can be reconstructed for a better future; but the spirit shown by some hon. members is just the opposite.

What is Great Britain doing? I would suppose all will admit that the part played in the war by Great Britain, by those little islands in the North sea, has been just as fine as the part played by Canada. I would imagine that all hon. members will agree with me when I state that the losses of young British manhood have been as heavy, aye, heavier than our own. Why, Scotland, the place from which my forbears came, has lost such a proportion of her young manhood as would make the angels weep. What is Great Britain doing? To-day perhaps the one solvent country in Europe, through the Economic Council of the Allies at Paris she is proposing to make advances to Germany in order to allow that country to get on its feet.

Mr. CURRIE: That is not votes.

Mr. McMASTER: No, but that is the spirit which should animate us to-day. Now, in that spirit I shall ask all hon. members to approach this matter—not animated by hate, for, as the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Andrews) said the other day, we cannot build up a new world on hate; we must build it up on love. Is it a strange doctrine to say that one must love his enemies? It is a doctrine that has been preached for two hundred years—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh. Two thousand years.

Mr. McMASTER: We may well laugh, because although it has been preached for two thousand years it has never been followed in international politics. The great fundamental reason for the Gethsemane through which humanity has passed during the last five years was that those principles were not adopted. And I ask this House and this country to approach this subject in the proper spirit—and we all know what that proper spirit is.

Let me ask this question also. Did those in our community from whom the right to vote is taken by this Bill—our people of Austrian origin—behave themselves badly during that period? I cannot speak from personal experience. I know there are very few German or Austrian people in Montreal, and there are none in my constituency; but as far as I know they gave no succour to the enemy, but behaved themselves in seemly and proper fashion; and from the information I have received I understand that in other parts of the country those belonging especially to the Austrian nation, Hungarians and Bohemians, were not only not anti-British or anti-Ally, they were pro-Ally, and volunteered in large numbers to fight for the Allies. Have there been plots in Canada by our German population? I do not think so. I believe I should have heard of them had there been any.

But, after all, I ask: How are we going to build up a Canadian people? It seems to me that there are only two courses to pursue: If a man is not a desirable citi-

zen, he should be asked on fair terms to leave the country; and if he is a desirable citizen, then he should be given all the privileges and responsibilities of citizenship. I know no other way by which you can build up a great nation.

Before I sit down I wish to deal further with the principle of the Bill. By section 30, subsection one (g) it is provided that:

> Persons who, by the laws of any province in Canada, are disqualified from voting for a member of the Legislative Assembly of such province in respect of race, shall not be qualified to vote in such province under the provisions of this Act.

To this provision I take strong exception. I do not think it is wise, nor do I think it is honourable. This is our Act—the Act of the Dominion of Canada. Naturalization papers are given by this Government—the federal Government. Once we give naturalization to people, no matter whence they come, they must be given full rights, and those rights include the right inherent in Canadian citizenship—the right to vote. We cannot have different grades of citizenship. What is this provision aimed at? It is because certain provinces, for reason which perhaps appears just to themselves, have withheld the provincial franchise from men and women of Oriental origin. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to discuss the wisdom or unwisdom of having orientals settle in this country, for it is not a question on which I would feel qualified to speak without giving it profound study. But that is not the question affected by the Bill. What the Bill affects is Canadian citizens, and the proposal is to take from Canadian naturalized citizens the right to vote,—the most precious right of citizenship. And when you consider, Sir, who are being disfranchised under this clause, its ignobleness, if I may use the expression, is startling. Who protected our Pacific coast when the war was on? The cruisers of Great Britain's ally, Japan. Who are being disfranchised by this Bill? The former subjects of the Mikado. Is that gratitude? A certain political and moral philosopher has said: What is not good morals cannot be good politics. This is not good morals for it is base ingratitude; and it cannot be regarded as good politics.

I am no Imperialist, Mr. Speaker, but I have a very warm regard for the Mother Country, and a strong desire to help her in every way I can, and I say that an Act such as this passed by the Parliament of the second, if not the first, of the members of the Britannic Commonwealth, the Dominion of Canada, cannot but tend to hurt the relationship which should exist between Great Britain and her great Eastern ally, Japan.

And who also is attacked by this Bill? Our fellow-British subjects from India. What did they do in the war? They, of another race, of another colour, sent—from a population of teeming millions, it is true—into what was essentially a white man's war, 1,500,000 men. They fought on the Western front; they fought in Egypt; they fought in Mesopotamia,—but they are not to vote in British Columbia. Is that right? Oh, you may say, you must not offend the feelings of British Columbia. I do not want to offend the feelings of British Columbia.

Mr. HOCKEN: You are doing it.

Mr. McMASTER: The member for West Toronto says that I am doing it. When the war broke out a Home Rule Bill had been passed in the Imperial Parliament, but in order not to offend Ulster that Home Rule Bill was postponed; it was put into the cupboard and allowed to get stale. What was the result of that desire not to offend Ulster? It was the rebellion of Easter, 1916, and it is the existence of the Irish question, the greatest and the most serious question that faces the British Empire today. You have to offend sometimes in order to do what is right. Surely the member for West Toronto has never hesitated to offend when he thought that to do so was necessary to the accomplishing of something that he thought good.

But, Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to conclude my remarks in a tone of bitterness or on the plane of conflict. I ask that the members of this House consider this Bill seriously, carefully and well, remembering that when you have your enemy in the dust, to rub his face in the dirt, or, as this Bill proposes, to rub his thirty-second cousin's face in the dirt, is poor business, poor politics, poor statesmanship.

Mr. WILLIAM D. EULER (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker it had been my intention to discuss certain phases of this Bill in Committee of the Whole, but the debate has taken a certain turn which impels to discuss the matter just a little more broadly than I could discuss it within the rules under any clause in committee and it is for that reason that I am going to make my observations now.

It is not my intention, although the provocation is great, to answer insult with insult. It is my intention to debate a certain principle, or the violation of a certain

principle, in this Bill from the point of view entirely of logic and justice and fair play. If I cannot convince the Government and members on the other side of the justice of my argument in a reasonable and logical way, I am assuredly not going to make an appeal to sentiment, because I think the time for that has pretty well passed.

Before I proceed further, may I say that I hope the Government will use the machinery which it is about to provide, and in connection with which certain amendments will, I trust, be made, to give the people of this country an opportunity of using it in the election of a Parliament that properly represents them.

I shall confine myself entirely to those clauses of the Bill which most closely touch the people in the riding which I have the honour to represent. I may say frankly that I am going to discuss to-night the attempt to disfranchise British subjects of late enemy origin,—or, if you like, of British subjects in Canada who are of German or Austrian birth. And I want to say that I am not on my feet to make a plea for the alien. I am not going to make a plea for any one; I am merely going to demand a square deal for men who are British subjects and good citizens of Canada.

I think, Sir, it is also in order for me to point out that in its application, the word "alien" has been abused in this House ever since I entered it. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House—perhaps hon. gentlemen on this side have occasionally done so—have frequently spoken in debate of "aliens," when they meant men of alien origin. I contend that when a man has become a naturalized British subject he is no longer an alien; he is in very truth a British subject, and entitled to the privileges of a British subject.

I realize, Sir, that in discussing these particular clauses in the Bill I am in a somewhat peculiar position. I appreciate that perhaps I am the only member of this House whose ancestors sprang from the race with which we have been at war. As is probably well known——

Mr. CANNON: The member for Edmonton.

Mr. EULER: I have no knowledge of any other member of the House who is of the same descent as I am. But whether there is another or not, I want to say that on that score I have no apology whatever to make, because before I am through I think I shall be able to show that, after all, I am in very good company. I should like to say also that I was born in this country, and that I am a Canadian. I would like hon. members as they listen to me to-night to remember, if possible, for the purposes of this debate that I am a Canadian as they are, and to give me credit, as I give credit to them, for a desire to serve my country, Canada. If they are able to do that I shall appreciate it.

Sir, I had hoped that the Franchise Bill when it was introduced into this House would be free from the objectionable clauses which obtained in the War-time Elections Act. It is not my purpose to indulge in any lengthy recriminations with regard to that Act. It has been described as a blot on the statute book of Canada. For my part I should be glad to see it relegated to the limbo of forgotten things, together with other scraps of paper, and other broken agreements. But I did hope after the minister spoke the other day that the Bill would be almost entirely free from the disfranchising clauses of the War-time Elections Act.

I know that the impression prevails throughout the country, fostered by the press, and justifiably so, I believe from the information that we had, that the Franchise Bill, which is now before the House, is a very fair measure, and that perhaps very little fault can be found with it. But a careful study of the Bill, together with a study of some of the provisions of the Naturalization Act passed last year, discloses the fact that this Bill will disfranchise many more British subjects than were disfranchised under the War-time Elections Act. Indeed, I think it is almost true to say that while the War-time Elections Act disfranchised its thousands, this Act as it stands will disfranchise its tens of thousands.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Under what provision of this Act does my hon. friend justify the statement he has just made?

Mr. EULER: I am coming to that, and if I am wrong I shall be very glad to be corrected, and my remarks will come to a conclusion very quickly. I am going on with this more particularly now because the charges made by my hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) were much the same as I am about to make, though perhaps my remarks may be made from another viewpoint. No exception was taken to the statements of the hon. member for West Lambton. In fact, hon. gentlemen opposite seemed to believe that what

he charged was the intent and meaning of the Act.

To make my point clear I want to state certain definite facts. The first is expressed in the Naturalization Act of 1919, section 11:

> The wife of a British subject shall be deemed to be a British subject.

That is all that is necessary for me to quote for the purpose of my argument. Secondly, the children of a naturalized alien, being minors, both male and female, become naturalized quite legally with the naturalization of the father. The result therefore is that the naturalization of a father of alien origin naturalizes his wife and his children of both sexes. I think that is the case. At least, that was the law up until the Act of 1914, and even since that Act was passed the children are still naturalized under the law, provided they are mentioned in the naturalization certificate. That I understand is the purport of the law.

The next fact I would mention is this: The Bill gives the franchise to women; that is well known. Secondly—and this is one of the most important facts of all—before these wives and children of naturalized aliens can be permitted to vote, although they are in very truth British subjects—and I want to emphasize that—the Bill before the House states very definitely that they must obtain personal naturalization. I will read the section for the purposes of record. Subsection2 of section 29 says:

> For the purposes of this Act, the allegiance or nationality of a person, as it was at the birth of such person shall be deemed incapable of being changed, or of having been changed, merely by reason or in consequence of marriage or change of allegiance or naturalization of any other person,—

Such other person being the father, I presume.

> —or otherwise than by personal naturalization of such first mentioned person.

I think that makes it perfectly clear that all these British subjects, being the wives or grown-up children of duly naturalized men of alien origin, cannot vote under this Bill unless they become personally naturalized through the Secretary of State. Finally, and this is just as important as what I have already mentioned, the Naturalization Act of 1919 provides (Part II, section 8, subsection 4, (b):

> No certificate of naturalization shall, before the expiration of a period of ten years after the termination of the present war, be granted in Canada, to any subject of a country which at the time of the passing of this Act was at war with His Majesty.

Then follow certain exceptions. Thus the joint effect of these clauses is to disfranchise thousands of women and men of German or Austrian birth. Now if there is any escape from what I have said, it must be through an interpretation of this clause. The clause is not absolutely clear to me, but it is certainly capable of being interpreted in the way I have indicated. If I have interpreted it incorrectly I should be very glad if the Solicitor General would set me right.

Hon. HUGH GUTHRIE (Solicitor General): The last part of my hon. friend's interpretation I think is absolutely correct. The Naturalization Act of 1919 provides that no subject of any enemy state shall be permitted to be naturalized in this country for a period of ten years after the close of the war. That would include Austrians, Germans, Bulgars, and Turks. They will not under the present Bill be entitled to vote, nor will they under the Naturalization Act be entitled to become British subjects for a period of ten years from the end of the war. That is correct.

Mr. EULER: I think the minister has missed my point. The point I am trying to make is this: British subjects, naturalized in Canada by virtue of the naturalization of some one else, either husband or father, must under the Bill before the House obtain personal naturalization in order to vote, and my interpretation is that they cannot obtain naturalization because of the clause I have just read. Is that correct?

Mr. GUTHRIE: They cannot if they are Austrians, Germans, Bulgars or Turks. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. EULER: Exactly. I am referring to naturalized British subjects of Austrian or German birth who have become naturalized by virtue of their fathers' or husbands' naturalization. I am correct then in stating that people originally of these races, though now British subjects—and I want again to emphasize that point—cannot obtain personal naturalization under the Act of 1919.

Mr. GUTHRIE: No, they cannot for ten years.

Mr. EULER: I am quite sure they cannot, because I took occasion to investigate and made inquiry of the Under-Secretary of State. I put this question to him: "What would you do if a British subject, of German or Austrian birth, who had become naturalized by reason of the naturalization of father

or husband, applied for personal naturalization?" He replied "Naturalization would be refused." So that point seems perfectly clear.

Let me review these points. We have, I think, in the Dominion of Canada, about 115,000 of male naturalized citizens of former enemy alien origin. My figures may not be exactly correct, but they are nearly so. These people are British subjects, although of German or Austrian birth. Secondly, this Bill says they cannot vote unless they become personally naturalized. Thirdly, the Naturalization Act forbids such naturalization. Therefore it is a fact that if the Bill passes as drafted, probably something like 100,000 British subjects in Canada will be deprived of the right to vote at the next election, and perhaps for a period of ten years altogether.

When the Naturalization Act was piloted through the House last session by the Solicitor General (Hon. Mr. Guthrie), it will be recalled that I objected very strongly to the ten-year clause, and made the argument then that credit should be given at least to those people who had already lived in Canada for ten, fifteen, thirty, forty or even fifty years. I was unable to carry my point, although as a matter of fact the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) said he was in sympathy with the stand I had taken in view of the fact that both he and the President of the Privy Council (Hon. Mr. Rowell), had so expressed themselves at the Peace conference in Paris. However, for various reasons, the suggestion was not adopted and I was unsuccessful in securing the result I desired. At that time it did seem to me that the reasons given for failure to adopt my suggestion were trivial and insufficient; and if I were of a suspicious nature, which I am not, I would be apt to surmise that the action of the Government last session in placing that ten-year clause in the Naturalization Act was committed with a pre-vision of what was to follow in the Franchise Bill which we have now before us. I do not say that I believe this to have been the case, but I say that if I were suspicious I would be apt to think that it was then the intention to disfranchise these people.

Mr. GUTHRIE: My hon. friend must remember the discussion of last year, and he no doubt knows that the Bill which this House passed then is the accepted model in all British colonies, being the Act in force in the Motherland, and applies to British citizenship, not only in Canada but through the British Empire. The ten-year clause in the Imperial Act, which we followed.

Mr. EULER: In reply to that statement of the hon. gentleman, let me say that the Prime Minister on the floor of the House, after I had drawn his attention to his own speech at the Peace conference, which he admitted embodied his sentiments in this regard, said:

> I assure my hon. friend that I will make representations to the British Government with respect to the matter with a view to having such modifications made in the Imperial Act as will permit of reasonable modifications in our own.

I communicated with the Prime Minister, not long ago, inquiring of him whether he had done as he had promised, and he replied that he was taking the matter up with the Solicitor General. I am informed, however, that nothing whatever has been done in that direction, and I am forced to the conclusion that there never was any intention that anything should be done.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if it were worth while, we might compare the present Franchise Bill with the War-time Elections Act. In the War-time Elections Act there was not the degree of disfranchising that will occur under this Act, by which every woman of German or Austrian birth will be deprived of a vote in the coming elections. And if I may be allowed a personal remark, I may say that this Act, if it passes, will disfranchise my mother, although she has lived in Canada as a good Canadian citizen, having reared good Canadians, for sixty years. It will deprive of the franchise all women who have lived in this country for many years, but who were born in Germany and were naturalized as a result of the naturalization of their fathers. But observe the injustice of this, Mr. Speaker. Many of those whom this Act will disfranchise have actually voted in past years, having been duly naturalized British subjects. Under this Act, if it is read with the Naturalization Act, they are deprived of the right to vote by reason of the ten-year clause. I know that there are in the riding I represent men who have lived in that locality during the past few years perfectly secure and serene in the belief that their franchise would not be imperilled, because they had complied with the requirements of the law in that they had become naturalized with the naturalization of their fathers. They have no remedy now. There can be no doubt in the mind

of any hon. gentleman that if these men had for one moment suspected that a law would be passed depriving them of the franchise, unless they obtained personal naturalization, they would long ago have taken steps to obtain such naturalization. Now, under the law, it is utterly impossible for them to do so. The Acting Solicitor General this afternoon spoke of anomalies which might arise if certain suggestions were adopted. I think one of them was that if the women of Quebec had not been given the franchise we should have the peculiar position of a woman of the province of Quebec being able to stand as a candidate for Parliament and yet not have the vote. I wonder if we are not in exactly that position to-day. These women and men who are disfranchised are still British subjects although they have not got the vote. Now Sir, the requirement of a candidate for the Canadian House of Commons is that he or she shall be a British subject of the age of twenty-one years. It may be that my constituency in its wisdom will select some good honest Canadian woman of German birth, a British subject, and will send that woman to the Canadian Parliament although she herself will have no vote. There are other anomalies in the Act as it stands, and as I believe that the minister was sincere this afternoon when he said that if necessary corrections were pointed out to him he would adopt them, I think after I have indicated some of these anomalies he will feel inclined to effect some changes.

This clause will enfranchise men who could not vote in the war-time election; it will enfranchise those men who were disfranchised in the last election if they had been naturalized within the last fifteen years and were of enemy origin. It will disfranchise men who had votes in the war-time elections. Now, you have this peculiar situation: Men of alien origin who could not vote under war conditions will be allowed to vote now that we have peace, and men who were allowed to vote in war time will not be permitted this privilege in the future. That, surely, is an anomaly of the first order. I desire to refer to another important point. I have not read the Act as closely as I should like to have done, but so far as I can see there is absolutely no provision giving the franchise to women of German or Austrian birth, British subjects, who gave their sons to the war, even if those sons were killed. I find no provision enabling such women to vote; and in reply to some statements made by another hon. member, I beg to give to the House just a little bit of proof that the German Canadians, British subjects in Canada, were not quite so remiss in their duty in this war as some people would have us suppose.

I have in my hand a list of men who were killed in the war, all of whom came from the city of Kitchener, or the town of Waterloo, and possibly a few from other parts of the riding. I shall not read all the names but I am going to read some of them, and I think that when you hear me pronounce them you will have no doubt whatever as to their racial origin. The first is Lieutenant Harry Snyder, a young man whom I had the honour to instruct when I was a public school teacher in the schools of what was then Berlin, now the city of Kitchener. That young man enlisted, entered the air force, was some time later reported as missing and has never been heard of since. I spoke to a brother of his last Sunday just before leaving for Ottawa. I mentioned the Franchise Act and this disfranchising provision. He said to me: "It will disfranchise my mother who gave her son." That is one case. Then there are Private Zapfe, and Private Schreiter, Private J. Gehl, Private Knechtel, Private G. Stuffer, who is a descendant of the Mennonites of whom we have heard so much; Private A. Schierholtz, Private George Strub, Private J. Gerbig, Private V. Hummel, Private J. Diefenbecker, Private H. Rosenberger, Private H. Treusch, Private S. Uffelman, Private Herman Gross, Private Clayton Fenner, Private Steckenraider, and Lieutenant W. Bauer. These men gave up their lives fighting in the armies of Canada. I do not know to what extent that clause will affect their mothers. I do know it will affect the mothers in some cases at least and I believe it will affect the sisters of some of these men. I referred a moment ago to the fact that some twenty years ago I had the privilege of teaching in the public schools in the city of Kitchener. Besides teaching the ordinary subjects of the public school course, I did what I could to inculcate in those boys and girls a measure of patriotism and of faith in British institutions. I taught those boys and girls that British law and institutions stood for justice and fair play. I believed then what I taught. After the record of the last four or five years and sometimes as I have listened to speeches and statements made in this House, that faith of mine has occasionally wavered and as a result of certain incidents has continued to do so. It

that clause is retained in the Bill, certainly my confidence in the justice of the British people in this House will not be strengthened.

The boys and girls of the city of Kitchener—and I speak particularly of that city because I live there and because there is in that city a large admixture of people of German origin,—are still being taught to be good citizens. They are told that Canada is a progressive country. They are told that the women of Canada have been given the franchise. I have no doubt that those boys and girls come from homes in which there are fathers and mothers who, perhaps, forty, fifty or sixty years ago, were born in Germany or Austria. They will tell the mothers that they also have received the franchise. When election day comes the mother will have to learn that under this law she has no vote. The father goes to vote because he is enfranchised again; he has his personal naturalization papers. I can fancy that the girls and boys will urge the mother also to go and vote because, I believe, our public schools are teaching the children that one of the greatest privileges and duties they may have is the right to exercise the franchise. The mother must say to them that she cannot vote. The inevitable question comes: "Why not"? The answer is that because thirty, forty or fifty years ago she was born in Germany or Austria. "But," says the boy, "father was born in Germany and he can vote; why not mother"? Do you think that any reply the father or mother can make will satisfy the sense of justice of those Canadian boys and girls? What will be the effect upon those boys? Will they despise the mother who is insulted, or will they look with contempt upon the law and the Government which did the wrong?

Let me take another concrete case. A father and a mother came from Germany, for example, thirty years ago, both of them being, we will say, thirty years of age. They brought with them a boy of five and a girl of three. In four or five years the father obtains Canadian naturalization in the regular way. In the course of two or three years another boy and another daughter are born to this couple. We have now the passing of this Act with an election following. The young people who were born in Canada are British subjects; the older ones are also British subjects. The younger ones do not require to be naturalized personally because they were born on Canadian soil. They have now reached voting age. The older son has been voting for twelve or fourteen years. An election comes on and under this Act you have this condition; that the father, the younger son and the younger daughter go to the polls and vote while the mother and the older son, who in the past has been voting, and the older sister, are compelled to remain at home. In addition to that, it is not at all a far-fetched suggestion that the younger son, whose mother, older sister and older brother are disfranchised, may have fought in the war as a volunteer recruit in the Canadian army.

I think it would be impossible to conceive of anything more illogical, more unfair, and, if I may use a word that is unparliamentary—that is more tricky or more calculated to destroy faith in the national decency and honour than this proposal. The War-time Elections Act was bad. But in the War-time Elections Act of 1917 the entry was made by the front door and the right of British subjects was taken away openly. By the Bill we have now before us, entrance is made by the back door of the Naturalization Act with the apparent idea that the plunder may be abstracted before those who are robbed know what has happened to them.

Mr. Speaker, there must be reasons for this legislation and I can conceive of only three, one of which perhaps I must already discard. The first one is that possibly the Government did not quite appreciate what the joint effect of these two clauses would be. I can hardly believe that to be the case because apparently the effect is quite intentional, being so admitted by the Acting Solicitor General. The second possible reason is that the Government felt that these people should be disfranchised in the interests of Canada itself. And the third reason that occurs to me is that these people are disfranchised in order to gain a political advantage.

Now let us examine the second. What can be said or has been said, to show that the granting of the franchise to these British subjects could prejudice the interests of Canada? The war is over, and I do not think it is the intention of the Canadian Government to prepare for another war with Germany or Austria or any other country; at all events I devoutly hope not. I do not see, under those conditions, how the vote of these women, cast in a Canadian election for members of the House of Commons, could possibly be injurious to Canada.

Let us examine the conduct of the people who are affected by this law. The question has been asked by hon. gentlemen on this

side, how have these people behaved? I can speak only for those of North Waterloo, and while I am very well aware that a great many comments have been made about that blessed portion of this Dominion, a great deal of what has been said has not been true. If I might again be permitted a personal remark I would say that in the first year of the war I happened to have the honour of being mayor of the city of Kitchener. That city was one of the very first to organize a branch of the Canadian Patriotic Fund, and its people, who are largely of German origin, voluntarily contributed individually and through the municipality, at that time a larger sum per capita than did any other centre in Canada. They gave liberally also to the Red Cross, the British Red Cross Society, and they subscribed most generously to the Victory Loan, as the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) will know. Again, in 1918 I think, the riding of North Waterloo subscribed a larger per capita percentage of the loan than did any other riding in the province of Ontario with the exception of those situated in the larger centres of population. Further, the number of voluntary enlistments compares favourably with those of many other parts of Canada.

If these people were disloyal, if they were acting as traitors—as one hon. gentleman opposite suggested—how is it that we have had no prosecutions? I may be wrong but I am pretty well acquainted with the facts in the county of Waterloo, and especially in the riding of North Waterloo, and I cannot recall that there was even one successful prosecution of a British subject of the kind I am discussing for treasonable utterances or anything that could be construed as disloyal. I want to say also that there are a great many people in that county who, if anything of the kind had been practised, would very soon have taken action, and punishment would have followed. Speaking of internments, British subjects, of course, could not be interned without a trial. There were about eight thousand internments in the whole Dominion, but with the exception of one, so far as I know, the persons interned were all alien enemies who are not the subject of this debate at all. In this connection I want it to be clearly understood that the people of whom I am speaking to-night are not alien enemies; they are people of alien birth but they are British subjects. Of these there was not one convicted, not one man was interned. I should perhaps make an exception. There were seven internments from the city of Kitchener out of about 8,000 for the whole of Canada, a fairly creditable record I think. Among those seven there were of course, no women, but one man was wrongfully interned, he being a British subject naturalized in New Zealand. Although this man was a British subject, with ample proof of naturalization from the Secretary of State of New Zealand, he was sent to the internment camp and kept there for three or four years. He was never accorded a trial, and finally, in spite of his protests, was deported to Germany but was later brought back by the Canadian Government who recognized and realized their error. I know that in the county of Waterloo, in the county of Perth, in Oxford possibly, in Bruce and Huron and Renfrew and in many sections of the Canadian West, there are thousands, almost hundreds of thousands, of the people of whom I speak now. To-day under this legislation they have no country. Surely the first privilege of a British subject is the franchise itself; and yet under this Bill the Government to-day makes outcasts of men who are innocent. They punish men who have committed no offence, because, although offences have been charged no definite statements have been given by hon. gentleman opposite who spoke before me. No proofs have been given of the broad statements which they have made with regard to the acts of treason committed by these people. If the Bill passes in its present form, this Government points the finger of scorn at a hundred thousand good Canadians and cries "Unclean." Why? Because these men and women by an accident of birth came from Germany or Austria and because they were trustful enough to accept the invitation and the promise of agents of the Government of Canada that if they came to this country and discharged their duty as citizens should, they would be granted all the rights and privileges of British citizenship.

Mr. Speaker, I intended to read some extracts from some of the papers in connection with this phase of the question but I will dispense with that. But, I do want to say that the whole spirit of the clause which I condemn is wrong. We have heard a good deal of the spirit of the bon entente that should exist between the people of Quebec and the people of Ontario I think it is right that such a spirit should prevail, but why cannot the same spirit be extended to the small minority that lives in other provinces of Canada? And, Sir, I want to place on record my convic-

tion that in the treatment of most of these people of former alien enemy birth, Germans and Austrians, a sad mistake was made by many Canadians and by the Dominion Government. I was going to say that some of it might be excused—no not excused, but explained by reason of the prejudice and the sufferings arising out of the war. But, Sir, if there had been something more of trust and a little less of suspicion it would have been very, very much better for this country. I want to say—and I know whereof I speak—that among the people of North Waterloo of German or Austrian origin—although we have not many Austrians there—there is no love of militarism and that most of them came from Europe to escape from that very thing. I want to say further that I do not believe that the common people in any part of the world desire war, because war means the slaughter of their sons. I do not believe that is true of any people, and it is certainly not true of the people of North Waterloo. They hate war. They want to be good Canadians,—if you will only allow them to be so.

Mr. Speaker, the Government of this country brought these people here, and they came in good faith, believing what was told them, that Canada was a democracy that welcomed all who would share her responsibilities. They toiled and helped to build up this country, including the county of Waterloo from which I come, as did also the Mennonites of whom we have heard so much. They identified themselves with us, their children attended our schools, and they absorbed our national ideals. In very truth they became of us, and we recognized the fact by entering into the sacred compact of citizenship with them. They have carried out their part of the bargain. Can an honourable nation do any less than that? If these people disobey the law they are as liable to punishment as the native born, their responsibilities are in no way lightened, and their property and industry must contribute to the national treasury.

Some eight or ten days ago I enjoyed a speech delivered in this House by the Acting Prime Minister (Sir George Foster), when he made a plea for greater tolerance as between hon. members on the two sides of the House. I appreciated very much what he said. Before I resume my seat I would like to say to him, if I may, Mr. Speaker, and if a younger man may with propriety say this to an older man: That kindness and trust and charity are infinitely more powerful than the degrading influences of suspicion—influences, which are exemplified in the Bill before us to-day. And I would say to him that the harvest which he can expect from the sowing anew of the seed of racial hatred will not redound to the advantage of Canada if carried out in this Bill. Canada is populated by people of diverse races. It will always be so, and you can only weld them into one great Canadian nationality by the process of education and by inculcating and applying the principles of justice and equality, and the square deal.

I do not dare to hope, Sir, that anything I may have said will induce the Government to strike out this clause, but if they do so it would be, not an act of generosity but an act of justice, for which I think they would receive full credit. But whether or not they take that course, when this Bill reaches the committee stage, if no one else moves in that direction, I certainly will move for the striking out of this disfranchising clause.

Mr. LAPOINTE: We will be with you.

Mr. EULER: In conclusion, Sir, I would like to say that in the ranks of the Allied nations, notably in those of the United States, there were thousands upon thousands of men of German or Austrian ancestry, and many of them held positions of high authority in that country. Yet I do not believe that the trust reposed in them was ever betrayed. But, Sir, I would like to come nearer home. From Waterloo, and from Perth, from Oxford and from Renfrew, from Bruce and Huron, and from the Great West there came hundreds of men to fight in the Canadian army, many of whom died on the battlefields of France. To-day I submit the honour of Canada is in the hands of this Parliament. I ask you not to insult the memory of these men through an affront to their sisters and brothers and to the mothers that bore them.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON (Qu'Appelle): Mr. Speaker, one clause of this Bill has been very freely discussed. I have very little to say with regard to it, but I wish to join with the hon. member for Waterloo (Mr. Euler) in stating that I think it is very illogical—indeed, it is still more illogical than he has shown it to be in that particular. We usually speak of what we ourselves know especially. Although there are not many people in my constituency of alien enemy birth, a number of such men homesteaded there years ago and became naturalized, they brought their children with them, many of them very young, and

I think I am correct in saying that probably more would be disfranchised among those families than those who are now entitled to vote, and yet those so disfranchised are the very people who should be entitled to vote. Those who are now entitled to vote are the people who, if any, should be disfranchised. If among those people there are any with German or Austrian sympathies they are those who had reached manhood before they settled in this country. Their children who have been educated in our Canadian schools, have acquired Canadian habits and imbibed Canadian ideals, and surely there is no disloyalty among them. If there is any disloyalty in that district it is among those who under this Act are entitled to vote. I do not know what will be said with regard to the rights of those people, but it seems to me that if a man who came from Germany or Austria is entitled to exercise the franchise, there is no good reason why his wife should not be also entitled. She is as much a British subject as he is; and his children, who were minors at the time he was naturalized, are British subjects just as much as he is. It seems to me very illogical if we disfranchise one part of the family without disfranchising the other, especially when we disfranchise those members of the family who are certainly much better Canadians than their parents who are enfranchised.

I would like to draw the attention of the Solicitor General (Mr. Guthrie) to some other features of the Bill. By subsection (E) of section 79 the agent of a candidate must publish the list of all those who contribute anything towards the election expenses. That, I think, is a move in the right direction, and I would like to congratulate the Solicitor General on it. I am sorry, however, that he did not go a little further. It seems to me that while he was making that provision he should at the same time have provided that a list should also be published of those who contributed to the party funds at any stage of the game.

The leader of the Opposition made a remark which was apparently very well received on both sides of the House with regard to the necessity of so legislating that the people would have faith in this Parliament and in its doings. Faith is the most necessary thing in this life. You cannot succeed in any line of business without faith; you cannot carry on any commercial undertakings without faith. Indeed, without faith we can do nothing; without faith in each other we live but a life of misery. Accordingly, we must so act that the people shall have faith in us; otherwise we cannot make the progress that we should. We must not only be entitled to the confidence of the people; we must also have that confidence. Any one who has been around the country a little knows that campaign funds are regarded with a great deal of suspicion; in fact, there is nothing of which the people are so suspicious. I do not mean the funds that go to the agent of the candidate or to the candidate himself in order to bring about his election; I mean the campaign funds that are contributed to the party. The Solicitor General has asked for suggestions. I suggest that he go a little farther than he has gone in section 79 and compel the publication of campaign funds of every description, including funds paid to the party or contributed to any association or group of candidates. If he does that he will accomplish more in the way of inspiring public confidence in Parliament than he would be doing in carrying out the step proposed; though I do commend him for the step that he has taken; it is a step in the right direction.

I am sorry that the Solicitor General is not in his seat; I wanted to direct his attention to another point. In schedule A to section 32, rule (14) provides:

> The onus of substantiating sufficient prima facie ground to strike off any name shall be upon the applicant.

The word "applicant" in that schedule is used about a dozen times, but outside of that particular section, "applicant" refers always to the man who is applying to be put on the list. The reference here would certainly seem to be to the appellant rather than to the applicant. The appellant is nowhere referred to as an applicant. The appeal is never referred to as an application; it is referred to as an appeal. If this section is allowed to stand as it is, there will be some confusion; but it would be quite a simple manner to change the word "applicant" to "appellant".

I again emphasize the point which I have made in regard to the necessity for extending the provision set forth in section 79 for the submission of a statement respecting election expenses, so that it will require every party, every group of politicians, every one in connection with such party or group of politicians, to make public the sources of funds contributed for all purposes in connection with party work.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I should be very glad that I caught your eye at this moment, if for no other reason that that it gives me an opportunity to pay on the floor of this House my tribute of admiration to my hon. friend from North Waterloo (Mr. Euler), who made a speech which, by its moderation of tone, its dispassionateness of thinking, its accuracy of knowledge of the subject with which he was dealing, and its general spirit, was, if I say say so, the very essence of what should animate the minds of all Canadian citizens in this period of reconstruction.

Sir, I should be guilty of a grave dereliction of duty if I intervened at all in this debate and did not offer my very hearty congratulations to my old friend and political comrade in arms, the Solicitor General (Hon. Mr. Guthrie), for the splendid specimen of parliamentary exposition which he gave us to-day. I have long taken interest in his career, and it was really a pleasure to me as an old personal and political friend to listen to his magnificent speech this afternoon. My regret is all the greater that that speech introduced a Bill which on the whole is a good Bill, and which, I have no doubt, the authors had their own difficulties in making even as good as it is, but which nevertheless did not rise to the height of a great opportunity and did not manage to miss the pitfall which has given rise to this debate.

Mr. Speaker, when one section of the miners of Britain met the other day and, under the leadership of Mr. Robert Smillie, a working man, a miner, who has risen to the ranks of statemanship, or near-statesmanship, voted £10,000 for the relief of the suffering women and children of our recent enemies in Europe, everybody felt: That is magnanimous; that is big conduct; and the people who are capable of such conduct are the people to run this world, if that were possible. When Lord Robert Cecil wrote a letter the other day in the midst of the Paisley election recognizing the bigness of the occasion and wishing success to his life-long political opponent because of his eminence of intellect—a letter which had much to do with Mr. Asquith's success—all over the world big-minded men felt themselves compelled to say: That is great; that is magnanimous; that is the way to solve knotty and difficult questions. It is the only way to bind up the wounds of war; it is the only spirit in which to enter on this period of reconstruction. If that be true of the nations of Europe, it is ten times as true of Canada,

[Mr. Deputy Speaker.]

where we have such a mixture of races and peoples and creeds, and where it is of vital importance that all our people should live together as far as possible in peace and friendship and mutual sympathy and good understanding. The Government had a splendid opportunity. If they had brought in a Bill framed on these lines, caring not whether it was admired by civilians or veterans or aliens, they would have themselves led the Parliament of Canada along large lines, along a broad way, and they would have given an example, the effect of which upon the whole nation it would have been hard to over-estimate.

I am hopeful that even yet they will reconsider the disfranchising portions of the Bill and cut them out altogether. The same Lord Cecil who wrote that letter in regard to Mr. Asquith's election gave a splendid piece of advice to the British people, which went all over the world, when he said the other day, "What we want to do in the period of reconstruction is to get rid of the war mind." Well, I am afraid, if I may say so in all charity, that that piece of advice has not penetrated very deeply into the mind of my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards). I refrain from saying many things at this moment that one might very easily say if one were not trying to get rid of the war mind oneself. What was the use of my hon. friend, who I am sorry has left the Chamber, taunting my hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) with having received certain votes in the last election? That does not get us any further forward, and more than that, such an attitude of mind could only come from having failed to appreciate the all-important fact that we are in peace times now, while we were in war two years ago. The duties of war are altogether different from the duties of peace. I myself, I think, would do things—certainly things would be justifiable in being done to keep the Germans out of Paris that would be wholly unjustifiable if done by any chance to keep one's political opponents out of this Chamber. The two objects are so very different. I deprecate on the part of any hon. member of this House any attempt to continue the spirit of war into the times of peace. That is my answer to my hon. friend on this particular head.

I deprecate equally any attempt to create strife between those who are called alien enemies and our soldiers in the recent war. Such an act is criminal to the best interests of this nation. Any man who has the real interest of Canada at heart must take the

very opposite road, and try to get all the citizens of this country in the peroid of reconstruction to understand one another and to appreciate the good that is in one another. I know there are different classes of soldiers. There are some who are differently constituted from others; we all have varying temperaments. But I do know this, that very large sections of the returned men when they were in the trenches did not hesitate, when the Christmas bells were ringing and when hostilities had been suspended, to fraternize with the very men they were fighting against, because they knew they were fighting against institutions, against autocracies, and not against individuals. Well, if that was the attitude of our soldiers in war and on the battlefield, I am pretty sure I am on solid ground when I say that these men in many cases would be very leaders in magnanimous thought and action in regard o a subject such as we are debating to-night.

There is not much more that one can say upon this question. Let me put my position in a few words: We have as a nation the right of every other nation to keep out of our country any people who we do not think would make good citizens; it is within the right of any nation to regulate its own immigration. But when it comes to people already in the country and recognized as citizens to the extent of promoting the wealth and prosperity and development of the country, then it is a grave responsibility for a government to go the length of depriving them of their votes. As some one has said in the debate to-night, if a man is a traitor, he ought to be either in gaol, or deported, or hung; but if he is not a traitor, if he is a citizen working for the promotion of the general material prosperity of the country, he ought to be a citizen of the country. That is the only logical conclusion to which I can come.

I return to the point of reconstruction. Here is a group of men working in a mining camp or in a factory. They are taking a chew or a smoke off the same plug. If by any chance in these days a bottle of something stronger than water is hovering around they are taking a dram out of the same bottle. But an election comes along, and the Government goes into the midst of those men and picks out one or two of them, by the miserable provisions of this Franchise Act, and says, "You are all right to work with these men, you are all right to read with them, you are all right to chew with them, you are all right to drink with them, but you cannot vote with them." There is no logic in it. And what will be the effect upon the group wherever they are? Put a badge of inferiority upon certain members of a group of workmen in various portions of the country, and the inevitable result of that is not to reconstruct; it is to continue strife, dissension, and suspicion, which may very easily lead to blows and continue within our own borders on a smaller scale that war which we are all thanking God has now ceased outside our borders. At a difficult period of the war the Government in pursuance of what they believed to be their duty, held an emergency Cabinet council on a Sunday, and they took certain steps. That was to keep the Germans out of Paris. I supported the Government then. I wish it had been my good fortune to be able to support every line of their enfranchising Bill, but I cannot do it with the marks of smallness that I find in those portions of this Bill which have been criticised so logically and effectively in the speech of my hon. friend from Waterloo (Mr. Euler). It is a small role for a big nation. Let us be a magnanimous Canada. Let our Government rise to the occasion and hold an emergency Cabinet council now, and afterwards come down to this House and say that the larger logic and the better spirit has prevailed with them. We shall gladly follow them, and they will gain, and not lose, in the country. But what is far better than that, because after all gaining and losing in an election is a trifle compared to the larger issues at stake, they will help to heal the wounds of war; they will be pouring oil into the sore places of mankind. They will be setting a splendid example to the world in a big way of dealing with the problems of reconstruction.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE (East Edmonton): As I listened this afternoon to the speech delivered by the Acting Solicitor General I was expecting to hear a statement in regard to the motive and reason underlying Clause 29, and I had hoped that by this time some one would have risen on the Government side to give some information that would justify that clause as it stands. That the speech of the Acting Solicitor General was magnificent in its ensemble no one can deny, but that the whole Act was built on the principle of fairness and simplicity is a statement that I challenge both on the ground of the facts contained in the Act and the other documents to which the Act refers. So far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, no one in this House will attack my conduct as being inconsistent, because when I was a candidate for the Con-

servative party and was consulted as to whether disfranchisement should take place under the War-time Elections Act I protested. I believe, however, that in the result the then Government was justified in taking rigorous measures to prevent disastrous consequences; but that a condition of that sort should be perpetuated when we in Parliament are bragging about the virtues of the League of Nations and are singing of "Peace on earth," and being made to swallow holus-bolus treaties of peace without a quorum in the House, I say that we ought to be exceedingly careful what we do if we wish to make the people of Canada believe that we are sincere and honest in our speech and in our actions. I believe that there is a good deal of misapprehension in regard to the Bill which is before us. As regards the Naturalization Act and the clause calling for ten years' residence after the termination of the war I had occasion to protest against that measure at the last session of Parliament when I said that it was shameful that we should have to enact such legislation, and the reply was that it was a universal act not applicable to Canada alone. I therefore accepted this explanation without further remarks. Now, however, I trust the Government will deem it its duty to have this measure changed to such an extent that men shall not be obliged to remain in Canada fourteen, thirteen, twelve and eleven years before they can be naturalized.

The statement has been made that in the past naturalization has been given too freely to some citizens of Canada through the mistakes of previous governments. This statement I do not challenge, but because mistakes have been made in the past by previous governments is no reason why this Government should go to the opposite extreme. I am going to endeavour to seek a motive in Clause 29, and I shall ascribe to that clause the best possible motive that can be conceived. If there is a reason at all in Clause 29 for disfranchising a British subject that reason lies in a naturalization act itself which requires, among other things, that the applicant for naturalization shall be of good character and shall possess an adequate knowledge of either English or French. Now, Sir, I can understand that it may be the desire of the Government to raise the standard of citizenship, and, owing to the operation of the law which made it possible for a woman to become a British subject by marriage or a son to become a British subject without naturalization, to see that such persons should possess the necessary qualifications, namely, good character and ability in English or French. That can be the only motive behind this clause, unless there be the unworthy motive that we are seeking to elect ourselves once more by disfranchising as many people as possible. If that is the case, I would go a step further and say that we should disfranchise every one who voted against the Union Government and so make a sure thing of it. I believe, however, Mr. Speaker, that the real motive underlying Clause 29 is in fact to ascertain whether the man or woman affected has all the qualifications required under the Naturalization Act. But if this interpretation be correct, then it will be necessary to amend Clause 29 so as to make this motive apparent at least. Now, let us see what this clause says.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope the hon. member will not go too far in discussing the details of the measure which, of course, can be discussed only in committee.

Mr. MACKIE: I have not yet entered into any details, Mr. Speaker, and I trust I may be permitted at least to broach the general principle of the Bill, which is the question of enfranchising or disfranchising. Clause 29 does disfranchise, and I wish to call attention to this particular portion of the Act which reads, inter alia as follows:

—provided, however, that this subsection shall not apply to any person born on the continent of North America nor to any person who in person applies to and obtains from any judge having jurisdiction in naturalization proceedings a certificate under the hand of such judge and the seal, if any, of his court, to the effect following:

The certificate is as follows:

This is to certify that from evidence submitted before me, I am satisfied that A.B. of.. .. .. in the province of .. .. (occupation) .. ..is a person naturalized as a British subject by operation of law, who, but for such naturalization is qualified and would be entitled at the date of the issue of this certificate to be personally naturalized in Canada.

Now it says that if you have disfranchised a man or woman there must be a personal application for naturalization. Is Clause 29 the only procedure enacted? Can a person simply step into a court and say: I wish to be naturalized, having been disfranchised as the wife of so-and-so or the son of so-and-so? Is there any particular procedure provided as to how a person may place his or her claim before the court?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is certainly discussing the details of the Bill

which can only properly be discussed in committee. He is not discussing the principle of the Bill, to which I shall have to ask him to confine his remarks.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: I hope that I am not singled out in any way because the debate has been carried on on clause 29.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order; if the hon. gentleman feels aggrieved at the decision of the Chair he has his remedy. The last remark which he has made is entirely uncalled for.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: Mr. Speaker, I bow to your ruling and I will endeavour to generalize more than I have, but I desire to call to your attention once more the fact that clause 29 has been discussed on the other side and on this side as well as the clause of the Naturalization Act.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no objection to making reference to a clause but there is an objection to discussing in detail the clauses of the Bill.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: I will simply discuss the effects of the Bill and the effects are just as they have been enumerated by the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler) and other members of the House. As it is drafted now, a man must take his application before the court and refer it under the Naturalization Act before he can get his naturalization, and it will be a long time before he can get his naturalization papers. It is unfair, therefore, I say, that you should disfranchise a whole population in Western Canada because it is the desire of this House to see that they have the necessary qualification under the Naturalization Act. If there be machinery in the court, whereby these men and women, being disfranchised, could immediately apply to the court and receive redress without going back to the Secretary of State, who is master in this matter, it might be all right to see that these men and women possessed all the qualifications required under the Naturalization Act, but as the Act is drafted it is impossible for them to do so. They are completely disfranchised and will have to abide by the consequences of the law as it is drafted.

What about, for instance in my own district, the thousand or more Galicians who went into the 218th battalion and fought overseas? What about those men who have come back? Some of them may have voted in the past and they will not be able to vote now. What about the mothers of those sons who went overseas and performed their duty voluntarily because the Conscription Act made it impossible for any of these people to go overseas afterwards. They volunteered like other people in Canada to go and they were placed in the 218th battalion. Is it just that the man who fought overseas, and naturalized by the father, should be prevented from voting and should be forced to adopt the method of being naturalized as of the first instance? Is it right that this man's mother shall be compelled to go before a judge and prove that she has a sufficient knowledge of the English or French language? The War-time Elections Act disfranchised a number of people for a certain period of years but there is no restriction in this Act; it covers any period and may extend back for forty or fifty years.

We must not forget that at the beginning of this war those Ukrainians who lived in Little Russia sacrificed a million or more men on the battlefield in the cause of the Allies. The Ukrainians in Western Canada are brothers and cousins. Shall they be treated as enemies? We must not forget that in the province of Alberta those men whom we call aliens contributed to war funds and bought Victory bonds to a degree that was satisfactory to people in charge. We must not forget that when the Winnipeg strike and other disturbances all over Canada took place, not one of these people was singled out as being amongst the men and women who took part in those disturbances. These are facts, but in spite of these facts we find here a law that will put a stain upon the Dominion of Canada if it goes through in the way in which it is constructed. I hope this Government will see the wisdom of amending the Bill in such a way that they can boast that it is fair and just to all who are entitled to take part in Dominion elections.

On motion of Mr. Fielding the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Sir GEORGE FOSTER, the House adjourned at 10.45 p.m.

Friday, March 26, 1920.

The House met at Three o'clock.

ACT RESPECTING COPYRIGHT.

Rt. Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Acting Prime Minister) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 37 respecting copyright.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This Bill is intended to bring the Copyright Law of Canada into conformity with the Berne Con-

vention. It establishes a uniform period of copyright protection, and also extends copyright protection to records, perforated rolls, cinematograph films, and so forth, and is intended to secure Canadian authors full copyright protection from all parts of His Majesty's Dominions as well as in Canada.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CIVIL SERVICE CLASSIFICATION.

On motion of Hon. Arthur Meighen (Minister of the Interior) the House returned to the order of motions.

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Honourable the Secretary of State (Hon. Mr. Sifton) I desire to lay on the Table a return to an order of the House dated March 18, 1920, calling for copy of representations, complaints, and correspondence, with reference to the classification of the Civil Service.

SOLDIERS' CIVIL RE-ESTABLISHMENT —PENSIONS COMMITTEE.

Hon. NEWTON W. ROWELL (President of the Privy Council): With the consent of the House I move that the following members be added to the Committee on Pensions: Messrs. Calder, Chisholm, Cooper, Copp, Edwards, McGregor, McLean (Royal), Morphy, Ross, Tweedie, White; and that the committee be authorized to continue the inquiries instituted by the committee on civil re-establishment last session into such matters as may call for further investigation, and to report its recommendations to the House.

The work of the Pensions Committee this year, as I pointed out in moving for the committee, will not be nearly so onerous as that of last year, nor would a committee on re-establishment have the onerous work that the committee had last year, in view of the extent and character of the investigation carried on by that committee. Furthermore, a number of the members of the House were on both committees, and it is thought that it would not meet with the convenience of the members to have two committees at work which might well be centred in one committee. I am therefore moving to add to the Pensions Committee the names of all the members of the Re-establishment Committee who are not already on the Pensions Committee, and to give the Pensions Committee the power to continue any investigations that may be found necessary.

Motion agreed to.

[Sir George Foster.]

EASTER ADJOURNMENT.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Acting Prime Minister) moved:

That this House adjourn on Thursday, the first April next, at 6 p.m., and that when the House so adjourns it stand adjourned until Tuesday, the sixth April next.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Mr. Speaker, may I request the right hon. the leader of the House to amend his motion so that the adjournment may commence on Wednesday evening. Thursday is a holiday of great importance to us who belong to the religious minority in this House, and I really think that it would be only proper, in view of that fact, that the adjournment should start from Wednesday night.

Mr. BUREAU: There is no sitting on Wednesday night either.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not desire to encroach on the sacred holiday privileges of my hon. friends. At the same time, however, the object was to devote as much time as we possibly could to the business of the House. It is not at all difficult for those hon. members who reside in proximity to the seat of Government to take holidays, because they can go home or go to their friends and enjoy themselves. But those who come from a distance and have to remain here have that much longer time on their hands, and unless my hon. friend strongly presses his suggestion I think it would be the opinion of the House that we should pursue our business, as moderately as possible, of course, and with as good demeanour as should befit the day. Thereby we should save that much time.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: I may say that I have been a member of this House for over sixteen years, and it has always been the custom to have the Easter adjournment from Wednesday night. I really do not see why there should be a change this year.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I had not paid any particular attention to the matter, but as my hon. friend assures me that the custom is as he states, perhaps it would be rather out of place to break it on this occasion. Under the circumstances I have no objection to amending the motion in accordance with the suggestion of the hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion as amended now reads:

That this House adjourn on Wednesday, the thirty-first day of March, at 6 p.m., and that

when the House so adjourns it stands adjourned until Tuesday. the sixth day of April next.

Motion as amended agreed to.

HOUSE OF COMMONS OFFICIALS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. E. B. DEVLIN (Wright): Before the Orders of the Day are called, may I say that some days ago I asked for the plan of organization respecting the staff of this House, and your honour, in answer, very kindly consented to lay it upon the Table to-day. May I ask you, instead of laying it on the Table to-day, to defer it until Monday or Tuesday in order that I may have an opportunity of further consideration with the hon. members of the House as to the real needs and necessities of the occasion.

Mr. SPEAKER: The suggestion of the hon. member is entirely agreeable.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS—INCOMPLETE ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. GEORGE PARENT (Quebec West): I would like to draw the attention of the right hon. the acting leader of the Government (Sir George Foster) to a question I asked a week ago and which was asked to stand as a return. I understand it is the privilege of the Government to deal with such questions as they like, especially when the answers call for a large amount of work. It is quite obvious that the particular question I refer to does not involve any great amount of work in the preparation of the information, and I would like to know when I may expect an answer to the question.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: What was the subject matter?

Mr. PARENT: The question was as follows:

1. What was the total amount of the gross consolidated debt of Canada on the 28th of February, 1920?
2. What was the total amount of the net consolidated debt of Canada on the same date?
3. What was the total amount of the assets of the consolidated debt of Canada on the said date?
4. What was the total amount of the yearly interest payable on the gross consolidated debt of Canada on the said date?
5. What was the total amount of yearly interest or revenue received or collected by Canada in respect to the property or securities constituting the assets of the public debt?
6. What was the total amount of the floating debt of Canada on the 28th of February, 1920?
7. What was the total amount of yearly interest payable on the floating debt of Canada on the said date?

And so on. The Department of Finance is surely in a position to answer every one of these questions right off.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not know that the delay will be very long before the return is made. There are a great many questions being put and a great many returns have to be made. I do not know whether this is out of its turn, but it will not be very long delayed.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. T. W. CALDWELL (Carleton, N.B.): I would call to the attention of the Government the answer given to a question on the Order Paper in regard to the stock of the Grand Trunk Railway Company. There were six questions—1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6. Questions 5 and 6 have been answered, but the answers to questions from 1 to 4 were omitted. I would also desire to point out that the answers to numbers 5 and 6 are not in accordance with the questions. I asked in question 5:

Has any member of the present Government ever held any of the stock of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, either personally or by proxy through any other person?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member should put that question either on a motion for the House to go into Committee of Supply or when the House is in Committee of Supply. When, on the Orders of the Day, questions are answered, a member must accept without discussion the answer of the Government as it stands.

Mr. CALDWELL: There are four questions not answered.

Mr. SPEAKER: They may have stood as an order for a return. Does the hon. member mean that they do not appear in the list of questions as having been answered?

Mr. CALDWELL: The questions appear but the answers do not. The answers to questions 5 and 6 are in Hansard, and I want to call your attention to the fact that the answers given are not in accordance with the questions.

Mr. SPEAKER: That point is one which the hon. member would have to take up with the Government on a motion to go into Supply, or when the House is in Supply, or at some other stage. On the Orders of the Day he must accept such answers as the Government give, but he has his remedy on the two occasions to which I have particularly referred.

Mr. CALDWELL: I would like an explanation as to why there is no answer to the first four questions.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If Mr. Speaker will allow me I will tell my hon. friend why. The first four question were allowed to stand as an order for a return and the return is to be brought down for my hon. friend. The other two questions were answered offhand and therefore it was not necessary to reserve them for any further examination. The answers will come all right.

Mr. CALDWELL: Thank you.

QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSION.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. C. G. POWER (Quebec South): I desire to draw the attention of the Government to a despatch in the Montreal Daily Star of Thursday, March 25, entitled "Big Changes at Quebec Harbour." It is as follows:

> The amalgamation of both the local agency of the Marine and Fisheries of Canada and the Quebec Harbour Commission is reported today in semi-official circles.

I do not wish to read the whole article.

> The head of the two combined bodies would be Sir David Watson, it is rumoured. The ultimate end to be attained by this reorganization would be a curtailment of expenses in the administration of these two branches of the public service.

I wish to be informed by the Government whether or not there is any truth in this rumour.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I will ask my hon. friend to repeat the question when the Minister of Marine is in the House.

SUPPLY—INTERIM VOTE.

On motion of Sir Henry Drayton the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON moved:

> Resolved, That a sum not exceeding $62,900,986.09, being one-sixth of the amount of each item set forth in the Main Estimates for the year ending March 31, 1921, laid on the table of the House on the 22nd instant, be granted to His Majesty for the year ending March 31, 1921.

Mr. BUREAU: May I ask if it is one-sixth of the whole Estimates?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is understood that we are consenting to one-sixth of the total appropriation but we reserve our right to criticise every individual item.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Absolutely so.

Mr. BUREAU: But we cannot move to throw out any item if we vote one-sixth of it?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: We have already voted one-sixth of it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am told that this is the ordinary way of arriving at it.

Mr. BUREAU: During the war.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The whole object is to get something with which to carry on the public service. The hon. member is not committing himself upon any item that he may wish to discuss.

Mr. FIELDING: While the practice is to take one-sixth of the whole I would suggest that the power should only be used in urgent cases, such as to pay the Civil Service and such like matters. Of course, in regard to debatable items, we cannot withdraw the vote for the one sixth, but I do not anticipate any trouble. The power is generally used to pay for urgent matters such as the Civil Service and I take it that the Government will apply it in that spirit and not apply it to other items which can just as well wait.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Does this include one-sixth of the $20,000,000 that we were asked to vote for government ships two or three days ago?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It includes one-sixth of everything but the effect is that the hon. member or any other hon. member will not be bound in any way with regard to any particular vote.

Mr. BUREAU: We are bound by the fact that we have voted one-sixth.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Yes, but the vote is not a vote of endorsation in so far as any particular item is concerned. As I understand it it is the ordinary vote which enables public business to be carried on.

Mr. CANNON: I have great confidence in the minister's explanation but on the other hand I very often clash with the chairman of the committee and I would like to have his interpretation of the rule.

The CHAIRMAN: The resolution which is now before the House provides for a vote of one-sixth of the entire Estimates which were laid on the Table on the 22nd of March. There is absolutely no doubt that this vote gives the Government the power to expend

one-sixth of every item in the Estimates if it desires to exercise that right. This is the customary blanket vote, but every item in the Estimates must once more come before this Committee in order that the other five-sixths be approved. Rule 17c remains in force the same as though this resolution were not adopted, and hon. members will have the absolute right to fully discuss any item when it comes before this Committee as a separate resolution.

Mr. CANNON: Suppose an hon. member, when the House is in Committee later on in the session, should move that an item be struck out altogether?

The CHAIRMAN: Any hon. member could move, during the balance of the session, that an item be reduced, or the Committee can vote for the rejection of any item. If the item is rejected, the Government would be precluded from expending the other five-sixths of that item. If the one-sixth which is voted to-day has not been expended, there are very few cases where the Government would find it advantageous to do so without being authorized to use the balance of the amount. Technically, it would have that power.

Mr. BUREAU: Heretofore it has always been customary to grant one-sixth of the amount required for the salaries of the civil servants and other public employees who are dependent upon those salaries for the maintenance of themselves and families, but how can we vote one-sixth of the sums necessary for the payment of contracts that we know nothing about? If we make the vote we are committed to the principle and we cannot escape from it. If we admit the principle that the Government has the right to spend one-sixth of the sum of $1,000,000 involved in the contract, it would be ridiculous for us to intervene later and say that the remaining five-sixths should not be spent. I cannot then move to strike the item out because I have already acquiesced in the principle of the vote.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend is, I think, unduly exercised over this matter.

Mr. BUREAU: I am not exercised at all.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It has been the practice ever since I have been in Parliament that when the end of the fiscal year draws near the Government shall secure the sums of money necessary in order to carry on the business of the country. The votes for this purpose have always been granted, and cheerfully granted. I am not sure that my hon. friend himself has not passed through two or three crises like the present in past years.

Mr. BUREAU: Yes, fortunately I did pass through them.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It has always been considered proper to grant the votes and no opposition has been made to that course.

Mr. BUREAU: It is a wrong principle to ask us to vote fifty or one hundred million dollars out of perhaps a total of $300,000,000, when there is absolutely no explanation of the proposed expenditure. That is what I object to. A vote for the salaries of civil servants is something we are familiar with, something that we know is necessary. But when you ask us to vote en bloc large amounts for other things that we know absolutely nothing about, and have had no opportunity to look into, that is an entirely different matter.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would like to assure the hon. gentleman that the motion which has been moved is the customary motion, and it was furnished to me by officers of the House. So far as I have been able to learn, the course which is now proposed, is the one which has always been followed. We must remember that salaries and other commitments have to be provided for, business must be carried on, obligations must be fulfilled, and interest must be met. However, I would meet the views of my hon. friend absolutely to the fullest extent that we can. For example, I do not think that the present vote of one-sixth would be any authority to the Government to undertake new obligations in the meantime. That, I think, is the only point about which my hon. friend is very much concerned.

Mr. BUREAU: I am not so much concerned except that I think that the principle which is proposed here is wrong, and I desire to protest against it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have looked up Hansard to ascertain the form in which previous requests have been made and the nature of the replies by the Opposition to those requests. I observe that in each case the Opposition has taken care to state that while granting one-sixth of the total appropriation it was to be distinctly understood they were not thereby sanctioning any individual item, but reserved the right to pass upon every item appearing in the Estimates. It is in that spirit that we are pre-

pared to meet the Government at the present time. That is, the understanding shall be that while voting one-sixth of the total appropriation necessary to enable the business of the country to be carried on until such time as the Estimates may be passed, we are in no wise prejudicing the right of any hon. member to discuss any individual item on its merits.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My understanding agrees absolutely with that of my hon. friend.

Mr. FIELDING: If it is desired to get at the root of the trouble the Government must be reminded that they should not have allowed so much time to elapse before seeking Supply. This House should have been called at a much earlier period. In the olden times when the fiscal year terminated on the 30th of June Parliament met in January or February. However it was thought that that time was too late and for business convenience it was deemed desirable that the session should begin earlier and end earlier. Accordingly the fiscal year was changed so as to terminate on March 31. Parliament was then summoned to meet in November or December and in the intervening time from the 31st of March, it was considered that ample opportunity was afforded to prepare the necessary public documents for the proper despatch of business. The present Government, however, for reasons of their own, have allowed months to pass without taking action. Now they find themselves at the end of the fiscal year with no money voted. The explanation of this trouble is that they should have called Parliament several months ago.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That should have been done on numerous other occasions by my hon. friends on the other side.

Mr. FIELDING: Quite possibly, but let us take each case in its turn. I would like to know what reason the Government can give, in view of the fact that we changed the fiscal year in order to have an early meeting of Parliament, why Parliament was not summoned before the 26th of February.

Mr. McKENZIE: I invite the attention of the Government to the point as to how an item that has once been dealt with should be considered when it comes up a second time. Are we not debarred from taking action in the future with respect to an item which has been already considered? It should be distinctly understood that although we are passing one-sixth of every item in the Estimates on the present occasion we shall not be precluded from discussing such items when they again come before the House for consideration.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I entirely agree with my hon. friend.

Resolution reported, read a first and second time and concurred in.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE INTERIM SUPPLY BILL.

On motion of Sir Henry Drayton the House went into Committee of Ways and Means, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON moved:

Resolved, That towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial year ending 31st March, 1921, the sum of $62,900,986.09 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 36 for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending 31st March, 1921.

Motion agreed to, Bill read a first and second time considered in committee and reported without amendment.

Mr. CANNON: Mr. Speaker, I wish to remark that this Bill is not yet distributed. I do not desire to raise objection now, but if such proceedings are repeated I would ask the Government to see in future that the Bill is distributed beforehand.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Hear, hear.

Bill read the third time and passed.

DOMINION FRANCHISE ACT.

DEBATE RESUMED ON SECOND READING OF BILL NO. 12.

Resuming the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Acting Solicitor General (Mr. Guthrie) for the second reading of Bill No. 12, respecting the election of members of the House of Commons and the Electoral Franchise.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Minister of the Interior): Mr. Speaker, the only purpose I have in intervening in the debate is to refer to a phase of it that developed

yesterday afternoon and evening with regard to a certain section of the Bill. It is a phase that ordinarily might well be left to discussion in committee, as it really concerns a particular item of the measure. The only reason that I desire to speak upon it now is that the Acting Solicitor General, who has charge of the measure in the House, has already spoken and, consequently, cannot address the House a second time.

Certain hon. members on both sides of the House called attention yesterday to what appears to be the effect of a reading together of the Naturalization Act as passed a year ago and section 29 of this Bill. The Naturalization Act passed in the first session of 1919 was an Act to determine Canadian naturalization in such a manner that a person naturalized in Canada would thereby become naturalized for all purposes of the British Empire, that wherever he might be he would be deemed a British subject. The Act as then passed was drawn and enacted in conformity with British legislation, part 2 of which was submitted to and adopted, I believe, by all of the Dominions of the Empire, thereby having the effect of establishing what might be termed Empire Naturalization.

By the terms of section 8 of that Act it was provided that no subject of a then enemy state could obtain naturalization in Canada until a period of ten years had elapsed after the expiration of the war. There were three exceptions to that general provision. The disabling clause contained in sub-subsection (b) of subsection 4 of that section was made not to apply to: First, those who though born in an enemy country were of a race or community known to be opposed to the enemy governments; secondly, those who had taken part in the war on behalf of the Allies; and, thirdly, those who, though enemy subjects, were British born, having thereafter become naturalized in enemy states. Those were the three exceptions to the general rule as embodied in the British legislation and as virtually transcribed into our legislation.

It will become manifest at once that the purpose of the legislation of 1919 was to impede, for a period of ten years, the admission into citizenship in the British Empire of those who were enemy subjects. Consequently nothing can be more apparent than that there was no thought that those who were British subjects at that time should be affected in any way whatsoever by section 8 of the Naturalization Act. Its purpose was only to delay, to impede for a fixed period, the admission to the privileges of British citizenship of those who theretofore had been subjects of enemy states.

Section 29 of our own Act provides that those who have become British subjects not by birth but by naturalization,—naturalization not based on the personal merit or qualification of the subject, but resulting from the operation of law alone—those subjects, though naturalized by the operation of law, must show the same qualification that British subjects should have before being admitted to the franchise. The intent of the section was that such examination, such investigation into the qualifications of those who would seek to vote by reason of naturalization by construction of law, should take place as would determine that they were qualified just in the same way as those who secured naturalization by personal application for same. The form of the certificate appended to section 29 is such that no one would be entitled to that certificate who, though not a British subject, could nevertheless become a British subject at that time. Well, it requires only a little reflection to see that the result is this: That the subject of an enemy state who became a British subject by construction or by operation of law would, if he or she had not so become a British subject, still be a subject of an enemy state. In this case the provisions of the Naturalization Act would at once take effect, and a judge hearing the application of such person for naturalization would be compelled to say: Yes, you are a British subject, but if you never had become such by construction of law I could not now make you such because you would be a subject of an enemy state and consequently disabled under the provisions of the 1919 Naturalization Act. This is the way section 29 comes to read the way it does. It is, I believe, word for word the same section as appears in the Act of 1918 which first of all gave the franchise to women and then determine what should be the extent of woman's voting privilege as a result of that franchise. The 1918 Act effected the purpose that it was intended to effect, because there was at that time no Naturalization Act to read with it. Subsequently the 1919 Naturalization Act was passed, and in the By-election Act of last year, just as in the Act of 1918, a similar clause to clause 29 of this Bill appeared. That was carried forward into the legislation that is now presented to the House, and from the discussion of yesterday it appeared that reading the Naturalization Act

with this section, a consequence not intended by the Government resulted. That that consequence does result there can be, in my judgment, no doubt; indeed, the Acting Solicitor General (Hon. Mr. Guthrie) in answer to an inquiry last night, clearly indicated that it did result. Now, I firmly adhere to the principle that no one in this country naturalized merely by operation of law should acquire rights to the franchise until he or she shows that in point of actual qualification he or she lives up to the general provisions of the legislation applicable to all naturalized subjects; lives up to all the qualifications that others applying for naturalization must have. No reason in the world could be advanced why, for example, a married woman who becomes a British subject, perhaps two or three days or weeks after she comes to Canada from an enemy country, by the mere act of marriage with a former alien enemy who had previously been naturalized, should be entitled to the franchise, whereas a man coming from an enemy country must, before he may be naturalized, show that he has an adequate knowledge of French and of English; that he possesses a character such as we desire in citizens of this country and the other qualifications called for in general by the provisions of the Naturalization Act. Those requirements that are demanded from all who come from all countries and ask for citizenship here should be found to exist in all persons who desire the franchise in Canada before that franchise should be granted. But I do not think, and I am sure that on reflection hon. gentlemen will see that it could not be logically argued, that any special disability should be put upon a person which was intended to apply to non-British subjects but which, taking into account the Naturalization Act and reading in connection with it the Act of this year, has the effect of applying to British subjects to whom it was never intended to apply at all. If that were to result, an alien enemy or one who formerly had been an alien enemy, who came to Canada in 1910 or 1911, took a homestead, and, to fulfil the requirements of the homestead law, took out naturalization in 1913 and became a British subject,—that alien enemy, according to the Act now presented, is entitled to the right to vote. Such a man under the provisions of the previous law which operated only for the duration of the war would not have had the right to vote, whereas a person who came to this country say forty years ago, and shortly after coming, say at the age of eighteen, became a naturalized British subject by reason of the naturalization of his father and had remained a British subject and had voted as such throughout all the elections since and even in the election of 1918—that person would find himself disentitled to the franchise. Well, there could be no justification, it clearly appears to me, for disfranchising that person and enfranchising the other. A much stronger argument could have been made for the retention of the disability on the recent arrival than could possibly be applied to a person who had been a British subject and a resident of Canada for perhaps forty years. That was not the intention of section 29, and the Government will propose in committee an amendment to the effect that no disability read out of paragraph (B) of subclause 4 of section 8 of the Naturalization Act should disentitle a person on that ground alone to the certificate required under section 29 of the present legislation. I feel that I have made clear our position as it is assumed by the Government. Of course, hon. members understand, without any explanation from me, that this Bill, in all its provisions and with all its principles, because as regards principles there are a dozen or twenty-four principles in legislation of this kind, is merely a declaration first of all that provision should be made for a general manhood suffrage and then that provision should be made for machinery for taking the vote in Canada for purposes of the election of members to this House. Hon. gentlemen will agree, without any explanation from me, that this Bill, presented in this way to the House of Commons, comes before the House open to amendment, discussion and suggestion. In respect of section 29 as I now explain it to the House, and in respect of every other section, as regards every feature whether embodied in the Bill or believed ought to embodied in the Bill, the Bill comes before the House, for suggestions as to amendment and for improvement if, in the wisdom of the House, improvement can be made. I simply present this feature of the legislation as it was intended to be constructed, with the effect it was intended to have, and in that way the Bill will be laid before the House in committee for full discussion and debate.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Has the amendment been prepared?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Mr. McKENZIE: Before the minister sits down, I should be obliged if he would give some explanation of what is meant in the certificate attached to section 29. I have not been able to satisfy myself as to really what it means.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not in charge of the legislation and I have already spoken. I do not know that I can add anything to the very clear words of the certificate. The certificate says, in effect, that no one, as I express it, constructively naturalized, shall vote unless he or she gets a certificate from a judge to the effect that, on his or her own merits as a citizen, he or she would be entitled to naturalization aside from the fact that he or she had become naturalized by operation of law.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Of course, the certificate will have to be changed in order to make it agree with the amendment.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Either that, or something would be required to be added to the effect that the certificate could not be denied, only because of the provision of sub-clause (b) to which I referred.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the hon member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) speaks, I must mention that he would be precluded from speaking inasmuch as he moved the adjournment of the debate and did not proceed with his speech, but he did not proceed out of courtesy to the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen). I merely mention this so that the occurrence may not be taken as a precedent.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Shelburne and Queen's): Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose to pursue the discussion along the lines of the debate of last evening, nor to make any review whatever of the remarks made by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) to-day. The discussion of last evening dealt with very interesting aspects of the question. The discussion respecting a clause disfranchising certain persons, not aliens, but British subjects, and the kindred legislation concerning the naturalization law, was certainly deeply interesting, much more interesting, I am sure, than anything I can hope to present to-day. In several of the speeches, and notably in the most impressive and very calm and effective speech of the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Euler), we had presented what I may call the anomalies, injustices, and even absurdities which would arise under the operation of this franchise measure if it were to remain in the condition in which it now stands. I hope that the suggestion made to-day by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) will remove some of those difficulties, and that when we have the Bill in its final shape, there will not be so much room for the criticism which was so effectively offered by the hon. member for Waterloo North. It is, however, not with these subjects, but rather with the more prosaic and matter of fact features of the Bill in one or two particulars that I desire to deal. There are many aspects of this measure which can most conveniently be discussed in committee, but there are some leading features which we may well discuss, as we have been discussing them, at this stage, the second reading of the Bill.

I accept, in unreserved manner, the assurance of the Acting Solicitor General (Mr. Guthrie) that the desire of the Government is to make this a fair and sound Bill which can be accepted by all parties. Believing that he has that object in view, and having in mind his invitation that suggestions are desired from all classes, I want to call the attention of the minister and the Government to one or two features of the Bill which I think are capable of amendment in order that the purposes which the Government say they have in view may be carried out.

In the operation of our electoral machinery, there are two stages at which there arise very strong temptations for the Government of the day to exercise an undue influence. The first of these is with regard to the preparation of the electoral lists. The second of the occasions when they have a strong temptation to act otherwise than fairly is with regard to the appointment of returning officers. If the Government may obtain, wholly or partly, control over the prepartion of the electoral lists, and if after that preliminary step in connection with the electoral machinery has been taken, they can proceed to go out into the highways and byways and select any partisans they please to fill the places of returning officers, then we shall not have a fair Franchise Act; we shall have a measure designed to bring about the purposes of the Government and not to guard, as they should do, the franchise as a sacred trust. In both these respects, the Government are taking to themselves unnecessary, dangerous power, power that they should not seek, power which the House ought not to grant. I shall not occupy the attention of the House more than a few minutes; but first, let us give a thought to the question of the returning officers. After the Acting Solicitor General had discussed the question for some time, some hon. member, it appears, had suggested that the judges might appoint returning officers. The Acting Solicitor General at once took exception to that, and I heartily agree with him on that point. I

4 p.m.

do not think judges should be called upon to appoint returning officers. We are all interested in keeping our judges out of politics, and I agree with the Acting Solicitor General that if we were to give judges power to appoint returning officers, that would be getting them dangerously near the political field. But it does not follow that because it is not wise to have judges make the appointments, we should give an unreserved hand to the Government to make the appointments themselves. It is true they have that power now; and that it has been exercised improperly is easily capable of proof. Every hon. member probably has within his own experience some knowledge of appointments made of returning officers which were not made for the highest purposes of a Franchise Act. But should the Government have an unlimited power? In my province of Nova Scotia, the Government exercises the power to appoint returning officers. The Acting Solicitor General says that this is a power which the Government should not abdicate, and I agree with him on that; the Government should take the power. But in Nova Scotia, when the Government appoint returning officers, they are not free to appoint whom they please; they must appoint the sheriffs of the province, who are judicial officers, so that there the Government, while they exercise the power of appointing returning officers, are not free to go out and appoint partisans for that important function, but they must take important public judicial officers for that duty.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Who appoints the officers?

Mr. FIELDING: The Government of Nova Scotia.

Mr. BEST: How much better would that be?

Mr. FIELDING: I expected that my hon. friend or somebody else would raise that question. But if the appointment of a sheriff by a Government makes him the partisan of that Government, does the appointment of a judge by the Dominion Government make him a partisan of that Government? What is the difference between an officer appointed by the Dominion Government to perform a judicial duty and an officer appointed by a provincial government to perform what is also a judicial duty? If we regard it as a crime for the Government of a province to appoint a sheriff to perform such a duty, what shall we say of the Dominion Government which calls upon the judges of the country whom they appoint to discharge judicial functions in connection with the administration of this law? Partisans they are and naturally always will be. I am not finding fault with the appointment of judges; I am not making complaint. But when exception is taken to a sheriff because he is an appointee of a provincial government, I say that with equal force one could take exception to deputing to one of the judges the duties in connection with this Bill, because the judge is appointed by the Dominion Government.

Let us consider the province of Quebec, from which there are some things that we can very well learn. The Government of the province of Quebec undertake the function of appointing returning officers, but they do not claim for themselves an unlimited right to choose. They cannot go out on the highways and byways and pick up the first man who will serve their purpose. They have the right to appoint the returning officer, but they must appoint him from the prescribed list of permanent public officials. If I am correct in the opinion, I think these officers are the sheriff, the prothonotary, and the registrar. At all events, there are three permanent stated officers and the Government must appoint one or other of them. Why cannot we have a similar provision in this Bill? If objection be taken that these three officers are provincial officers, then, as I have already said, the fact that they are provincial officers is no more a disqualification than the appointment by the Dominion Government is a disqualification in respect of a judge. In both cases you have men discharging, with a sense of responsibility, a judicial function, or what is to some extent a judicial function. But if there is anything in the point that because officers are appointed by the provincial government they are disqualified, then let us enlarge the list and say that the Dominion Government shall select as returning officer a person from a class on a prescribed list; and if the three officials named in the province of Quebec, or the sheriff named in Nova Scotia, are not enough, then put on the list, if you like, one or two responsible officers appointed by the Dominion. My point is this: I do not think that the Government should have the power, as they now have, to go out on the street and select any partisan and appoint him as a returning officer. I want them to exercise their power, but I desire to see them exercise it with the limitation that they shall appoint to this high and important office some man who has already a fixed status in the country, a man who

holds a responsible office, either local or Dominion, and who can therefore be held accountable for his acts. I submit in all sincerity to the Government of the day that in seeking the continuation of the present system, whereby they can take any partisan they choose and appoint him to the position of returning officer, they are exercising a dangerous power; and if the Government desire to make this Bill as fair and equitable as it is their avowed intention to make it—I am accepting their assurance in that regard—I ask them very earnestly to give careful consideration to what I have said touching the selection of returning officers.

Let us turn to the question of provincial lists. My hon. friend the Acting Solicitor General (Mr. Guthrie) argued at considerable length to prove that this Parliament has the power to enact a Dominion Franchise law. Well, Mr. Speaker, I really do not know why the hon. gentleman devoted so much time to that point. I do not think that any one ever disputed the power of Parliament to pass a Dominion Franchise Law. I am quite sure that Edward Blake and the other great men to whom reference was made never for one moment set up the contention that the passing of a Dominion Franchise Act was beyond the jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada. It was not a question of constitutional power or of constitutional jurisdiction; it was a question of public convenience and public advantage; it was a question of public economy. I think it is a great pity we could not have in every province provincial lists adopted for Dominion purposes. I can see great advantages in that if it were possible. The preparation of these lists is a matter of great trouble and expense, sometimes of worry and annoyance, to men interested in politics. It is a pity we have to have trouble of that kind in the preparation of one list, and it is doubly a pity that we should have to go to the same trouble and expense a second time for a Dominion list. I repeat that the question is one of public convenience and not of constitutional power. I have had such strong views on that question that a great many years ago, in the early days of my political experience in Nova Scotia—more years ago than I care to confess—I remember sending a telegram to Sir John Macdonald offering the suggestion—for the franchise question was then up at Ottawa—that instead of quarreling about lists a conference should be called of the Dominion and provincial governments with a view to agreeing upon some basis of lists that both could accept. Unfortunately that view was not taken. My hon. friend, the Acting Solicitor General yesterday read an extract from a speech delivered by Sir John Thompson who said that there was so little difference between the Dominion and provincial franchise that there was no reason for maintaining the separation. I quite agree. But if the difference was so slight that there was no need for two laws, what need should there be for two lists? For obvious reasons, we should favour the adoption of provincial lists generally, if it were possible, but we know that it is not possible because the lists of the several provinces differ so widely. In Quebec the women are not on the list, and clearly, if we are to carry out the purpose of this House, so far as that province is concerned, there must be some machinery for enrolling the women of Quebec. In that case you cannot adopt the provincial list as it stands. In the case of Prince Edward Island, there are no lists at all. A man comes to the poll and swears that he has the right to vote, and he votes. Speaking generally, I think that is a dangerous practice. Prince Edward Island is a happy, prosperous community where everyone knows everyone else, and there is no room for dispute regarding any one's qualifications down there. That province is the most prosperous part of the Dominion of Canada. There are none who are very rich and none very poor; everyone knows his neighbour, and there are no possibilities of dispute. But when you adopt generally the principle in vogue in that province you will have men coming up to the poll at the last moment and getting on the list by simply swearing that they have the right to be placed on it. As I say, that is a dangerous principle. I am afraid that you cannot adopt the provincial lists generally. Let me say, however, that the provincial lists ought to be encouraged wherever they exist and are fair and reasonable. What I am about to say by way of illustration concerns Nova Scotia, but it may, I think, be said as well concerning New Brunswick. I think that conditions are much the same in these two provinces, but my hon. friends from New Brunswick will speak for themselves. There is no reason why the lists of the province of Nova Scotia made up under the existing law should not be accepted as a finality, and when the Government proposes to appoint A, B, and C, possibly their own partisans, to get out and add to that list or take from it, I think they are making a grave mistake. Whatever may be said about the other provinces, the lists are made up in Nova Scotia in a way which

I believe leaves no room for dispute. What is the method? The foundation of the electoral list in Nova Scotia is the assessment roll. The property qualification in Nova Scotia is so small that I agree with the statement that it is virtually manhood suffrage. The revisors are not appointed by the Government of Nova Scotia but by the municipal councils. They take the first assessment roll as a basis. That assessment roll indicates the names of all persons who are assessed as owners of property, to a very modest extent, as tenants of property, also to a moderate degree, as sons of tenants, sons of owners, sons of farmers. Practically speaking, it gets down almost to a basis of manhood suffrage. A public notice is given of a day when the revisers will meet for the purpose of making further inquiry. The lists as prepared by the officers are posted up, the officers hold a meeting, and those concerned add to the list or take from it as the case may be. The lists are then made up. Is there no appeal? Yes, there is an appeal to the sheriff. I suppose my hon. friend from Annapolis (Mr. Davidson) from his interruption a moment ago, considers that that is no appeal at all. The sheriffs of Nova Scotia are as much a judicial body, lacking only in volume of dignity, as the judges of our country. They hold their offices by a tenure almost as secure as that of the judges. There was a time many years ago when the sheriffs held their offices from year to year. That has passed away and the sheriff is now appointed not for life, but during good behaviour, and he can only be removed for cause. Let me illustrate the character of these men from my own experience. There are two counties —Queen's and Shelburne—

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The hon. gentleman says they can be removed. What is the removing power?

Mr. FIELDING: The Government of the province which appoints them and nobody else. I do not know whether my hon. friend can suggest anybody else.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No; I just wanted the information.

Mr. FIELDING: I want to illustrate the character of these sheriffs to show that they are a body deserving of respect. It is a fact that they are appointed during good behaviour. I want to give an illustration from my own constituency. I happen to represent two counties. In these counties there are two sheriffs and the junior of these two sheriffs is the senior in the matter of the years of his official life of all the judges in the province of Nova Scotia. He is a man of longer experience in official life than any member of the bench of Nova Scotia. The junior of these two men has been in office for thirty-six years. He is the sheriff of the county of Queens. The sheriff of the county of Shelburne has been in office for forty-three years. The sheriff of the county of Shelburne, Mr. George Maclean, a most respected Conservative, was appointed many, many years ago by a Conservative Government. He was in office when I and my friends came into power in 1882. He was continued as a capable and respected official and he has been there for forty-three years, a man who has performed the duties of his office, as sheriff and returning officer, in a manner that has won the respect and confidence of the people at large. These happen to be the older sheriffs in the province. Other hon. gentlemen who are familiar with the sheriffs in other counties will be able to testify that the sheriffs of Nova Scotia are a body well qualified to act as a court of appeal in the revising of the lists and although there may be some party strife I think we all agree that the manner in which the sheriffs of Nova Scotia discharge their duties is satisfactory to all political parties. Therefore I want to suggest now in regard to the provincial lists, whatever may happen with other provinces, because in Canada conditions vary, that the Government consider the manner in which the lists in each province are made up and that, unless they have some reason to believe that the lists are made up in a partisan and unfair manner, they accept the lists as a finality and do not appoint any parties of their own to go out and put names on, or take them off and make up whole new lists for themselves. In the interest of fair play I ask it; in the interest of economy I ask it. It means a waste of time and money to get out a second list under conditions of that character. I think the situation is much the same in New Brunswick but again I say I must not speak too positively as to that.

My only purpose at present is to offer the Government in all good faith two suggestions. The first is that you amend your present system of appointing returning officers. If it is necessary to show how that system has been abused I shall be prepared to do so but I do not want to raise that question now. As I am not dealing with individual cases; I am only dealing with principles. I would suggest that the Gov-

ernment adopt a prescribed list of officials from whom they shall select their returning officers and if there is any fear that the provincial officers are prejudiced then put on your prescribed list some Dominion official who can be called upon to act as a returning officer and who would be a responsible citizen known to everybody. Let that be done instead of appointing a man particularly for the occasion.

The second point is that inasmuch as I believe the lists of Nova Scotia are fairly made and there is no reason why they should not be accepted, I want to suggest to the Government that as respects that province unless somebody can show that the lists are not fairly made, these lists be accepted as a finality and that this Government shall not send out men to disturb lists of that kind.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER (East York): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Guthrie) should be congratulated upon the very able address with which he favoured this House in introducing the Franchise Bill. Although we have had in this Parliament such great men as Macdonald, Blake, Mackenzie, Aylesworth and others and although a review of the history of Parliament presents many notable figures, I think we will come to the conclusion that we have a degree of talent in the House to-day equal to that at any period in its history. It seems to me that while honouring the memory of the able men of those early days we should not be unmindful of the quality of the men that we have in this House to-day. If I chose, I think I could name many members who are sitting in the House to-day who could be truly compared with the great men of former years.

The hon. the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King), in replying to the speech of the hon. the Minister of Militia and Defence laboured very strenuously in his criticism of the Franchise Bill. His attempt was a complete failure. His particular effort seemed to be to inform the House that while he was offering a criticism of the Bill, at a later period, when it came before the committee, he would reserve the right to further criticize it and possibly suggest many amendments. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that he has need to make a greater effort if he wishes to be more successful than he did yesterday.

The Minister of Militia and other members of the Government, with the ability which they possess, have prepared what may be a fair Bill but there possibly will be some amendments to be made to it. In fact there are some amendments that they have consented to make. But I think there should be other amendments. I think the Government should consider the disfranchising of slackers, deserters, evaders and alien enemies. When I speak of this class of citizens I might remind the House that we have had some experience. We need only go back a few months and recall what took place in the great city of Winnipeg. There we found a class of people who were creating a great deal of trouble and who undertook to cause a rebellion that might have spread throughout the Dominion and become a very serious matter for the country at large. However, it was checked. These people were principally foreigners but amongst them were a few Canadians who had held prominent positions including some clergymen who had associated themselves with these foreigners and aliens in the effort to create a rebellion in this country. That being so there is still danger to be feared from the actions of the "Reds" or Bolshevists of whom we have many thousands in Canada. There should be some check on this class of people and they should not be permitted to dictate, or to voice their views, as to how the country should be governed, or offer themselves for public positions, neither should they be permitted to participate in the enactment of legislation. In my opinion this class should be disfranchised and the present Bill should be amended so as to bring about that result. In order to retain control over these people either the War-time Elections Act should be continued or the present Bill should be amended in the desired direction.

We must consider the sentiments of the people of Ontario and of Manitoba and the other Western Provinces with respect to slackers, deserters and evaders. We should heed the desire expressed in regard to these persons not only by returned soldiers, but by the mothers, wives and sisters of men who fought at the front, and who say that these undesirable individuals should not enjoy the rights of free citizenship. I think I am safe in saying that hundreds of thousands of worthy citizens throughout the Dominion have given utterance to that sentiment. In my travels throughout the Dominion, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, I have found that a general feeling exists in favour of the disfranchisement of these undesirable characters, and that the aliens

especially should be deprived of the franchise for some years to come. During the war we had to intern many thousands of these aliens in order to prevent them from destroying the property and probably even going further and destroying life, and the adoption of the necessary safeguards involved the Dominion in millions of dollars of expense. I do not think that these people have changed materially in their sentiments since the war was brought to a close, and therefore the Government would be well advised to enact such amendments to the present Bill as will disfranchise them until they have demonstrated themselves to be suitable citizens. They should not be allowed to be candidates for office or register a vote at any election in this country. It is not asking too much to insist upon that course. All slackers, deserters and evaders should be disfranchised for at least ten years. I have heard it even suggested that the period of disfranchisement be extended to twenty or twenty-five years, but the shorter time proposed will give us a chance to judge as to their qualifications for citizenship. It is not fair to those gallant men who freely volunteered their services to defend this country and the rest of the British Empire that slackers and men of a similar type should have as free a voice in the making of the country's laws as should be enjoyed by those who underwent such great sacrifices. To any such proposition as that I say No.

When it became necessary to reinforce the ranks of our gallant men who were fighting overseas and the Military Service Act was called into operation, many young men who should have been in the ranks of the defenders of this country fled to the backwoods and even crossed to the United States to avoid military service. Perhaps if these young men had been left alone they would have accepted conscription and would not have been characterized so unworthily as evaders. Unfortunately they were badly advised by certain of the Liberal press. Doubtless if good counsel had been extended to them many of these men would have gone overseas without any compulsion. But the advice given to them was bad, perhaps even pressure was brought to bear upon them. They acted upon that advice and failed to rally to the defence of this country. Why then should the same treatment be extended to these young men as is enjoyed by those who fought and bled for their country and the Empire?

It would almost appear as though the underlying motive with some persons in their antagonism to our war efforts was to sacrifice the English and preserve the young Frenchmen of Quebec. Doubtless many hon. gentlemen opposite will dispute the existence of any such motive; but I have heard it stated by many citizens throughout Canada that there appeared to be in the province of Quebec a desire to conserve the lives of the young French-Canadians and to sacrifice men of British birth so that those who had thus been preserved to the detriment of the British-born might be free to engage in a policy of expansion having for its object the securing of control in the other provinces of the Dominion.

We have been told by the hon. member for Red Deer that we should get rid of "the war mind." How is it possible to get rid of the war mind when we recall the numerous slackers, deserters and evaders who have shirked their duty in Canada? It is all very well to talk of getting rid of the war feeling, but that feeling has been so strongly impressed upon the minds of people in the majority of homes in this country by the actions of those individuals to whom I have referred that it is very hard to eradicate.

The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) asks us to help heal the wounds of war. Who created the wounds of war? The slackers, the deserters, the draft evaders—men who refused to do their duty in their country's hour of need. How can we heal the wounds of war, Mr. Speaker, when those wounds are so impressed on the minds of our people? It is all very well for the hon. member for Red Deer, who, as well as his brave sons, did their duty nobly and well, to preach reconciliation, but he must remember that all minds do not think alike, and he must permit those who lost their loved ones at the front to express their opinions as to how soon they will be prepared to forget and forgive. I venture to say that it will take a lifetime to erase from their minds the impressions created by the war.

In some parts of the Dominion we had the experience of practically no response from young men to do their duty, notwithstanding the efforts of the Government by voluntary enlistment and, that having failed, by conscription, to bring those young men to a sense of their obligations to fight for their country. Indeed, the attempt to enforce the Military Service Act led to riots in some parts of the Dominion, and we heard the threat made that rather than obey the law those men would create a revolution. I submit, Sir, that it was not creditable to en-

courage that condition of affairs, and it seems to me that a great deal of the responsibility for this revolutionary sentiment is upon the shoulders of many of the priests and bishops and public men of this Dominion. It has been said by hon. members that there should be no ill-feeling amongst the people of the various provinces, but when we remember such instances of disloyalty it forces us to the conclusion that it will take many years to restore the old-time harmony that existed in this country. Had those who were so anxious to give advice attended to their own business I believe conditions would have been entirely different. I do not blame those young men, but I do blame their advisers. I firmly believe that we shall not be able to overcome the lack of harmony created by such improper advice for perhaps another forty years.

Mr. W. H. WHITE (Victoria, Alta.): Mr. Speaker, as one who comes from a constituency which this Bill is bound to affect very seriously, I would like to say a few words. The matter has been pretty well discussed, particularly by the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler), who has pointed out the great injustice that is about to be done to a large proportion of our population. I may say that it is not in any spirit of self-interest that I am taking part in the debate, because, owing to the Military Service Act, those who were inclined to support me did not get an opportunity to do so.

I may also say that I was not, as was charged by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) against another hon. member (Mr. Pardee) elected by reason of the Military Service Act. I submit, Mr. Speaker, there must have been a tremendous difficulty in the Unionist party when of two members elected on the same ticket one cannot withdraw from that party without the other taunting him that he could never have been elected had it not been for that Act.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, permit me to say that the hon. gentleman is misquoting me. I never said anything of the kind.

Mr. W. H. WHITE: Would the hon. member allow me to quote his exact words to that effect?

Mr. EDWARDS: I will be very glad for my hon. friend to do so,—if he can.

Mr. WHITE: I find the following passage in the unrevised Hansard report of the hon. gentleman's speech:

> The hon. gentleman is very bold and very courageous in stating to this House and to the country that he does not care a button whether his course is popular or unpopular. Just a short time ago he was perfectly willing, when he was seeking election in 1917, to avail himself of the measure disfranchising some people whom to-day he says it would be a crying shame to disfranchise.

A little later in the course of his speech the hon. gentleman (Mr. Edwards) said:

> The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Pardee) in the election of 1917 was not only perfectly willing, but anxious to avail himself of the Act which was passed enabling him to get his seat in the House.

Is that clear? Will the hon. gentleman accept Hansard?

Mr. EDWARDS: I said that he was willing to take advantage of the Act which gave him the soldier votes.

Mr. W. H. WHITE: "To get his seat in the House."

Mr. EDWARDS: That does not say that the soldier vote elected him. That is what my hon. friend said; I did not say that.

Mr. W. H. WHITE: "Enabling him to get his seat in the House" and "being elected"—there may be some distinction between those two statements, but there is very little difference. With regard to the Bill itself and the promise that has been made by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) that some changes will be made in the most contentious clause—clause 29—I may say that certain hon. members from the eastern part of Canada, judging from their remarks regarding the people affected by this Bill, would lead one to believe that there is something wrong with those people,—that they are so wild and unprogressive that we would be better rid of them. I think the member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) said: We do not want them; let us get rid of them, or words to that effect. But let us go outside of this Parliament and take the statement of a man to whom frequent reference is made in this House, the man who is able to handle the largest spending department of the Government. I refer to Mr. D. B. Hanna. I remember his appearing before a committee of some members of this House and pointing out that some of the most productive districts in the North-west Territories were settled by Austrians. He pointed to a certain line along which these people had located and said that more was being produced along that line than in any other part of Canada. These people, he said, are our hope for the West; some day they will be our best citizens.

I ask hon. gentlemen what is the matter with these people? What is the charge against them? What have they ever done that they should be discriminated against or singled out for special treatment? Let us take the history of these people. They came to this country at the invitation of the Government of the day; they settled on land that was not cleared; in many cases they took sections en bloc in order that they might be together, and often they got the very worst kind of land. But they were encouraged to settle on it, and to-day wherever they are, they are producing more per acre than any other class in the whole of the Western territory. What have they done? Have they not been as progressive as others? Do they not produce as much? What was their attitude when the war broke out? An hon. gentleman on the other side of the House has said that thousands of them left his district and enlisted in our Forces. In some cases they changed their nationality in order to be able to enlist. They wanted to become Canadians; they wanted to serve Canada. I may say in passing that they are a people who bring no national pride with them; you never hear them boast of their country, as the Americans and the Old Country people do. The Austrian never says anything about the country that he came from, though after he learns English he may tell you what part of Ontario he had been in. He wants to be a Canadian citizen. He does not want to be an Austrian all his life; he never intended such a thing. But apparently we do not want to let him become a Canadian. If the member for St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames) were here he would bear me out when I say that the provincial constituency of Whitford in Alberta, largely peopled by Ukrainians, was the first constituency in that province, or perhaps, in any province, to make a voluntary assessment upon themselves of $5 each per month for the Patriotic Fund. Afterwards they went further and subscribed another $5, making the contribution $10 per month from every homesteader in that district. So that from that point of view they appear to be good citizens. The very fact that the 218th Regiment was made up of ninety per cent of that class of the people shows that they were willing to serve their country.

Mr. GRIESBACH: What was the other name of the 218th Regiment?

Mr. W. H. WHITE: I believe it was called the "Cornwall Cossacks."

Mr. GRIESBACH: It was the "Irish Guards," was it not?

[Mr. White.]

Mr. W. H. WHITE: They were called the Irish Guards first and afterwards the Cornwall Cossacks. But that only goes to support my statement that the majority of them were of that class. That nickname was applied to them because most of the men were of Austrian birth, but they did good service.

Now, it appears that these people have been willing both to assist patriotic movements and to serve their country in the military forces. Moreover, hundreds of them got past the recruiting officers and went to the war; yet under the provisions of an Act similar to this the wives, mothers, sisters and brothers of these people were cheated out of their vote in the election of 1917—that is, if you like to call it an election. I never considered it an election; in my opinion it was a revolution. A revolution is usually organized and carried out for the purpose of removing from office a Government that cannot be dislodged by constitutional means, but this revolution was organized and carried out for the purpose of continuing in office a Government which could not remain in office by constitutional means. This revolution has had no parallel on this continent, unless it be in Mexico and some of the other Latin republics.

While on this subject I wish to read from a local paper to show what is the spirit of the Ukrainians in the Western country. A body of Ukrainian farmers, about the time the Soldiers' Land Settlement scheme was inaugurated, held a meeting and adopted the following resolution:

> We, the Ukrainian farmers assembled at this meeting, hereby volunteer and promise to gratuitously help any returned soldiers settling in my district on the land by offering to do all the required improvements on their farms, such as hauling lumber, erecting buildings and fences, clearing, breaking and discing the land, and will also arrange to do all necessary work with our teams and machinery during the seeding and harvesting operations, free of charge.

Yet some people say they are against the soldier. The resolution continues:

> We also wish to solemnly assure such newcomers that friendly help will be at their disposition, and they will not suffer any want or hardships of a beginner. And we will greatly appreciate the presence of the returned man in our communities who would be able, willing and anxious to teach us the great British ideals, to promote our loyalty and to help us to attain the standard of British citizenship.

Knowing that the soldiers who would take up land would have difficulties to meet, these people determined to make it as easy for the soldiers as possible and solemnly pledged themselves to give them assistance.

Governments, like people, sometimes have suspicions that are not well founded. Shortly after the war broke out the Government called from their duties certain members of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police. I was for many years a member of that body. It is an organization that has a splendid record for efficiency; no organization of its kind has had so few failures recorded against it. Well, these men moved about among the Austrians and people of that class in the West, not in uniform but in civilian clothes, putting forward one pretext or another—the pretext of buying cattle or of looking for land; and during four years of this ferret work they never found one man in Victoria district guilty of uttering a word of sedition. Why be suspicious about a class of people like this? If you go into some other sections among the Scotch, you will find somebody who is dissatisfied and making criticisms in connection with the conduct of the war. I do not know whether or not you can find any such people amongst the Irish. There is, however, no reason at all for these suspicions, because those people have never done anything to warrant them.

Let me take another class of people with whom this measure is going to deal harshly. I know of a man of the nationality to which I refer who comes under this Act, who sent his boy to the war, and his boy is still over there and will remain there. Under this measure, if it passes, that man, now that his son does not give him a vote, is disfranchised and he cannot vote in the next election. Another case which I know is that of an Englishman, British-born, married to a German girl, and there is a good deal of intermarriage of that kind in this country. They had three children, one boy being nine years old, and although that man made the supreme sacrifice, his wife is not entitled to vote under this legislation. That may be justice; it may be freedom; it may be the way to build up national unity, but it does not look like that to me. I am sorry the Acting Prime Minister (Sir George Foster) is not in the House, for two reasons, one being that I wished to compliment him on the splendid speech he made the other day when he said that we should have more tolerance; that we should get closer together; that while it was very easy, sitting in private, side by side, to agree, when we got into the House, differences arose. I should like to submit to him the case of two neighbours of mine who came to this country possibly thirty years ago, farmed side by side; who paid the same taxes, who went through this period of development, suffering hardships side by side, each man doing his part to develop and make a great country of Canada. Then, when an election comes along, although they pay the same share in taxes and every thing else, one man is disfranchised while the other is permitted to exercise his franchise. Such a condition of things is unfair whatever way you view it.

Another case which I should like to mention is that of a man, honest and good enough to pay an income tax on $11,000 of his profits, paying it cheerfully. This man sent his eldest son to France and he is still overseas and will remain there, but his father is disfranchised under this measure. We know that this present Government and the Conservative Government before it have at least the reputation of dividing the Canadian people into two classes. It is charged to them, and I think everybody who knows anything about the matter will say, that they are to blame for whatever disunion there exists at the present day. If the Acting Prime Minister were in his seat, I should like to appeal to him, because judging by the speech he made the other day I do not believe that this Bill suits him very well. Although he is only Acting Prime Minister for a short period of time, let it not be said that under his regime he is creating another unnecessary division. These people of whom I speak and who are disfranchised will, as long as they live, be called alien Canadians; they cannot get away from that. We have the French Canadian and the English Canadian, but these people will be distinguished by being called alien Canadians, and there is not much chance of building up, and it is a waste of time and energy for any one to speak of unity in Canada when every session, one after another, the Government brings down legislation that divides people further and further apart. I do not expect that there will be any fairness in this Bill. I feel somewhat as the hon. member for Edmonton East (Mr. H. A. Mackie) does about the Bill. He said: We shall have another Act that will win our elections by disfranchising. He suggested to the Government that they should go further and do the thing right and disfranchise all but those who voted for Union Government last time. I will go one better than my hon. friend; I will raise the "ante" and say that there is no need at this time to go to the expense of a general election. Money is very hard to get, and this measure is framed in such a way

5 p.m.

that you can have out of it pretty nearly any result you wish. My suggestion is that there should be one man appointed by the Government to decide the political complexion of each district and that the Government should be allowed to appoint that man.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: My hon. friend agrees with me that we ought to disfranchise every one who voted against the Government?

Mr. W. H. WHITE: No, I was supporting the suggestion of my hon. friend by going him one better. The suggestion was yours and I made it better. My hon. friend thought that would be a good idea.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Even at that the Government would not be safe.

Mr. W. H. WHITE: I do not think I have anything to add, but I am sorry I cannot hope for any success, because the policy of the Government seems to be "safety first." That is the game they are playing. This Bill is, for this side of the House, a little worse than the other election law, and for hon. members opposite, a little better. They are exercising their privilege of making laws with majorities, and I suppose they will continue to do so as long as the people permit them. I wanted to do my duty, in fairness to many citizens although they will never have an opportunity to support me or, for that matter, to vote against me, in bringing this matter to the attention of the House and in endeavouring to find out what reasons the Government have for so unfairly discriminating against these people.

Mr. S. W. JACOBS (Georges Etienne Cartier): Mr. Speaker, representing one of the most cosmopolitan constituencies in the Dominion of Canada, I feel that I cannot allow this debate to conclude without offering a few observations, reserving any extended remarks which I may have to make when the Bill reaches the committee stage. I have not had the time to peruse with care the Bill as it is before the House; but I have read several sections of it, and in my remarks I wish particularly to deal with those. Perhaps, inasmuch as I have not read this measure, I may be considered to be in the same position as the famous Sydney Smith who said that he never read a book before he reviewed it, because it prejudiced him so. The origin of some of the principles embodied in this Bill will be found in the Act which was passed in the session of 1919; that is, in the By-elections Act, and the part of it to which I wish to refer particularly is that which deals with the naturalization of married women. The House will remember that when that Bill came before the House in July, 1919, I made a somewhat vigorous attack on the principle enunciated and in the clause of that Bill to which I am about to refer. Notwithstanding anything that we on this side of the House had to say, the Bill went through, and probably the Government find that it has worked so well that they want to perpetuate it in the Bill now before us.

I should like to know from the Acting Solicitor General or from the Government, why a distinction is made in the matter of naturalization and in the matter of voting, between women born on the North American continent and women born on the continent of Europe. Is it because women on this continent are more intelligent? Is it because they are more refined? Or is it because they understand the advantages of voting for Union Government? What is the reason that women born on the continent of North America are placed in a category by themselves and in a higher class than are women born in Europe? Under this law, if it passes, you will find a full-blooded negress of San Domingo; a daughter of a Mexican greaser; a Mulatto from the State of Georgia, having greater rights in this country as voters, than the most refined and cultured womanhood of France, Belguim or any other continental European country. This is not a matter which affects enemy alien countries at all; it is not a matter that appertains only to Germany and Austria. It declares in so many words that any woman who comes from the continent of Europe is obliged to obtain personal naturalization from a judge of the district in which she lives before she can exercise the right to vote, while this negress from San Domingo will have the right to vote simply upon going to the poll and declaring that she is the wife of so-and-so, who happens to be a British subject. Is not that grotesque; is it not ridiculous; is it not something that brings the laws of this country into disrepute? Why, under this law the late respected Duchess of Connaught, if she were alive, and living in this country, would have no vote whatever; but her cook or housemaid, or some person who happened to be imported from Alabama, would have the right to vote. I leave that thought with our super-patriots on the other side of the House.

I should like to say a word or two with regard to the naturalization of alien enemies and the postponing of their naturalization and concomitant right to vote until the expiry of ten years after the close of the war. There seems to be an idea among the members of this House, and even outside of this House, that we are excluding from naturalization the whole of Austria and Germany; that is to say, that every one who comes to this country from what were Austria and Germany will not be able to secure naturalization until the expiry of the ten-year period. That is not the fact. We are excluding from naturalization only those people from the portions of these countries that are still named, Austria, Germany, Bulgaria and Turkey. Austria to-day is dismembered. There is in that country a population of something like five or six milloins, in Vienna and the surrounding neighbourhood. Practically the whole of Austria, or fifty-five millions of people, now comprises Jugo-Slavia, Czecho-Slovakia, Roumania and other countries surrounding Austria. The man in Canada from Vienna will not be allowed to exercise the franchise, but the man from Prague will have that right because he comes from Bohemia. The citizen from Cracow will be given the right to vote because he comes from what is now Poland, while citizens from any of the other places I have mentioned will also be accorded the privilege by reason of the fact that they hail from countries that no longer form a part of the new Austria. I ask hon. members, is that a protection to this country? Are we protected when we give the right to vote to fifty-five millions of former alien enemies, and deprive of this right a paltry five or six millions living in what is now Austria? Take Alsace, which to-day is as much German as is Saxony. If Alsace had the right to declare by plebiscite whether it would elect to remain a part of Germany or be a part of France, it would no doubt choose to remain with Germany. But citizens of Alsace to-day will have the right to come here and in the ordinary course be naturalized after five years. Any man living in Danzig to-day—and no one can conceive of any place more German than that—has the right to come and be naturalized in the same way, as if he did not come from an enemy country. But the man from Berlin will have no right to vote. These are some of the anomalies in the Act which naturally attract the attention of even the most superficial observer, and it seems to me that the Government must give some good and valid reason why it should declare in the Act that some people of enemy alien origin have not the right to vote while others have. Let us be logical first.

I desire to say a few words regarding the Naturalization Act which was passed last year, and which is intimately associated with this Act. We have boasted in this House for the last year or two, at least since the Peace Treaty was signed,—and no one was louder in his pæans of praise of our nationhood than the President of the Privy Council (Hon. Mr. Rowell)—that Canada has achieved a national status and is now in a position which it has never occupied before. Mr. Speaker, we have not re-written one line nor changed one tittle of the British North America Act, but it seems that by some unseen force the whole position of Canada has changed, and we have now an entirely new status. That being so, do you not think that it would be only right and just that we should have our own Naturalization Act?. Why was it that, simultaneously with our achievement of this national status, we tore our Naturalization Act into a thousand pieces and threw it into the waste paper basket, and accepted the British Naturalization Law? Surely we should be able to declare who is a British subject in Canada and who is not. Yet, when I ask the Acting Solicitor General why he did not allow these two Acts, the Imperial Naturalization Act and the Dominion Act, to function side by side, so that we could take our choice either of the Act conferring the right of British citizenship in Canada after three years, or the other extending the period to five years, the hon. member informed me: "We have only the Imperial Naturalization Act; we have not the right to draw up a different Naturalization Act and place it on the statute book, we must take the Naturalization Act dictated and written by Downing street and sent to us, and if we do not take it we shall get nothing." And we took it; we swallowed the dose, nauseous though it may have been.

I do not wish at this stage of the debate to go into the question of the advisability or justice of having in this country three different classes of citizens, first, the British citizen who has the right to vote; secondly the potential British citizen who will have the right to vote ten years after the expiration of the war; and, thirdly, the citizen who does not intend to become naturalized at all. Under the ancient system in England—and in Russia it continued, I think, down to 1862,—there were three classes of

citizens, first the free man; second, the serf; and third, the slave. We are making serfs, Mr. Speaker, of these people to whom we deny the vote in the regular way. Here are people who come to Canada, having selected this country from among all the countries in the world as that in which they should like to live and bring up their families, and where they expect to die. They have left their native country because they are dissatisfied with conditions at home; they are dissatisfied with the life lived there and with the class distinctions that prevail in their society. We admit them to this country, and mark you, Mr. Speaker, before they are admitted they are examined through a microscope by the Immigration Department. The Department of Immigration have page after page of rules in regard to the admission of foreigners into this country. One who reads that list of rules would imagine that people thus selected are too good for this world, that they are as white as the driven snow and that they have to be 100 per cent perfect before they come into this country and are received by the immigration officers. They must be mentally perfect, they must be perfect physically, and they must never have declared any views in regard to constituted government—they must never have said that they wished to forcibly remove the autocrat of Russia or the Kaiser at Berlin. When it is found that they have complied with all these requirements we permit them in the goodness of our hearts, to come into Canada. They are perfect, in so far as respectability is concerned when they enter. But they do not know about our naturalization law and they find that they have to wait ten years before they can be permitted to make the declaration: Civis Britannicus sum.

Why should they want to come to this country? They can go to the United States, reside there for five years and have conferred upon them the rights of American citizenship, and those rights they hold against the world. If a man is a respectable citizen and if he is qualified in regard to the immigration rules, he is permitted to enter the United States and the test is one of character and not geography. But for some reason known only to the Government, hon. gentlemen fear that people who come from these countries may vote against the Unionist Government. Judging from the lurid picture painted last night by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) who said that they are the worst people in the world and that the door should be closed to them for all time, that they are traitors, and so on, one would imagine that these were a very bad lot, but all I have to say is that if they are only half as Prussian as the member for Frontenac they would qualify as voters on the Unionist side.

When these people can go to the United States and be received as citizens after five years' residence, why should they want to come to Canada; why should a German want to come to Canada? We are not offering any advantages to him; we are declaring in our laws that he is to be put in a class by himself, that he is to be a pariah among our people, that he must breathe the free atmosphere of Canada for ten years before he is entitled to the rights of citizenship and that at the expiration of that time we, in the goodness of our hearts, may take him in. The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) yesterday said something that I consider a truism. He said that people may chew together, or they may smoke together or perchance they may drink together, but when they go to the polls they cannot vote together. Do you think that makes for harmony in this country;—does it not rather make for intolerance? The rank and file of our own people are the proper judges of these things, and it is the rank and file of our own people that the alien comes in contact with. What will be the impression of the Canadian citizen born in humble circumstances who happens to fraternize with an alien in the village or on the farm, whom he finds to be quite a respectable person and fit to associate with his wife and family when he discovers that that alien is denied the privileges which he himself possesses and for a reason which he cannot understand? The fact is that when this Bill becomes law it is going to prove a boomerang to those who are its authors. The Government will find that every man who is now denied the right to vote, when he does get that right after a period of ten years, will have his reckoning with the party and the Government.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman is discussing the Naturalization Act. His remarks have no connection with the Bill which is before the House. There is nobody denied the right under this Act. Does he suggest that persons not naturalized should vote?

Mr. JACOBS: No, I do not suggest that persons not naturalized should vote but I do suggest that it was an outrage on the part of the Government to permit to pass into legislation the Naturalization Act of

1917, which declares that these people shall not have a right to naturalization until they have been in the country for ten years.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend himself had a part in that; he did not even challenge a division of the House upon the Act.

Mr. JACOBS: Did he not?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, and the Act passed without division. What is the use of discussing the Naturalization Act on the second reading of this Bill? The Naturalization Act is passed. The hon. member had better bring in a Bill to amend it.

Mr. JACOBS: That is in keeping with the peculiar mentality of my hon. friend.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is true.

Mr. JACOBS: Because I did not call for a division of the House on that Act I am deemed to have acquiesced in everything the Government did in that respect. The hon. gentleman must remember that on two or three occasions when the Bill was in committee we did everything we could to point out what would result from the policy of allowing the British Government to come into our country and dictate to us what we should do.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why does not the hon. gentleman bring in an amendment?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Because the Prime Minister promised that he would see to it that it should be amended after a conference with the Imperial authorities.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We can only amend it in this House. Bring in a Bill.

Mr. JACOBS: It will be remembered that Lincoln said before the Civil War that no nation could exist half slave and half free. That is the condition that exists in this country. We have half our people free and the other half are deprived of the rights of citizens. That is what this Act proposes to do.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not this Act.

Mr. JACOBS: I am referring to the Naturalization Act, this Act and the Women Voters Act of 1918 all in conjunction.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This Act does not disfranchise anybody.

Mr. JACOBS: Will the hon. gentleman tell me in what respect it affects the Naturalization Act which we passed last year?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It does not affect it at all. I am saying to the hon gentleman that if he complains of the Naturalization Act he should bring in an amendment embodying his views, and submit that to the sense of Parliament instead of criticising the Naturalization Act.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order; we had better proceed according to the rules of the House.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The resaon I say "hear, hear" is that the hon. gentleman should be held to the discussion of this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: With reference to the point of order I may say that it is somewhat difficult to disassociate the Naturalization Act from the consideration of this Bill. It is no doubt true that the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) has gone very far afield but there is a remote connection between the two measures. I hope that the hon. member will not proceed too far along this line.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is what the minister himself did this afternoon.

Mr. JACOBS: I would like to say a word or two in regard to the manner in which passports are affected by this Naturalization Act and by this Bill when it refuses to give aliens the right to British citizenship. No person but a British subject has the right to take out a passport in Canada to travel abroad. For example, a German who has been in this country for ten years and has not been naturalized has no rights whatever as a citizen of Canada.

An hon. MEMBER: Order.

Mr. JACOBS: If he requires a passport in order to travel, and if he is not naturalized, where is he going to get that passport? Mr. Speaker, a man in that position who has lived in Canada for nine and a half years can only get a passport to travel by applying to Berlin. Actually a man who has been a citizen of Canada for that period of time can only obtain the right to travel abroad when the Berlin Government wishes to give it to him; the Canadian Government has no right whatever to do anything for him.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would ask the hon. member how he applies this argument to the Bill under discussion?

Mr. JACOBS: Mr. Speaker, I want to point out the anomalies, the absurdities, the grotesqueness of this Bill. It is practically impossible to discuss this Bill, in its ref-

erences to naturalization, without referring to the Naturalization Act. I am attacking the Government not only because of the terms of the Bill now before the House, but the provisions in that measure with respect to naturalization. They deprive us of the Naturalization Act under which we worked successfully for so many years. I charge that upon the Government and I say it is because of the fact that these people who are affected not only suffer the loss of their vote, but will be unable to obtain the most elementary rights of citizenship.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have concluded what I desired to say on that phase of the subject but I shall have something further to say when the Bill goes into committee. I was not in the House yesterday when the Acting Solicitor General stated that he understood some one had made the remark that there was a joker in the Bill but that for himself he wished to say that he knew of no such joker. There may be no joker in the Bill but there are in it a few jokes which I have endeavoured to point out to the House. I trust that before the Bill emerges from committee we will have full opportunity of dealing further with it, and that after the anvil pounding which we may have to bring to bear upon the measure it will be something less objectionable than it is in its present shape.

Mr. E. B. DEVLIN (Wright): I do not intend to occupy the time of the House at any length upon the present occasion. I purpose making such remarks as I deem to be necessary, when the House is in committee and we can review the respective clauses. However the Acting Solicitor General was kind enough when he presented the Bill to say that if anybody could discover grave difficulties in its application he would be prepared to accept amendments and remedy the defects so discovered. Well, Sir, taking that statement in conjunction with the one just made by the hon. gentleman who preceded me as to there being a joker in the Bill, I would like to call the minister's attention to what might possibly be the joker in question. To-day we have heard a number of hon. gentlemen speak about the rights of different nationalities in connection with this Bill and the Naturalization Act. I had hoped that I would see some hon. gentleman opposite rise and speak in the name of the Democracy of England, and show how the poor Englishman is being treated under this Bill. So far, however, no one has taken that point, and therefore it falls to my lot to draw the minister's attention to the fact that under this Bill harsh treatment is meted out to residents in Englond. If the minister will kindly read section 38 of the Bill he will find the following clause:

> Except as in this Act otherwise provided any British subject, male or female, who is of the full age of twenty-one years, may be a candidate at a Dominion election.

That means that any gentleman living, say, in England, may be a candidate in our Federal elections—there is absolutely nothing to prevent him. But if that gentleman living in England should take it into his head to come over to this country and offer himself for election and ask the electors to refrain from voting for him or to vote for him, or should he have the hardihood to advance reasons why the electors should vote for him, then he falls immediately under the provisions of section 11 which the Government apparently overlooked when they drafted the Bill and commits an indictable offence, which seems hardly fair. Let us read section 11:

> Any person, not being an elector, who resides without Canada and who, to secure the election of any candidate, canvasses for votes or in any way endeavours to induce voters to vote for any candidate at an election, or to refrain from voting, is guilty of an indictable offence against this Act punishable as in this Act provided.

The Minister of the Interior being a shrewd and very capable lawyer, will see right away, or I am a very dull lawyer, that any gentleman residing, say in the city of London or in any part of England, may under section 38 become a candidate for this House, but if he attempts to say a word as to why he should be elected, then anybody in the country who wishes to bring a charge against him for so doing, can land him in jail. Now, hon. gentlemen have spoken about the Austrians, about the Germans, and about men of different nationalities. I do not claim any great intimacy with the Germans or with the Austrians, which may be my great misfortune, but I do know something about England and about Englishmen, and I am a great admirer of the democracy of England. I am a greater admirer of the democracy of England than I am of the laws of England, and I believe this to be a case in which the Englishman should get fair play. I bring this point to the attention of the Government and I say further that whereas I have found in the perusal of this Bill innumerable clauses that are jokes, and mean when the House resolves itself into Committee to move to amend some of them; in the meantime the Acting Solicitor General

should see to it that the Englishman is properly treated by this Bill.

Mr. LAPOINTE: And that he gets justice.

Mr. DEVLIN: And that he gets justice.

Mr. LUCIEN CANNON (Dorchester): When the Acting Solicitor General introduced this Bill yesterday afternoon I followed his speech with great attention and drew certain conclusions that I wish to communicate to the House before the motion for second reading passes. The first conclusion that I drew was that the electoral law of Canada would certainly be improved by the fact that the Franchise Bill of 1920 was fathered by the Acting Solicitor General and not by the Minister of the Interior. I did not have the honour of a seat in this House when the famous debate over the War-time Elections Act took place, but I was a very inquisitive reader of newspaper reports and also a very anxious student of the Hansard reports, and I might say that if I had admired the astuteness of the Minister of the Interior I could not give as great a measure of admiration to his sense of fairness in the debate of 1918 as far as the breadth of the electoral franchise in a free country like Canada was concerned.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon up to five o'clock Canada apparently was to be given a fair, a liberal and a broad franchise. In the evening as the shadow of night fell I saw the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) enter the House, sit next to his colleague, the Acting Solicitor General (Mr. Guthrie) and have a few words of private conversation. As to the outcome of this private conversation we have had this afternoon an explanation by the hon. Minister of the Interior himself—an explanation which may be very clever, but I must say that it has not removed from my mind all the doubts and suspicions that I entertain with regard to clause 29.

Coming back to the Acting Solicitor General, Mr. Speaker, he has been given highly flattering eulogies by the speakers on our side. I know that he is quite satisfied with them and anything in the way of compliment that I might give him would not add in any way to the very high appreciation we entertain of his speech of yesterday. But I notice, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Acting Solicitor General made two omissions. They may have been voluntary; I hope they were not.

The first omission was in connection with the very learned debate which took place in the House of Commons during the session of 1885 when the giants of Canadian politics of those days—Edward Blake, John A. Macdonald, Sir Wilfrid Laurier and others, were fighting over the Franchise Bill and were debating whether provincial rights should prevail over federal privileges. It is not my intention, Mr. Speaker, to go into that discussion. I do not wish this afternoon to argue with the learned Acting Solicitor General whether the provincial franchise should be maintained as regards federal elections, but I simply wish to say to him that we on this side of the House—we who belong to the Liberal party, who have belonged to that Liberal party for many years—would have been more pleased when he mentioned the debate of 1885 if he had not omitted the name of the greatest statesman that Canada has produced—our late lamented leader, the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier. More so, Mr. Speaker, because in that memorable debate—

Mr. GUTHRIE: If my hon. friend will permit me, Mr. Speaker? I had a list of those names before me as I spoke yesterday and the name of Sir Wilfrid Laurier was certainly on my list after that of Sir John Macdonald. I thought I mentioned it, and I note it in Hansard to-day.

Mr. CANNON: I accept with great pleasure the explanation given by the Acting Solicitor General. I knew that it would be sufficient for me to draw his attention to that omission for him to repair it.

The second omission, Mr. Speaker, which I noticed in the remarks of the hon. Acting Solicitor General was that of a spirit of high statesmanship when he came to discuss the amendments to the electoral law of Canada introduced by the Laurier Government in 1908. The hon. gentleman told us that in 1908 he had supported amendments to the then Franchise Bill, and he gave us the reason why those amendments had been brought in. The way I wish to answer that part of my hon. friend's remarks is as follows: Either the vote given by the Acting Solicitor General in 1908 was a thoroughly honest vote—and I have no doubt that it was—and if such was the case I do not think that the Acting Solicitor General of Canada, speaking as such in the House of Commons, when introducing a Bill of such great moment as the Bill he introduced yesterday, should try to ridicule the Government of 1908 and their motives for

having afforded him the opportunity of giving a good vote. Or, Mr. Speaker, the case may be the opposite, and the vote given by the hon. Acting Solicitor General in 1908 might not have been as good as I think it was. In such a case I think my hon. friend should not boast about it, because if he does we might have our doubts as to whether he is sincere—he must be—but we might have our doubts as to his sincerity on the present occasion.

The hon. Acting Solicitor General told us yesterday: "If there are any vices that can be remedied, if there is any flaw that can be removed, just point them out and I will be pleased to consider your suggestions." It is my intention to study most carefully and seriously the Bill when it comes in Committee of this House. And why so? Because the idea that the Acting Solicitor General may have of a vice or of a flaw may not be exactly the idea that I myself hold. When I consider the Votes and Proceedings of the Seventh Session of the Twelfth Parliament, that is, the session of 1917, I notice to my great surprise, although the hon. Acting Solicitor General yesterday afternoon told us that he had always fought in the fore ranks of the Liberal party, that during that session he left his party and voted in favour of the War-times Election Act. Therefore I conclude that although the Acting Solicitor General yesterday was very generous in his remarks, words in his mouth might not have the same meaning that they would have in the mouth of a leader of the Liberal party who always had remained faithful to the principles of the Liberal party.

Mr. Speaker, a gentleman made a speech yesterday—he represents the county of Frontenac. I do not wish to take the time of the House in commenting on the speech made by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), but I may tell him once and for all that whenever he attacks the province of Quebec, whenever he attacks our traditions, our aspirations and our ideals, whenever also he attacks our intellectual standing in the House of Commons or in the country, he reminds me very strongly, Mr. Speaker, of those niggers in Africa who complain that the sun shines too brightly in their eyes.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member will recall that on the occasion in question the member for Frontenac was asked to withdraw that remark, and he did so. I do not know that any useful purpose can be served by reviving the incident.

[Mr. Cannon.]

Mr. CANNON: Your remark, Mr. Speaker, is perfectly just. As I have said, I do not wish to take up the time of the House in this connection. I simply want to quote in reply to the member for Frontenac the words of a French poet. The hon. gentleman, will, I am sure, appreciate this reference. The poet, referring to those natives of Africa who complain that the sun shines too brightly in their eyes, goes on to say:

> Et le dieu poursuivant sa carrière.
> Versait des torrents de lumière
> Sur ses obscurs blasphémateurs.

No matter what the hon. member may say, the province of Quebec will continue to be, as she has been in the past and will be in the future, a model to the other provinces of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, the Franchise Bill is introduced during the reconstruction period. The Government should be guided, so far as this legislation is concerned, by what happened in the country to the south of us during the reconstruction period which followed the Civil War. In those days there was a class of politicians in the United States who did not desire to forget what had happened during the Civil War and who, after General Lee had surrendered, peace had been signed and the southern armies had been demobilized, wanted to continue some of the conditions of war. These people, Mr. Speaker, were called "carpet baggers." I hope that we shall have none of that kind of politicians in Canada. I hope that on both sides of the House this question will be considered as it should be considered—as one of national importance, not one of political expediency.

The Acting Solicitor General talked of the Liberal party in a very light mood. But we on this side are not ashamed of the past record of our party—the party which framed the first franchise law in 1874; which gave the secret ballot; which in the different provinces has given a fair franchise; which in the province of Quebec has introduced the one man one vote system. Our party stands on this question with a record which should call forth the praise of every honest-minded citizen of Canada.

We wish to have a fair franchise. The question of disfranchisement has been discussed at length and been discussed by people who have more experience and knowledge than I have. I heard with great pleasure the Acting Prime Minister (Sir George Foster) say at the opening of the House that, the period of war being over, we wanted peace, and express the hope that his last days in politics would see a closer

union of the different races of this country. If we wish to have harmony in Canada; if we wish to have union; if we wish to have good understanding, the sooner we remove from our statute books any law which is in the nature of class legislation; any law which discriminates against a certain section of our population, the sooner shall we attain the object hoped for by the Acting Prime Minister.

The time for a narrow franchise has gone. There may be some old-time Tories in this House, but they must know the history of England; they must know the history of politics in Canada. The Tory theory of granting the franchise to a class as opposed to the masses is dead and will never revive. In 1829 creed exclusions were done away with in England; in 1832 property exclusions were to a certain extent done away with. Since then other reform bills have been introduced and adopted in England, until to-day England has a franchise under which nearly every British citizen has the right to vote. In Canada we have had the same path to follow. We had a very narrow franchise act in Upper Canada; the same was true of Lower Canada. But since Confederation the basis of the franchise has been broadened every year, and now, when the Government introduces new legislation in this regard, the franchise ought to be given to every honest, law-abiding citizen of Canada, no matter what his origin may have been.

When the Franchise Act, having been amended to meet the desires of the Opposition and of the liberal-minded members on the Government side, has become law, let the Government show their good faith by immediately appealing to the country in order that the electors may choose a Government that will be representative of the wishes of the Canadian people, a Government that will have a programme and a policy designed to meet the needs of the moment. This Parliament is not representative of the people. Members sitting on the other side, members sitting on this side, do not represent the majority of the people in their respective constituencies, and the time has come for the election of a new Parliament. When this Franchise Bill becomes law and when an election is decided upon, I hope that the election will be conducted in such a way as to cause the Canadian people to forget all the horrors, all the irregularities and all the illegalities of the last election.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

The House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—short title.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Is it the intention to take up any of the contentious clauses of the Bill this evening?

Mr. GUTHRIE: No, we can run over a few of the purely formal and non-contentious clauses. If there is any objection to a clause, it can stand.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I suggest that this first clause pass now, but in view of the fact that many members will not be present this evening I believe it will be more satisfactory to the House generally if we proceed in committee at a subsequent meeting. This evening we could take up some of the other Government measures, as suggested by my hon. friend (Sir George Foster) last evening.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We shall pass this one section. We shall come back after six o'clock in committee, but we shall not continue very long in committee on this Bill, and then we shall take up some other Government Bills.

Section agreed to.

At six o'clock the House resumed, and then took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 23, to incorporate Canadian American Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Griesbach.

Bill No. 33, to incorporate International Loan Company.—Mr. Blake.

Bill No. 34, respecting the Montreal and Southern Counties Railway Company.—Mr. Archambault.

DOMINION FRANCHISE ACT.

House again in committee on Bill No. 12, respecting the election of members of the House of Commons and the electoral franchise, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: When the committee rose at six o'clock, section one had been adopted.

On section two—Definitions.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The majority of the definitions that are to be found in section

2 are the same definitions, practically though not identically, as are to be found in our former election law. Some new phrases are introduced in this section. I think perhaps it might be well for us to consider the section subsection by subsection. In subsection (a) there is a mistake. The clause "advance poll" as meaning a poll held "as by section ninety-nine of this Act provided." I move that subsection (a) be amended by striking out the word ninety-nine" and inserting the words "one hundred" in lieu thereof.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. TRAHAN: I think it was understood this afternoon that consideration of contentious clauses would be deferred for the time being, and any definitions that have a bearing on such clauses should, I think, be also postponed. I have read section 100, to which I take exception on many grounds, and inasmuch as subsection (a) of section 2 has reference to that section I would suggest that we let it stand for the moment.

Mr. GUTHRIE: It is merely a change from the word "ninety-nine" to the words "one hundred." This is only a matter of referring to the clause by its proper number.

Mr. TRAHAN: If later on section 100 were not adopted, then subclause (a) of section 2 would serve no purpose. It would be useless. I suggest therefore that as it has a bearing on section 100 we suspend its consideration.

Mr. GUTHRIE: If there is any objection to the adoption of this subsection I have no desire to press it.

Mr. GAUVREAU: There is a confusion between the French and the English versions of the Bill. Subsection (a) in the French version speaks of "agent officiel," and in the English version we are discussing "advance poll."

Mr. GUTHRIE: Under the circumstances, Mr. Chairman, I move that the whole of section 2 stand.

Motion agreed to. Section stands.

On section 3—repeal:

Mr. GUTHRIE: This is a pretty general clause and on referring to schedule 4 on the last page of the printed Bill I think it will be seen that we have included there every Act of this Parliament which affects Dominion elections or anything in relation to them. The intention is to repeal everything.

[Mr. Guthrie.]

Mr. TRAHAN: In section 3 reference is made to a certain number of Orders in Council; they are all repealed. But the schedule refers only to the statutes. I would suggest that a list of the Orders in Council repealed should be put in the schedule.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That would be at variance with the practice of this or any other House. The statute does not recognize the repeal of the Orders in Council because they in general terms are referred to in section 3. The repeal of all statutes would necessarily include all Orders in Council whether that section so stated it or not. It is under the authority of a statute that the Orders in Council are passed. When we put a schedule of the statutes in the Bill I think that includes everything else.

Mr. BURNHAM: I would like to ask the minister if there is anything in the Act which does away with the provision which we had incorporated in the law after considerable trouble by which offences set out in this Act, instead of being the subject of indictment only, can be proceeded with by information before an ordinary magistrate and tried in the ordinary way. This is simply designed to have the law in general vindicated without any special or direct reference to the election, but it will be plain to anybody that it has a distinct bearing on an election case. If I lay an information against some person for the infraction of the Election Act, and have that dealt with by a magistrate and have the man fined, it is quite plain that there is something that has transpired under oath which would enable anybody to upset the election.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think we will have to wait till we come to these clauses. We are now dealing with the general repeal clause. I may say, however, for the information of the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) that this Bill does recognize both kinds of prosecutions. The more serious offences are dealt with by way of indictment and the less serious by summary conviction. I thas been suggested that perhaps it would be better to deal with all prosecutions under this Act by summary conviction. That is a matter that can be determined when we get to those clauses, which are about the middle of the Bill.

Mr. McKENZIE: I was not here when the explanation was given by the minister, but I understand that his position is that repealing the statutes repeals all Orders in Council. I do not go that far. I think rather the idea is that the Order in Council is made

under the statute, that certain rights are extended under that Order in Council, and that although the statute itself may be repealed the Orders in Council stand. I do not think it falls to the ground merely because the statute does.

Mr. GUTHRIE: For anything heretofore done under the Order in Council, it stands just as the statute stands for any Act heretofore done under the authority of the statute, but for all future purposes both statute and Order in Council go.

Mr. McKENZIE: The minister says so.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is the best I can do.

Mr. McKENZIE: If he will take the general interpretation Act in the revised statutes he will find that the force of Orders in Council is more extended.

Mr. GUTHRIE: As I understand, without referring to the Interpretation Act, the effect of an Order in Council is precisely the same as the effect of a statute. It has the same force and effect as a statute—no more and no less. It has to be passed under the authority of some statute. Until the repeal of the Act anything done under the provisions of the Order in Council is perfectly valid, and continue to be valid, but on the repeal of the statute everything goes and no further Order in Council could be passed.

Mr. McKENZIE: I quite understand that no further order could be passed by virtue of the statute, but there is vitality, effect and force in the order already carried out under the statute.

Mr. GUTHRIE: To make the matter clear we have included in section 3 an express repeal of all Orders in Council. It cannot be doubtful under section 3.

On section 4—notices, how given:

Mr. BUREAU: It is rather a wide discretion to give an election officer when you say that he may advertise or give a notice in such a manner as he may see fit? All notices ought to be given for a purpose but this might mean giving no notice at all. In every other case where a notice is required. the mode by which the notice shall be given is provided for, whether it be by a poster in a public place or otherwise.

Mr. GUTHRIE: My hon. friend should read line 3 of the section.

Mr. BUREAU: (reading):

When any election officer is by this Act authorized or required to give a public notice and no special mode of notification is indicated——

Mr. GUTHRIE: In every case the Act says what the notice shall be.

Mr. TRAHAN: The clause is useless, then.

Mr. GUTHRIE: This is the clause from the old Act to cover any unforeseen case. It has been in the old law for many years although we have changed the language to a very slight extent. The old Act had the words "as he thinks best calculated"—not very elegant language in the first place. We have made an improvement in the language as it appears in section 4. It may be that some case requiring notice has not been provided for. I think, speaking from memory, every case is substantially provided for.

Mr. BUREAU: Strike out the section, then.

Mr. GUTHRIE: No, because there may be cases unprovided for.

Mr. BUREAU: There ought not to be.

Mr. GUTHRIE: As we go on with the Bill I think we will make every point clear. In the meantime, I do not think the clause should be struck out.

Mr. POWER: In the course of the last election a case occurred where this clause might have been enforced. The returning officer in my riding refused to give me a list of the enumerators. I telegraphed to Mr. O'Connor at the time, and he stated that although there was no law on the subject I should be given the list. In spite of that, the returning officer refused to give me the list. I had to employ people to find out who the enumerators were. I imagine that would be a case where this section would apply.

Mr. GUTHRIE: No, this has reference to public notice. However, if there is any contention I will let it stand.

Mr. BUREAU: We will go through the Bill and when we come to another clause where notice is to be given, we can provide the mode by which notice shall be given.

Mr. GUTHRIE: In all involved acts there is usually inserted a general clause to cover anything that might be unforeseen.

Mr. TRAHAN: These general clauses are always dangerous.

Mr. GUTHRIE: It is more dangerous to have no general clause.

Mr. BURNHAM: I would like to impress upon the minister the fact that for any public notice, especially if it is a general one, a handbill is a very dangerous proceeding. The whole principle of giving notice in important affairs of a public character unquestionably is to post something in the public office of the municipality wherever that may be. Every city, every township, has a place where certain notices for the public benefit must be posted, and really I think the least the returning officer, or any other election officer, can do, is to post up there within a certain specified time the notice which he desires the public to take cognizance of. Because, to leave it to a handbill simply means that the handbill may be thrown away, and that be the end of it.

Mr. GUTHRIE: If my hon. friend (Mr. Burnham) would examine the Act he would not make suggestions of that kind. As I say, so far as I know, and I think I know the Bill pretty well, every case where notice is necessary is specially provided for. With respect to anything the returning officer, the deputy returning officer, the registrar, or the judge has to do there is an express way of giving notice by posting, by registration, by publication in the newspapers. For every single case there is a specific provision. But it may be that same notice will be required that has not been provided for, and if so, rather than have no provision, we have a general clause. Take any important Act in the country, take the Municipal Act, and it is declared that in all other cases not otherwise provided for the advertisement shall be so-and-so. Under any general legislation occasion may arise when notice has to be given and there is nothing in the law which provides for it. This is intended only for cases not otherwise provided for.

Mr. BURNHAM: With all due deference to the minister and his reasoning I do not see why the analogy in the Bill itself should not be followed in a case not provided for. It is quite possible that something or other of an important nature may arise, not provided for by Parliament, which the election officer would treat as if it were of no importance whatever. He could give notice where it suited him, by handbill or otherwise. It might be extremely bad whether and nobody would know where to go to find out about these things. Above everything else in the world in the matter of an election it is most important that a candidate or his agent should know what is going on by simply visiting a certain office—going to a certain place and looking at the notice board to see if any new notice has been posted up. That is a precaution it is very easy to take. I am not at all convinced by the minister that because there may be some things unprovided, therefore the analogy in the very Bill itself should not be followed.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: I agree with the clause and will give the committee an example of where it will be useful. Supposing you wanted to get a notice from Edmonton to Fort McMurray. There is no way in which notice can be given to a place three hundred miles away except by wire. Now supposing you wanted to give a notice to say to Fort Vermilion. There is no way in which you can cover the distance of three hundred miles except by sending a telegram to Peace River, and from there you will have to go in three hundred miles on horseback. If there is not a general clause by which you may use some discretion to get over those distances in our country publication will be of no use. This clause provides for a method and gives the returning officer discretion to do what he thinks best under all these circumstances. The clause is quite an important one and should stand as it is because of the great distances we have to contend with in the western country.

Mr. BURNHAM: I would say in reply to that, it is very easy for the man who has authority to send the telegram to say "Please post this telegram in the usual place for the municipality."

Mr. MACKIE: There is no such place.

Mr. BURNHAM: If there is no such place then all I have to say is that whilst the principle would be violated there is no question it is not of much importance. I can assure the hon. gentleman however that in more thickly settled places, in cases that are not so extreme as the hon. member has just spoken of, it would be an exceedingly dangerous thing, if a candidate had a hostile returning officer or election agents who were unfavourably disposed to him or were themselves unscrupulous.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: In the case of Fort McMurray the only places we have for posting of notices are the Hudson Bay Company's store and the office of the North Bay Transportation Company. The same at Fort Vermilion and also at Wabasca. The only places there are the Hudson Bay Agency and the Roman Catholic church. There is no use in talking about sending

out notices in the western country, we have not got the facilities for it.

Mr. BURNHAM: I am talking about municipalities.

Section stands.

On section 5—printed documents to bear name, etc., of printer:

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: This clause is the same as the one in the old Act, is it not?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Under the old Act the penalty for non-compliance with the provision was $200 and costs or six months.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What is the penalty for violation of the provision in this case?

Mr. GUTHRIE: It is much more serious.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Would printing cover typewriting?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not know. It has been held in the province of Ontario that typewriting is printing. The clauses in regard to penalty will be found on page 67 commencing at section 84:

> Any person who is guilty of any indictable offence against this Act is liable on indictment or on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding two thousand dollars and costs of prosecution or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years, with or without hard labour, or to both such fine and costs and such imprisonment, and if the fine and costs imposed are not paid forthwith (in case only a fine and costs are imposed) or are not paid before the expiration of the term of imprisonment imposed (in case imprisonment as well as fine and costs is imposed) to imprisonment with or without hard labour for such term (or such further term) as such fine and costs or either of them remain unpaid, not exceeding three months.

With respect to non-indictable offences the fines are less. They are dealt with by section 85.

On section 6—Removing notices forbidden.—Copy of subsection 1 to be printed on documents posted up.

Mr. GUTHRIE: If memory serves me right that is the old clause unchanged.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Is there any reason for repeating the penalty of this section? It is all set out in section 84.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I would think that the provisions of section 84 applied to any offence under section 6. The latter section was taken bodily from the former election law, section 250A.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It seems to be needlessly encumbering the Statute.

Mr. TRAHAN: But this section must be published.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes, there is some necessity for it. It has to be printed as a notice, and the notice would have to include the penalty. That is the object in view, I suppose.

Mr. BUREAU: Otherwise there would be no offence.

Section agreed to.

On section 7—Oaths, how administered.—Gratuitous Administration.

Mr. DAVIS: I suggest that "police magistrate" be added there. I have an unpleasant recollection of an election that I lost in Manitoba because those words were not in the Act.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The section now includes "a judge of any court, a notary public, a justice of the peace or a commissioner for taking affidavits having authority or jurisdiction within the place where the oath or affirmation is administered." Personally, I see no objection to including "police magistrate." If the words are to be included I would insert them after "justice of the peace" in line 33.

Mr. MICHAUD: While we are adding a few words to this section I would suggest that we also add "stipendiary magistrate." He is not a justice of the peace.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think a stipendiary magistrate is a judge, but I see no objection to adding the words, "stipendiary magistrate, police magistrate," after the word "peace" in the thirty-third line.

Mr. GAUVREAU: I think it is worth while to have the French version before us while we are reading that section. The English version reads, "having authority or jurisdiction." Why is it that in the French version it is, "ayant autorité et jurisdiction." That is not a correct translation.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I can hardly be held responsible for the translation into French —I wish I could be. I am glad my hon. friend has mentioned that point. I think both versions should be the same.

Mr. BUREAU: In the interpretation clause, Mr. Chairman, the word "judge" is defined. The definition is, "'judge' includes chief justice." I would have less doubt about a chief justice being a judge

than I would about a stipendiary magistrate being one. If a chief justice is a judge, the puisne judges have not got much judgeship about them.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: It is sometimes difficult to get a justice of the peace in a polling booth when a deputy returning officer requires to be sworn in. Can the oath be administered by the poll clerk?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I am not sure on that point, Mr. Chairman. I will look it up.

Mr. J. H SINCLAIR: I see no reason why it should not be done It would be a great convenience if the statute provided for it.

Mr. GUTHRIE: It is only for the swearing in of officers that you want power given to the poll clerk to administer oaths?

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Yes.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The deputy returning officer is sworn in by the returning officer.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: The returning officer, we will say, is the sheriff of the county and resides in the county town. The county may be a hundred miles long. My hon. friend surely does not mean that all the deputy returning officers must come before the returning officer to be sworn in? At any rate, it has not been the practice in the past.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not think that the Act as drawn states before whom the deputy shall be sworn. Section 25 provides:

> Every deputy returning officer shall before acting as such take the oath in form H.

I assume that would be an oath taken before any person authorized by this Act to administer oath.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: Suppose a returning officer residing in Edmonton appoints deputies at Peace River, Colling River, McMurray, Mackay, Fort Chipewyan and Fort Smith. These points cover a distance of several hundred miles, and at none of these places is there a notary public or justice of the peace. If you happen to find a member of the Mounted Police at his post you may get him to swear somebody as commissioner. But at the last election I endeavoured to get the Provincial Government to appoint a man a commissioner and send him along with the ballot boxes to swear the deputies as he went along the route. The Provincial Government was not favourable or kind to me and at first I was not able to succeed. However I took the matter up with Mr. O'Connor by wire and he got in touch with the provincial authorities and they finally yielded and had a man appointed who could go about and do this. It would be impossible for the returning officer to do the work himself. I would like to see some provision in the Act under which it would be possible for the authorities at Ottawa to appoint someone a commissioner to swear in deputies or other officers in these far away places.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Section 25 does not provide that the deputy returning officer shall be sworn in before any particular person; consequently he can be sworn in under the provisions of section 7. The returning officer can swear in the poll clerk, and the poll clerk, when sworn in, can swear in the deputy returning officer. Would that remove the difficulty?

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: No. In this stretch of country five hundred miles long there is no person to administer an oath, although there are six or eight ballot boxes and, consequently, six polls. The returning officer cannot accompany the men with the boxes and swear the deputies, so we have to get a commissioner, and that commissioner must be appointed by the local authorities. If the local authorities are not well disposed toward you, you may not get one at all, and the returning officer will be forced to take a trip of perhaps three hundred miles in order to administer this oath.

Mr. GUTHRIE: As the Bill is drawn, every deputy returning officer before acting as such must take the oath. The question raised by my hon. friend is: How is the deputy returning officer himself to be sworn? He cannot act until he is sworn; I see the difficulty where very great distances have to be covered and there are very few commissioners. When we come to section 25 I shall be glad if my hon. friend will remind me of that point.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: What does the Acting Solicitor General say to my suggestion that the poll clerk be authorized to administer the oath to the deputy returning officer?

Mr. GUTHRIE: The poll clerk is appointed under section 26, but before he can act he must be sworn. We all assume that the first man sworn is the deputy returning officer; the deputy himself cannot appoint a poll clerk until he is sworn.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Then the deputy must go before a justice of the peace to be sworn.

Mr. GUTHRIE: He must go before someone authorized by this Act to administer an oath; then he can swear his poll clerk.

Mr. BUTTS: Is there any provision in the Act imposing a penalty upon any person with jurisdiction who refuses to administer an oath? We have had numerous cases in Nova Scotia where magistrates have refused to swear in a man, even for the voters' list.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes, there is a provision in that regard somewhere between sections 80 and 90.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 8—penalty for inducing persons to make false oath:

Mr. GUTHRIE: The former sections covering this subject were 273 and 274; they have been combined in one. The former section read, "Every candidate who," and so on; this section says, "Every person who" does so-and-so.

Section agreed to.

On section 9—executory contracts void:

Mr. POWER: Would this clause cover, for instance, a contract made by a candidate with a newspaper or an advertising concern for advertising?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think it would. An executory contract is a future contract uncompleted by payment, delivery or execution. The purpose of the section is to void promises made before an election to be implemented after. It has been the law of the land for many years.

Mr. POWER: There have been things in the law of the land for many years that I think are wrong. We have laid down as crimes things which are not crimes. Why force a man to commit a crime? I suppose every member of the House has at one time or another made a contract with a newspaper or an advertising agency for advertising—

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is not an executory contract. An executory contract is for something to be performed and paid for in the future.

Mr. POWER: What about the terms of the undertaking?

Mr. GUTHRIE: If it be an executory contract, the amount cannot be recovered. There are in this law provisions for the recovery of debts incurred during an election; there is a time within which an account must be rendered, and the like Those provisions will be found towards the end of the Bill. There is a general provision to make void every promise of an executory nature which is not to be performed before the election, promises which used to be made for the purpose of securing political influence here, there and the other place. I think there is a strong moral ground for retaining this section.

Mr. POWER: It is a promise or undertaking to pay, after the election, if one be elected. I maintain that we should not void it; there is nothing wrong in promising that you will pay a newspaper only if you be elected.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The case of a newspaper is an executory contract, so that it is a contract completed by execution. It may be postponed.

Section agreed to.

On section 10—contributions for political purposes:

Mr. PROULX: Is not subsection 2 going too far? It reads:

> Any company or association violating the provisions of this section.

Some shareholders might not know that the directors were making contributions. The word "wilfully" or the word "knowingly" should be inserted.

Mr. GUTHRIE: This is a good old section passed after careful consideration. I think, in the year 1908, and possibly it was in the old Act of 1898. It is considered a very salutary proviso in our law. I would not open the door in this respect if I could avoid doing so.

Mr. DEVLIN: But do companies contribute towards election expenses?

Mr. GUTHRIE: They cannot under this clause.

Mr. CANNON: Why limit the clause to companies? Why not extend it to persons? It might be easy for a man connected with a big company to make a large contribution, and that would be just as wrong as if the contribution were made by the company.

Mr. GUTHRIE: No.

Mr. CANNON: Why not?

Mr. GUTHRIE: An individual has a heart and soul and mind of his own, and he has a right to vote and can lawfully exercise political influence. The case is different with a company. An incorporated company is not a person within the meaning of

this legislation. The purpose of the section, as my hon. friend probably knows, was to get rid of a system that was growing up in the United States and in Canada, which was very objectionable in its results. The great corporations were exercising a large amount of influence on the political situation in this country and in the United States, heavy contributions being given by the corporations as such. Individuals might think twice before they would spend their own money; but when it was looked on as a matter of corporate funds and the result of the election might possibly help the general financial standing of the company; and ultimately favourable legislation might be passed by the successful party, huge contributions began to flow, not so much in this country as in the United States. But the time came in Canada when, in the wisdom of this Parliament, it became necessary to check that evil, and I think it has been fairly well checked in this country.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Oh, oh. I do not think so.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) seems to smile at that.

Mr. LAPOINTE: He is doubtful about it.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not know the system that prevails in the province of Quebec, but in Ontario and elsewhere the evil has been pretty well checked; and if it has not been checked in Quebec, let us devise legislation that will check it.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Was that what my hon. friend told us after the election of 1911 when he came back to the House?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not remember ever discussing the question of contributions by corporations in this House, and I did not tell any one anything about it. I think this is the first time in twenty years that I have ever opened my mouth on the subject. But if there be any doubt as to what is going on in this respect, let us have a law broad enough to stop it, and if the present enactment be not broad enough, let us improve it. I would not suggest weakening it in any way, I would suggest strengthening it.

Mr. CANNON: I was suggesting to my hon. friend that the law should be broadened by adding the word "person." He mentioned Quebec. Naturally I am more familiar with conditions existing in Quebec than with conditions existing in the other provinces, but in Quebec, and probably in all the other provinces, individuals doing very large business now do not do their business under their individual names any more, but under corporate names. Most people do that. Therefore, individuals who have in reality the greatest interest and sometimes all the interest in the companies are doing business under corporate names in our province—and I think the same is true of most of the provinces. These gentlemen naturally will not, according to this clause,

9 p.m.

contribute as a corporation, but they may well do so individually under their personal names, and that is not supposed to be an indictable offence, although the result is exactly the same in the end.

Mr. GUTHRIE: They cannot use corporate money for the purpose.

Mr. CANNON: But the corporate money is their own money.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I never before heard that it was considered as wrong in this or in any other country for a man, out of his private means, to contribute to a cause which is desired to succeed in an election. I never heard it suggested before that such a thing was an offence or wrong in principle or morals or in any other respect. But it has always been considered, to say the least, as a matter of doubtful propriety, to use corporate funds in an election. Under this clause an individual cannot, as a shareholder, or officer, or attorney, or agent of a company, contribute any corporate money. The company itself cannot contribute. But I have never yet heard it suggested that an individual should not be permitted, out of his private money, to contribute some of his money for the success of the cause which he happens to have at heart.

Mr. MAHARG: Is this clause exactly the same as the clause in the old Act?

Mr. GUTHRIE: With the exception of two or three words, it is.

Mr. MAHARG: Would the minister mind giving us those exceptions?

Mr. GUTHRIE: The clause in the old Act read as follows:

Mr. DEVLIN: Is the minister referring to the Act of 1911?

Mr. GUTHRIE: No, I am referring to the Act of 1908. If I recollect the matter

properly, the only change in the clause is in the first words. The first words of the old section read:

Any company or association.

And the first words in the present clause read:

No unincorporated company or association and no incorporated company or association.

Mr. MAHARG: Does this mean that no group of individuals, whether large or small, can contribute to or secure funds in any way for the purpose of the election campaign of a candidate?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think that is practically the effect of the section. No business men can group themselves together as a company or association, whether incorporated or not, to contribute funds towards an election campaign.

Mr. MAHARG: According to the section no group of labour men, returned soldiers or others—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Farmers.

Mr. MAHARG: —can group themselves together, unless they get incorporated, to assist financially in the election of a candidate. Could this be done under the old Act?

Mr. GUTHRIE: The object aimed at is to prevent men from grouping together and using their joint contribution for the purpose of assisting in an election campaign.

Mr. MAHARG: What about their individual contributions?

Mr. GUTHRIE: An individual contribution would not be viewed as unlawful, but if a number of men joined together in the form of an association for the purpose of using their joint contributions towards a campaign it would be unlawful under this Act.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: I think the same purpose was accomplished with the section as it stood in the old Act. Why make people suspicious that this section has been drafted in a different way with the object of reaching them? What is the object of changing the words of the two first lines?

Mr. GUTHRIE: The only reason I know for the change was that it would prevent men from grouping themselves together for the purpose of influencing an election by financial contributions.

It seems that this is one of the clauses that may be regarded as contentious, and in view of my statement this afternoon perhaps it might be as well for us to postpone its further consideration for the time being. I would therefore move to let the section stand.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Does the minister think that individuals could group together under the old Act?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think they could. The only groups prohibited under the former Act were those who incorporated.

Mr. DEVLIN: They could not group together under the old Act.

Mr. GUTHRIE: It has been pointed out to me that my interpretation of the former law was incorrect. The former Act provided that "no company or association other than one incorporated for political purposes alone shall" etc. That would cover a group or association just as under the present Act. The draughsman of the present Bill, Mr. W. F. O'Connor is, I may say, an experienced man, and he changed the language into "no unincorporated company or association" etc.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I desire to put myself on record in favour of this law, which I think is a good one, although possibly it might be improved. I think that the cure for the evil we are trying to overcome is publicity, and if the minister can devise some method by which funds will be made public the difficulty will be met in every respect. I think this clause is to some extent insufficient. The real cure is publicity of campaign funds, and I should like to know if there is anything in the Act in this regard?

Mr. GUTHRIE: There is a provision. I have not the exact section, but it is the same provision as in the former law, which requires that a detailed statement of all contributions, payments, loans, advances, deposits or promises of money made on behalf of the candidate, shall be given to the agent or returning officer for publication.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think this section might very well stand. But before leaving it I would say that, it being mainly intended, as I interpret it, to prevent business corporations from contributing to campaign funds, it has my hearty approval. I feel that it cannot be made too exacting. In order to make perfectly clear the purpose of the section, I think it would be an improvement if one or two words were added to subsection 2. This subsection reads:

Every director, shareholder, officer, attorney or agent of any company or association violating the provisions of this section * * * * is guilty of an indictable offence, etc.

I should like to see inserted, after the word "agent," the words "or any person on behalf of any company or association."

Mr. GUTHRIE: In law the term "agent" includes any person acting on behalf of another. However, I note the suggestion of the hon. member.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My desire is to have it made perfectly clear that the law prohibits business corporations from contributing to political funds, and I should like to see the section amended to that extent.

Section stands.

On section 11—Persons not electors and not residents of Canada forbidden to canvas:

Mr. GUTHRIE: The change here is in reference to the penalty. Under the former Act the penalty was from $100 to $200, or six months' imprisonment. Now it will be an indictable offence punishable by fine up to $2,000.

Mr. CANNON: What is the reason for this clause?

Mr. GUTHRIE: It is fairly explicit; it is a clause adopted by Parliament in 1908. I do not know that I can give any better reason than the language in the section. I do not think I could give the reason for it better than it is given in the language of the section:

Any person, not being an elector, who resides without Canada and who, to secure the election of any candidate, canvasses for votes or in any way endeavours to induce voters to vote for any candidate at an election, or to refrain from voting, is guilty of an indictable offence against this Act punishable as in this Act provided.

The object was to prevent convassing by the foreigner who has no right or business in this country, who is not a native of Canada, and who only takes part in an election as a paid agent. A man who has no stake in the country will take a desperate chance that a citizen of the country would not take, and then skips over the border when the election is over so that he cannot be reached by our criminal law.

Mr. CANNON: Take an election in which we would have imperial preference discussed in Canada, would a person from Great Britain be debarred?

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is not a foreign country.

Mr. FIELDING: It says anybody who resides outside of Canada.

Mr. CANNON: People of that class will be debarred from taking part in an election. Suppose we should discuss at a future election the question of reciprocity and a prominent man from the United States would like to address a meeting in Montreal and tell the people there what his views were upon that question; this section would bar him out of our country.

Mr. GUTHRIE: No, it is to be "at an election," and "at an election" is defined in section 2 as including:

The period after the issue of the writ for an election, or after the dissolution of Parliament or the occurrence of a vacancy in consequence of which a writ for an election is eventually issued, until the elected candidate is returned as elected.

People who came out from Great Britain or other parts of the world to discuss public questions could not be very well be said to be coming here for the purpose of securing the election of any candidate. They would not be canvassing for votes at an election.

Mr. CANNON: Certainly they would.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I can only say to my hon. friend that I do not know the exact origin of this section but my hon. friends across the way who then sat in the Government when this Act was put upon the statute book can probably give the reason for it better than I can. I admit the propriety of it. I see good reason for it and I do not think it is open to the narrow interpretation that the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) seeks to put upon it.

Mr. CANNON: I am perfectly willing to accept any interpretation that the minister can give, but that is how I interpret the clause, and I think my interpretation is right.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think my hon. friend's interpretation is absolutely wrong. The Act says that the person must be here canvassing and that he must be here at an election.

Mr. CANNON: "endeavours to induce"—

Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes, I grant that. The object was to keep out a person who had not a vote in this country and who had no interest in the election. The real object that the section was intended to achieve was to keep out stragglers from the other side who came in here, hired by some political party or other and who, after having done their nefarious work, quit the coun-

try, went to the other side and we were not able to catch them.

Mr. MOWAT: If the section were wider than the Minister of Militia (Mr. Guthrie) says it would not do any harm, because the words are "in any way endeavour to induce voters to vote for any candidate at an election." That means during the period intervening between the issue of the writ and the polling day. I do not see why persons from outside should come into Canada anyway.

Mr. DEVLIN: I called the attention of the House to this section this afternoon. The hon. Minister of Militia not having been here at the time, the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) took note of the objection, but apparently the Minister of Militia has not received any intimation of it. I will repeat in substance, very shortly, the objection I have to this clause. By section 11 it is provided that:

> Any person, not being an elector, who resides without Canada and who, to secure the election of any candidate, canvasses for votes or in any way endeavours to induce voters to vote for any candidate at an election, or to refrain from voting, is guilty of an indictable offence against this Act punishable as in this Act provided.

That means that any citizen of England —I used the words "citizen of England" this afternoon to call attention to the absurdity of the matter; I might have included any citizen of Ireland, or any citizen of Scotland, or anybody residing in the Isle of Man, or any other place that I might mention—would not have the right to come over here and try to influence—I want the minister's attention because this is a serious point—or induce any voter to vote for any candidate. By section 38 of the act any one of these gentlemen may be a candidate himself. The result is that of any man in England, or Ireland, or Scotland, or the Isle of Man, or Newfoundland, wants to be a candidate for this House, he may be one.

Mr. POWER: He would go to jail.

Mr. DEVLIN: No, he could be a candidate. But if he undertook to come over and hold meetings and say to the electors: "You should vote for me" for the reasons I have given, he would find himself landed in jail. Now that is very absurd and I would like to ask the minister if he can offer any other interpretation of the clause to the House.

Mr. GUTHRIE: It would be a very easy matter to change section 38 by saying that all candidates for seats in this House shall be residents of Canada. I think they should be. I quite approve of the section as it is drawn, but it is not of very great consequence. I would not like to see it changed unless there is some good reason for it. My hon. friend and myself were in the House when the section was put in and we supported the Government that had put it there. I thought it was a good section.

Mr. DEVLIN: That was section 69.

Mr. GUTHRIE: No, both sections,—certainly section 11.

Mr. DEVLIN: I do not wish to interrupt the minister but if he will allow me, I have under my hand section 69 of the Act which my hon. friend refers to and which corresponds to section 38. Section 38 of this Bill reads:

> Except as in this Act otherwise provided any British subject, male or female, who is of the full age of twenty-one years, may be a candidate at a Dominion election.

The clause to which the minister refers in section 69 of the Dominion Elections Act which reads:

> Except as in this Act otherwise provided any British subject may be a candidate in an election for a seat in the House of Commons. No qualification in real estate shall be required of any candidate.

That is really more favourable to the British subject.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not see how. I may be obtuse but I cannot see the difference.

Mr. DEVLIN: Well, I did make the remark to the Minister of the Interior that I might be dull but I could not help seeing it.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I see the anomaly that might arise if we permit section 38 to remain as it is in the Bill. What I suggested was that we could very easily cure the difficulty by inserting a few words in section 38 to provide that a person who offers himself as a candidate for election to this Parliament should be a resident of Canada.

Mr. DEVLIN: If the minister is going to undertake to debar any British subject from being a candidate for this House then I cannot offer any further objection.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Unless he is a resident of Canada.

Mr. DEVLIN: I cannot offer any further objection.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I personally would be prepared to go that far.

Mr. DAVIS: If the clause were amended so as to read that any person who canvasses for votes or who, by personal solicitation, endeavours to induce voters to vote for any candidate other than himself at an election, that will fix the whole matter.

Mr. GUTHRIE: It has been suggested to me that we could meet the point raised by my hon. friends opposite very simply by amending the first line of section 11 to make it read thus:

Any person, not being an elector or a candidate—

And so on. Then my hon. friend would be able to carry out his wish that at some time or other in the future, residents of the British Isles might sit in this House. I do not agree with the proposal, but if the Committee is willing I am perfectly content that after the words "not being an elector" we shall add "or a candidate."

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the amendment carry?

Mr. DEVLIN: I do not take the responsibility for it; it is the Act of the Government.

Mr. POWER: Notwithstanding the very lucid explanation of the Acting Solicitor General I am still opposed to this clause. I expect we will very shortly have in this country a strong Labour party. The Labour party are about to organize and will perhaps need in their organization the help and assistance of some members of their body in the United States.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. POWER: I see no reason why they should not be allowed to come in—

An hon. MEMBER: Keep them out.

Mr. POWER: —to help in an election by speeches. More than that we shall also have, I think—

An hon. MEMBER: We have got enough Socialists here now.

Mr. POWER: —a strong Prohibition party. I see no reason, for instance, why "Pussyfoot" Johnson, who is now in England, should not come here, and yet if "Pussyfoot" Johnson were to come here he might be put in jail, and then the President of the Privy Council would be in trouble.

An hon. MEMBER: Even Billy Sunday might come here.

[Mr. Guthrie.]

Mr. POWER: In any of these cases it might be pleaded that intervention on the part of strangers would be perfectly legitimate. Lord Jellicoe could even come here and explain his naval proposals. I would not like to see Lord Jellicoe put in jail.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I would not like to see him here engaged in an election either.

Mr. POWER: It would not be a good thing for the Tory party. However, if the clause must remain let the hon. gentleman make it a proper one. The clause provides:

Any person, not being an elector, who resides—

And so on. Well, residence is a very difficult term to define. A man who remains here over night might be deemed to "reside" in Canada. If the Acting Solicitor General adopted the phrase "who is domiciled in the country," then I think perhaps the clause might suit his purpose. In the province of Quebec we have discussed the question of "residence" and "domicile" in making up electoral lists time and again, and I would ask the minister to substitute "domicile" for "residence."

Mr. MANION: As a representative of another province than that of my hon. friend opposite, I should like to say that personally I am convinced that the Canadian people can very well run their own elections without assistance from either English or Americans.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 12—conveyance of electors to polls, etc., for hire, forbidden.

Mr. GUTHRIE: These are the time-honoured clauses 270 and 271 which have been for a long time in our law.

Mr. FIELDING: Honoured more in the breach than in the observance.

Mr. GUTHRIE: They have been combined in these proposals and the language has been changed to some extent but the change does not affect the meaning. There are the same old sections, and as my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) said a moment ago perhaps more honoured in the breach than in the observance. It has not been my experience, but I have heard of it in other cases.

Mr. P. McGIBBON: I think we ought to be candid and fair and strike this out.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Let us be honest.

Mr. McGIBBON: No man can run an election nowadays under this provision and

get the vote out. People will not walk five, ten, or fifteen miles to vote. The candidate has got to get the vote out, no matter what party he belongs to or what Government he supports. This piece of hypocrisy that as my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) has said is observed more in the breach than in any other respect. I think we ought to be honest and strike it out.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: I endorse that view, only I support it more strongly than the hon. gentleman has done. In the last election when I heard my opponent was hiring everything in the city I engaged more men to go and hire the remaining conveyances. I make this statement without any reservation. If any gentleman wants to prosecute me under the Act for what I have done he can do so, but I will institute prosecution against every other member of the House if anything is started on me. As a matter of fact, however, that is the practice that is followed. I will give you a good reason for it. In the city of Edmonton there is a pretty large territory, as much as would accommodate the cities of Chicago and New York. They have two or three mills there and the men cannot go to the polls in the morning; the operator will not allow them out at noon except for an hour. If you are to get these men to the polls between five and seven o'clock you must do something else than merely send invitations to them. It is well known that we have been hiring conveyances for election purposes, and I endorse the statement of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. McGibbon) that it is time for us to stop being hypocrites.

Mr. BUTTS: Just before the motion for the adoption of this clause is put let me say that I agree entirely with the Bill as it stands only it does not go quite far enough. I think it would be well if the Acting Solicitor General would add to the prohibited conveyances:

Dirigibles, hydroplanes, submarines, submarine chasers, and all other chasers.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Mr. Chairman, all that my hon. friend has suggested is covered by the clause as it now stands in these words "or other means of conveyance." I think, though, this clause might stand. As we have made fair progress on the Bill I now move that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Before you leave the Chair—

The CHAIRMAN: The motion is not debatable.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I do not want to debate the motion, but—

The CHAIRMAN: If the minister wishes to withdraw his motion it will be in order for the hon. member to continue the debate.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I withdraw my motion.

ELECTION IN ST. JAMES, MONTREAL.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Quebec East): I wish to ask if the Government has any information to give the House in regard to the election in St. James, Montreal? Is it to be postponed on account of the notices being sent out too late?

Rt. Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): I have no knowledge of any postponement of the election. I have seen it stated that there has been some irregularity in connection with the lists, but I have not definite information as to what the particular irregularity is. If I may be permitted to give an impression that I do not want to be bound by, I would say that it does not seem clear to me that there is any authority in any one to decide that there is any irregularity and to postpone the election. If there be any gross irregularity, I can see that it would be for the courts to deal with it when properly seized of the particulars. However, I am speaking without accurate knowledge of what is the difficulty that is said to exist.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I move that the Committee rise, report progress and beg leave to sit again.

Progress reported.

BRITISH COLUMBIA INDIANS.

SETTLEMENT OF DIFFERENCES CONCERNING INDIAN LANDS.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Minister of the Interior and Superintendent General of Indian Affairs) moved the second reading of Bill No. 13 to provide for the settlement of differences between the Governments of the Dominion of Canada and the Province of British Columbia respecting Indian lands and certain other Indian affairs in the said province.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time and the House went into Committee thereon—Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 2—Power given to Governor in Council to settle differences between Canada and British Columbia respecting Indian matters.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Mr. Chairman, is this Act based on the report of the commis-

sion with reference to lands in British Columbia which was tabled a few days ago?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think the Act has anything to do at all with the Commission "that reported a few days ago." I do not know what commission the hon. member refers to.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: With reference to Indian lands in British Columbia.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That commission reported in the early months of 1916.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR. That is the commission I referred to. I think the report was tabled by the leader of the Government a few days ago.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That may be, but I presume the report was put on the Table four years ago as well. It would be tabled a few days ago for the assistance of the House in the debate. That is the report referred to in the preamble to the Bill, and it was made in the early part of 1916.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: What was the total cost of that commission?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The information has been given before, of course, but I can give it again. The total cost, inclusive of salaries and living allowances, clerical services, travel of clerical staff, transportation, surveys—a great many surveys had to be made in connection with the work—office expenses, including rent, printing, binding and lithographing—$317,797.68.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: That is a very large amount. Could the minister tell us why the money was spent by that commission?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The principal reason is that the commission lasted so long. I would not like to state whether it took longer than was necessary to do its work, but there are some who think it did.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Would the minister state how much was paid to the commissioners?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The amount paid in salaries was $159,255.76, extending over four years, and the amount paid in living expenses was $62,490.92.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: The minister has not specified the commissioners who received this money.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The commissioners were as follows: Hon. E. L. Wetmore, chairman, from April 12 to November 30, 1913; N. W. White, commissioner; G. H. Bergeron as secretary; J. A. J. McKenna as commissioner; S. Carmichael as commissioner; D. H. Macdowall as commissioner; J. P. Shaw as commissioner; C. H. Gibbons as assistant secretary and secretary; A. H. Green, D.L.S., as technical officer; and McGregor Young as counsel.

Mr. BUREAU: Do I understand that the Bill is made to empower the Governor in Council to carry out agreements which may be the result of the report of the commission to settle Indian affairs in British Columbia?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not quite. The commission was appointed in pursuance of an agreement between the representatives of the Government of British Columbia and the representatives of the Government of Canada. The differences between the two Governments had lasted for a number of years; indeed, I think ever since British Columbia was a province. The two Governments by agreement undertook to appoint a commission composed of two representatives for British Columbia and two for the Dominion, the four so appointed to appoint a fifth, and the cost to be shared equally. The expense figures I have given are shared equally by the two Governments. Perhaps I should very briefly state what the points of difference were. The British Columbia Government had contended that it, as distinct from the Governments of the other provinces, was entitled to a reversionary interest in all the Indian reserves in British Columbia; that is to say, if for any reason, whether by extinction of the tribe or by a decision to sell the reserves, or for any other cause, the land or any part thereof ceased to be used by the Indians, the Government of Canada was not entitled to sell that land on any portion of it being surrendered and place the money in a trust fund for the benefit of the Indians, as is done in the case of every other province, but that that land upon so ceasing to be used by the Indians reverted to the province of British Columbia. The administration of Indian affairs, if such a claim were to be conceded, would become not only very difficult but a tremendous burden upon the Dominion. That claim has not been conceded by the Government of Canada. The Government of British Columbia, by the terms of the Act of Union of 1874, bound itself to provide lands or reserves in that province adequate to the needs of the Indians, and the Government of Canada, on the other hand, bound itself to maintain a standard of Indian administration, equal in generosity, equal in

liberality towards the Indians, to that maintained by British Columbia prior to Confederation. Clause 19 of the agreement, if I remember correctly—I do not know that I can express it fully; I have not the clause before me now—used words upon which British Columbia based its claim to this reversionary interest.

As time proceeded it became evident that certain reserves were larger than was necessary for the purposes of the Indians. That is true in every province. Scarcely a week passes without a surrender being made in some province of a portion of a reserve, the lands so surrendered being sold by the department and the proceeds going, according to the terms of surrender, to the trust fund,—some of them usually going to the Indians themselves direct. So this occurred in British Columbia. Reserves were found to be larger than necessary, and in some cases they were found to be too small. This, then, immediately brought to an acute point the question what was to be done with the reserves so in excess. We could not sell them, because if we did the money would not be ours, and we had no money with which to get new reserves.

I think I have indicated to the committee some of the difficulties that arose. It was determined by the two Governments that there should be a final end to this controversy. It was made more acute by the developments in relation to the Kitsilano reserve, which had become a very valuable property, to the business centre of the city of Vancouver; indeed, it was required by the Vancouver Harbour Commission in connection with harbour developments. That, then, became a fitting cause for the sale of that reserve and for the acquirement of some other land less valuable but more adapted to Indian habitation and to Indian pursuits. The property was valued at anything from half a million to a million and three-quarters. The Harbour Board had to have the property, but both Governments were claiming the proceeds, we, of course, claiming them only as trustees. There was not time,—and furthermore there were other objections to doing so,—to have this question of reversionary title decided by the courts. Consequently, an agreement was entered into and provision made therein whereby interim reports should be made, interim recommendations by the commission looking to the disposal of reserves or parts of reserves that might be immediately required for other purposes. Now, it was a term of that agreement, and embodied in the Orders in Council passed by the respective Governments subsequently adopting the agreement, that the agreement should be sympathetically received and acted upon by the two governments subject to such conditions or modifications as would be deemed reasonable. The effect was that virtually there was no agreement at all further than an agreement to have the matter investigated, and while that in itself might be worth while, it did not lead to any finality. The Commission set to work and performed—on the whole, I think, very well—undoubtedly a very laborious task. Interim reports were made. One report was made with respect to this Kitsilano reserve, and that report was acted upon. As a result the Harbour Commissioners took possession of the Kitsilano reserve, and have possession of it to-day, but we are still in controversy as to what is to be done with the money. Accordingly, the Harbour Board has not paid any money and there is no decision as to what they are going to pay or what is going to be done with the money when it is paid. A report was received in the early months of 1916 recommending certain cut-offs and certain new reserves, and the Government of Canada not long afterwards intimated its readiness to accept the report and to abide and be bound thereby. The report provided on the general and main issue that where land was found to be in excess of requirements, that excess might be sold and the proceeds equally divided between the two Governments, the Government of Canada to utilize the portion so received by it on behalf of the Indians for whom, of course, it was trustee. Now, the Government of British Columbia did not deal with the report at all. They indulged in certain communications from time to time, it is true, but they have not yet intimated their willingness to accept. Indeed, we have at the present time no official communication—one was made and withdrawn—as to what the Government of British Columbia is prepared to do with regard to that report. But at the last session of the legislature of that province the Government took power to negotiate with the Dominion Government looking to the adoption of the report embodying modifications which were to result from the negotiations. There is no question in my mind that legislation is necessary to enable that to be done. That being the attitude and the action taken by the Government of British Columbia it seems desirable that we should be in the same position, because there will be no object in our negotiating with them

without authority. They stand there with the authority given them by their legislature; it seems to me right and necessary that we have similar authority from ours. We have a list of the cut-offs recommended and also of the additions recommended; and the report is on the Table. This legislation is authority to negotiate and to make binding any agreement arrived at covering various details of these cut-offs and the disposition of the proceeds.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Can the dispute not be settled by the courts?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is possible that the question of reversionary interest might be settled on a stated case. My information is that an attempt was made some time ago by the legal departments of the two governments to come to terms on a stated case, but they could not agree on a stated case. A suggestion has been made again by the Attorney General of British Columbia looking to a stated case on two or three phases. They claim absolute ownership of the Kitsilano reserve. They claim reversionary interest and interest at law in all the other reserves. But in his communiction the Attorney General stated that the British Columbia Government were anxious to settle the matter amicably if they could. I have replied to that communication with a proposal which I hope will result in an amicable settlement of this question.

But even if such a settlement should be arrived at, that would not take care of the subjects sought to be taken care of by this Bill.

The question is, what shall be cut off from the reserves. There are one thousand reserves in British Columbia alone, and they are all dealt with in the report. Even though the question of the reversionary interest were settled, we would still have to negotiate with the province as to just what cut-offs should be made from various reserves, what additions should be made to others and what reserves should be added in the province. Consequently the legislation is necessary in any event even though we may have come to a stated case on the question of reversionary interest.

Mr. BUREAU: The clause itself seems to presume that, because power is asked for the Governor in Council to fulfil every act, deed, matter or thing necessary for the carrying out of the said agreement between the Governments of the Dominion of Canada and the province of British Columbia according to its true intent. There is something that seems to be rather of a judicial character, namely as to the intent of the agreement. If you cannot agree together and get a stated case, how are you going to come out of the matter? If you give power to the Governor in Council, and the Government of British Columbia does not agree, what is the effect?

Mr. MEIGHEN: If we do not agree, we do not get anywhere; but if we do agree as to the intent, then doubtless this clause makes the agreement binding.

Mr. BUREAU: It gives the Government power to make it binding?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. DEVLIN: I do not wish to interfere in the affairs of British Columbia, but it seems to me—and I have had some experience in connection with the Indian Act—that this legislation in clause 3 of the present Bill is asked for independently of what may appear in the Indian Act. We are the custodians of the rights of the Indian, and the Government cannot take away from the Indians any of their reserves without first obtaining a surrender from the Indians concerned. The Government having obtained that surrender—I speak now from memory—the money goes to the credit of the Indians. If this Bill is passed, then it varies altogether the provisions of the Indian Act. I have in memory now a case in the constituency which I represent. There are two settlements, one of which is a very important settlement, at the other end of the county, called the village of Maniwaki. The land connecting the adjoining settlement, the River Desert, with the village of Maniwaki belongs to the Indian Reserve, and the river Desert runs right through that, and alongside of that is the main road which is practically the only communication between the two places. For years I applied to the Minister of Public Works of the former Government, not the present Government, and later to the Minister of Indian Affairs, to have that roadway protected by some kind of construction. The Public Works Department could not act because this land was Indian land. This Government, I feel sure, would not be prepared to act possibly for the same reason, although I want to call the attention of the Minister of Indian Affairs to the fact that it is work that is absolutely necessary for the preservation of the Indian Reserve. It is also work that is absolutely necessary

10 p.m.

to preserve a means of communication between the one place and the other. Upon this land that I speak of now in the immediate vicinity of the water, very few Indians reside; I think that right around there might be one family of Indians. And yet that land cannot be taken away from the Tribe. The Tribe still exists and the Tribe will not surrender. If this legislation is passed, of course, similar legislation could be applied as to Indian reserves in the province from which I come and with which I am more familiar. I fail to see in what way, whilst the Indian Act remains, even in spite of clause 3 or any clause of the Bill, you are going to take away from the Indians vested rights. You may alter the sections of the Indian Act, but these are vested rights

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know the reserve to which the hon. member refers in the province of Quebec at Maniwaki, having been there, and I know the position of the road and river. It is quite true that the Indian Department would be powerless to take from that reserve any portion of it without the formality of a previous surrender, and it is quite true that in this case also of the British Columbia reserves, affected by the report of the commissioners, though we might agree on a settlement of this whole trouble, dating back almost to Confederation, we would be absolutely powerless to carry it out if even one band, for any reason, however capricious, were to say: We will not surrender these two acres —or whatever the area may be. It is only in most exceptional cases and for most extraordinary reasons that the Government, as the guardian of the Indians, should assert the right to take any land without the consent of the band. But for the life of me I do not know how we are ever going to settle this matter unless we do assert that right. We have no reason to apprehend especially that there will be the exercise of caprice or obstinacy on the part of these bands. It will be our endeavour in any event to secure surrenders, even though this clause passes. But surely it is only right that we should have the power to carry out this settlement, because the legislation is asked for only for the purpose of carrying it out, and otherwise we cannot administer Indian affairs in British Columbia. It is for the purpose of settlement that this commission was appointed, and in order to make the settlement effective we must have the power in this clause. The reasons are extraordinary; the circumstances are most unusual and compelling, and on that account I decided to ask Parliament for this power in this special case.

Mr. DEVLIN: I said at the opening of my remarks that I did not wish to enter into the details of British Columbia affairs. Does the minister think that if this legislation passes, he will be able to give a good and valid title?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. This legislation, being subsequent to the Indian Act, is valid legislation. I do not think there is any doubt of that. This legislation has been submitted to the Justice Department and they understand the purport of this clause.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Are the Indians themselves satisfied with the settlement that is proposed here?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is a pretty large order. I do not know that they are. I believe the Indians of British Columbia, at least some people who represent them, claim that they want to go to the foot of the Throne on the whole question of Indian title in British Columbia, but that is another question. They claim that the old Indian title has never been extinguished in British Columbia, but I do not think there will be any object served in getting into a discussion of that subject; it has to do with the state of mind of the Indians, and I do not think I would be justified in saying that all the Indians of British Columbia are satisfied, because I do not think they are and I do not think they ever will be.

Mr. BUREAU: I have here something new that has just been brought to my notice. It is a letter from the special agent of the Allied Tribes of Indians of British Columbia. From this letter they appear to be dissatisfied and they would like to have a hearing.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does that not refer to a hearing with respect to Bill No. 14 rather than this Bill?

Mr. BUREAU: To this Bill. They say that they had a promise in 1910 that their case would be submitted to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and that the matter would be adjudicated. I do not think that the minister should entertain any objection to going into this question. Whatever there is in these people's contention, we might just as well know it and see where we stand. As the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) has said, we are brushing aside the Indian Act in this case, and

giving the Governor in Council the right to take any part in an Indian reservation without surrender. If we brush aside the Indian Act, the money which is derived from the sale of the reservations will be disposed of without reference to the provisions of the Indian Act, and it follows that the whole procedure after taking over the land will not be under the operation of that Act. If this matter could be postponed I could look into it further and be able to submit information to the minister that might possibly throw light on the subject.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There will be no need of that, for the reason that if the Indian contention is right, or if they should be encouraged to go to the Privy Council or anywhere else on the question of the extinction of the original Indian title, they will be in just as good a position after this measure goes through as they are now. Their claim, if it is good, challenges the whole foundation of the original Indian Act, but their request to be heard should have no bearing on this Bill. This Bill would be invalid in relation to British Columbia lands in the same way that the whole Indian Act would be invalid, if their claim were good. That is to say, they might just as well be heard against the Indian Act as against this. I do not think their request has anything to do with the question of the wisdom of passing this legislation.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think the minister would get on as quickly with the Act by postponing further discussion for the time being as if he proceeded and we had to delay the third reading for a time. There are some representatives of the Indians in the city at the present time who wish to be heard in reference to the matter, and who are anxious to present their case to some members of the House, and I think it is due to them that we should give them a chance of being heard through their representatives.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If there are any Indians who want to be heard in relation to this Bill I have not heard of it. There are Indians who have come down and have seen myself and other ministers, and no doubt hon. members also. They want to be heard in relation to an amendment to the Indian Act and it is mainly for that reason that that Act is being referred to a committee. But I cannot see why they should want to be heard in relation to this Act.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have a petition from Indians, asking to be heard in reference to this very Act.

[Mr. Bureau.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is a wonder they did not petition me.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not know why they did not, unless it was, as the minister has intimated to-night, that he was not inclined to listen to the Indian point of view.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I never heard of the matter before.

Mr. PECK: While I have no desire to see this Bill hurried through, I desire to say a word or two in regard to the advisability of proceeding. There are more Indians in the constituency of Skeena than perhaps in any other riding in Canada, and I am the very last man who would wish to do an injustice to them. I have the very greatest respect for the Indian tribes in my riding, especially the more advanced tribe of Tsimpshian; but I have known of this controversy for a long time, and I do not see that we shall get anywhere unless we empower the minister to deal with the Government of British Columbia. There are in British Columbia a lot of reserves that have been held up for years, such for instance as the Giltsalt Reserve. I may say that there is a good deal of mining up in the mountains and in the valley, and the whole development of the district is held up because the reserve cannot be dealt with. If this Bill passes it will be possible, I understand, for that reserve to revert immediately to the province of British Columbia, and development of the country will be proceeded with. I should like to know who are the Indian agitators that come from British Columbia. Some representatives of the Indians may be all right, but I may mention a man named O'Meara—

Mr. FIELDING: An Italian, apparently.

Mr. PECK: He is an agitator, wherever he comes from. He annually makes a business of going to the Indians and collecting a few hundred dollars to keep him going. He is a sea lawyer and keeps up an agitation from year to year, and these people come down and try to confuse—I was going to say confound—the minister.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is not the gentleman I refer to.

Mr. PECK: This man is typical of them.

Mr. BUREAU: I have the names of the men here. They are Peter Calder, of Nishga Tribe; George Matheson, of Tsimpshian Tribe; Peter R. Kelley, of Haida Tribe; Basil David, of Shuswap Tribe; all repre-

senting the Allied Indian Tribes of British Columbia.

Mr. PECK: I know them; they are all O'Meara's children.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The minister wondered a moment ago why the representatives of the Indians did not petition him. If the minister is agreeable to postponing this matter I shall be glad to ask them to see him to-morrow if possible, or at any other time he may suggest.

Mr. MEIGHEN: For the sake of getting the Bill through I would deny myself the extreme pleasure of seeing Mr. O'Meara.

Mr. MACKENZIE King: I am not speaking of Mr. O'Meara.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am afraid there is too much truth in the remarks of the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Peck). Mr. O'Meara has undoubtedly made himself the parent of considerable trouble among the Indians of British Columbia, and I do not feel very sympathetic at all towards his whole mission and his conduct.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am not referring at all to Mr. O'Meara, but to a man named J. A. Teit.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Mr. O'Meara is not an Indian, but one of a number of people who make themselves leaders of Indian trouble. He is not alone in that regard. The Indian is just as much the victim of the agitator as many other people in this country, and when Mr. O'Meara is presenting Indian affairs and obtaining signatures to petitions he does not pretend to do so on his own behalf. He always puts forward the Indians. I do not think there is any reason for delaying this Bill at all. So far as I am concerned it would only mean coming back again. These men have been heard times without number, back over the years, by the last Government and the Government before the last. I would not wonder but that the leader of the Opposition himself has received delegations on this very point. It has been in controversy—if you call this a controversy—for years and years; I cannot say how long, but I know the dispute dates back into a good part of the period of the Laurier Administration, if indeed it does not antedate that. I do not think that any good purpose would be served by crowning the matter with another delegation and sitting and listening to the story over again.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I think it is only fair to the gentlemen who are represented as being agitators, to put on Hansard some of the arguments they present against the present Bill. They say:

1. The Indian tribes of British Columbia have always claimed tribal ownership of their respective territories under aboriginal title and the Proclamation issued by King George Third in the year 1763.

2. In the year 1875 by report of the then Minister of Justice of Canada adopted by the then Governor General of Canada in Council it was declared that the land claims of the Indian tribes of British Columbia are well founded and that those tribes are entitled to an interest in all the lands of that province.

3. The then Government of the province of British Columbia and succeeding governments of that province refused to recognize the land rights so declared, and proceeded to deal with the lands of British Columbia as the absolute property of the province notwithstanding the fact that in the year 1875 the then Land Act of the province had been disallowed upon the ground that its provisions ignored the land rights of the Indian tribes.

4. The present position of the Indian land controversy which thus arose and has ever since continued is shown by the following extract from the statement of the Allied Tribes prepared at the request of the present Premier of British Columbia and presented to him on 13th December last:—

"By means of the direct and independent petition of the Nishga tribes we now have our case before His Majesty's Privy Council. We claim that we have a right to a hearing, a right which has now been made clear beyond any possibility of doubt. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, when Prime Minister, on behalf of Canada, met the Indian tribes of northern British Columbia, and promised without any condition whatever that the land controversy would be brought before the Judicial Committee. Moreover, the Duke of Connaught, acting as His Majesty's representative in Canada, gave positive written assurances that if the Nishga tribe should not be willing to agree to the findings of the Royal Commission, His Majesty's Privy Council will consider the Nishga petition. In view of Sir Wilfrid Laurier's promise and the Duke of Connaught's assurances, both of which confirm what we regard as our clear constitutional right, we confidently expect an early hearing of our case."

5. By communication which on 27th May, 1918, the London agents of the Nishga tribe addressed to the then Lord President of His Majesty's Privy Council, it was submitted on behalf of all tribes allied in support of the Nishga petition, among other things as follows:—

"They are unwilling to be bound by the agreement regarding reserves mentioned in the petition which was made in the year 1912 between the Government of Canada and the Government of British Columbia, as therein stated, 'as a final adjustment of all matters relating to Indian affairs in the province of British Columbia,' and under which the findings of the Royal Commission have been made. On the contrary, the allied tribes contend that both that agreement and the Order in Council adopting it which was passed on 27th November, 1912, are beyond the power of the Government of Canada."

3. Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that your honourable body do not read a second

time said Bill No. 13, until all matters above set out and related matters shall have been fully considered by your honourable body.

And your petitioners will ever pray.

Peter Calder, of Nishga tribe.
George Matheson, of Tsimpshian tribe.
Peter R. Kelley, of Haida tribe.
Basil David, of Shuswap tribe.

All representing the Allied Indian Tribes of British Columbia.

Dated at Ottawa, the 23rd day of March in the year 1920.

I have nothing to add.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It will be very clear to the hon. member now that what I said was correct. What these people claim—or rather what this man claims and what he got others to help him to claim—is that in 1874 the original Indian title was not extinguished, and he wants others to assist him to the foot of the Throne to argue out that question. Do hon. gentlemen really want to bring that question into the discussion of this Bill? Why? If that were the case we ought to cease the Indian administration altogether because we will have no Indian reserves at all.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Does my hon. friend deny that these men are true representatives of the Indian tribes?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Mr. O'Meara?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No, these four gentlemen.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, of course they are not. I understand there is no Indian agent or missionary or any one who has anything to do with it who does not denounce the whole movement and denounce the men, or the man, at the head of it. I do not think the committee will be well advised to make the representations they have presented a cause for interference with the regular course of parliamentary procedure. It seems to me that it would be giving it an importance away beyond what it deserves. If there is anything in it it is just in the same position after the Bill passes as before. There is nothing disturbed by this Bill.

Mr. BUREAU: These Indians, I understand, are only, a minority, a lot of troublemakers according to the statement I hear from hon. gentlemen on the other side who seem to know about this matter. It is said that they only represent a small portion of the whole and that the majority of the Indians are willing to submit to the report of the royal commission. Is my comprehension of the facts right? Is it true that these men are a minority, that they are just a few troublemakers who come before this House to oppose this legislation?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That part, I am satisfied, is right. I cannot make any statement as to the opinion of the majority of the Indians of British Columbia on the report of the commission. I cannot say that it can be said that the majority of them have any definite opinion on the matter. I do not know. If I had the deputy minister in front of me I might speak perhaps with more authority on a question of that sort, but I do stand by what I have said as to the authoritative or lack of authoritative character of the representations made through the instrumentality of Mr. O'Meara.

Mr. BUREAU: I would point out to the minister that the Indian Act provides all the machinery required for the surrender of this land and if these men are only a few troublemakers there should not be any difficulty because unanimity is not required. A tribe may reach a decision upon it and the majority decides whether the surrender shall take place or not.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, yes.

Mr. BUREAU: The fact that you want to discard the Indian Act so as to reduce the area of these reservations is an indication to me that certain Indians are not getting a fair deal. They may be getting a fair deal but they are not getting the deal that they desire to have. If the Government were certain from the reports of their agents, or the investigations that have been made, that these men did not represent the feelings of the Indians, then, under the Indian Act, you have the power, where necessary, to get these tribes together and get them to surrender those parts of the reservations that you desire to acquire. The Government of British Columbia want a part of them and the Dominion Government are willing to make an agreement with the interested parties. Are we going to discard the contracts which we have made with these wards and under which we are bound to take care of their property and to look after them? I think that some consideration should be given to this matter before we proceed further. I see that one of the gentlemen who has signed this petition is the Rev. Mr. Kelley. Does the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Peck) know him? He is the Rev. P. R. Kelley, of Nanaimo.

Mr. PECK: I know most of the reverend gentlemen in my riding but I cannot say that I know Mr. Kelley. I never heard of him.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have the pleasure of knowing Mr. Kelley very well; I have heard from him in connection with another Bill which is before the House, Bill No. 14. I am sure he is a gentleman well qualified to speak on these questions. He seems to know all that concerns the Indians of British Columbia.

Mr. BUREAU: What I was saying when I was interrupted was this: No harm will be done by delay and we will have the opportunity of reading the papers and memoranda which have been prepared and thus of knowing exactly what we are doing when we vote upon this Bill, which brushes aside the Indian Act for the purpose of carrying out certain agreements. No time will be lost and we shall have the satisfaction on this side of knowing what the claims of these people are. We do not want to stop the passage of this legislation if it is necessary, and if the claims made are unfounded surely no exhaustive discussion will take place.

Mr. PECK: I do not want it to be thought for a moment that I wish to impose any hardship on the Indians of British Columbia; in fact, no member of the House will go as far as I am prepared to go in order to help them out. As far as the franchise is concerned, I wish to see the more advanced tribes get it, but I do not see that we are going to get anywhere unless you empower the Minister of the Interior to deal with this question. Unless you do that it will be possible for any tribe or any crest to hold up the Bill. Take the Eagle Crest consisting of only half a dozen. They can hold the settlement up unless the minister is empowered to deal with the matter.

Mr. LAPOINTE: We are not trying to kill this Bill. We merely want—on behalf of these people, who are in the minority, who are feeble and who ask for protection—a little time to study their grievances and to consider the question. I do not think this request should be refused.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If hon. gentlemen opposite press for time to study the Bill further I am not going to ask the committee to report the Bill. I want, however, to bring this fact to their attention, especially to that of the hon. member for Three Rivers. Ninety-nine per cent of the Indians of British Columbia might look with favour upon the settlement and be satisfied with it, but unless this Bill goes through it might well be that the other one per cent could defeat its whole purpose. There might be some little tribe, in which there might not be twenty men who have a vote, but if those twenty men refused to surrender an acre and a half of their reserve——

Mr. BUREAU: I do not object to the Bill, I only want time to consider it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am answering the hon. gentleman's point. If those twenty men, with respect to an acre and a half of their reserves, say it shall not be surrendered no matter what happens, then the agreement we may come to goes by the board. It is not very hard for any one—at all events with some tribes—to get his way, if he goes about it in a skilful manner, with at least twenty persons. Consequently it seems to me necessary that if it is decided by us as trustees for the Indians, and we are acting for the Indians, that this is a proper settlement of a long-standing controversy, surely it is right that we should put it out of the power of any one who tries to influence the Indians, as well as of a very small minority of Indians themselves, to totally defeat the whole settlement. I only want to point out that if there was a petition presented to myself asking to be heard against this Bill on any ground that affected the legislation that would be one matter. But when people come and say "You have no title to Indian lands in British Columbia, they are still owned by the Indians and the descendants of the Indians of 1870," it does not seem to me that it is to be taken seriously as in any way affecting this legislation. That is the point I desire to make. On the ground that my hon. friends opposite wish to study the legislation in all its bearings I certainly will not press this measure now. I therefore move the committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Progress reported.

INDIAN ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. Mr. Meighen moved that Bill No. 14 to amend the Indian Act be read a second time and referred to the special committee, appointed on March 25th inst. for the consideration thereof.

Mr. BUREAU: Who form the committee?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The committee was appointed yesterday.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know whether this is the most appropriate moment but if it is I would like to move that we return to the Order of Motions in order that a change may be made in the personnel of the committee just referred to.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The motion can only pass with the unanimous consent of the House.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The committee named to consider this Bill consisted of Messrs. Boys, Charlton, Davidson, Ethier, Lapointe, Lanctot, Reid, Mackenzie, Stacey and Wilson (Saskatoon). I desire to move that the name of Mr. Charlton be omitted from the committee and that there be substituted therefor the name of Mr. Harold (Brant). I do this at the suggestion of Mr. Charlton.

Mr. HAY: Will the Bill come before the House again after it has been considered by the special committee?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: All Bills referred to the committees are submitted to Committee of the Whole House before they are read a third time.

Motion agreed to.

MAPLE PRODUCTS ADULTERATION.

On the motion of Hon. Mr. Rowell (Minister of Health) Bill No. 28 respecting Maple Products was read a second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 2—Manufacture and sale of adulterated maple sugar or syrup—Adulterated maple sugar or syrup defined—Use of word "maple" restricted to pure maple sugar or syrup.

Mr. ROWELL: I should like to make an amendment to subsection 3. As hon. members will see, the language of this subsection—which is the language of the law as it now stands in the Adulteration Act—is so broad that it covers the use of the word "maple" in any connection practically, and some difficulties have arisen in the administration of the Act where the claim has been made that the word should not be used in relation to products having no relation to maple syrup whatever, such as the Maple Leaf Milling Company's brand of flour. It is difficult, however, to frame a definition that will just meet the case, and the Department of Justice has suggested that the clause should be amended in this form:

by inserting at the beginning of the said subsection the following words: "Except with the consent of the Minister of Health."

I would therefore move that the clause be so amended.

Mr. FIELDING: In the case of the Maple Leaf Milling Company they would simply have to get consent?

Mr. ROWELL: Yes; and in any similar case. One came to my attention during the past two or three months, where a firm had been selling a maple brand of biscuits, and had been doing so before this Act was passed. Their right to do it was challenged. Their product had no relation to maple syrup or maple sugar, but it was said they were violating the law.

Mr. BUREAU: Is it the Maple Biscuit Company?

Mr. ROWELL: I think the Maple brand of biscuits manufactured by the McCormick Company of London.

Mr. BUREAU: Don't they claim that they sweeten their biscuits with maple sugar?

Mr. ROWELL. Then they should not have permission under that clause, because unless it were pure maple sugar they should not use the term "maple."

Mr. DEVLIN: The minister instanced flour; that is not a product of maple sugar.

Mr. ROWELL: No; but my hon. friend will see that this subsection does not require that it shall be a product of maple sugar or syrup. The subsection really creates a monopoly in the use of the word "maple," and it may be a serious question whether such was contemplated by the Act.

Mr. CAHILL: Will the minister explain subsection 2 of section 2? What is meant by being "up to standard" within the meaning of the Food and Drugs Act of 1920?

Mr. ROWELL: That Act prescribes a certain standard of purity, and the product must comply with that standard to be entitled to be considered pure maple sugar within the terms of this clause. That standard is fixed in order to protect those who are making maple syrup and maple sugar. A certain amount of maple syrup or maple sugar was being adulterated with other sweetening mixtures. The syrup or sugar must comply with a certain standard, or it cannot be sold as maple syrup or maple sugar.

Mr. CAHILL: That is provided for in subsection 3 of that clause. But what is the standard of maple syrup? May it be thinner or thicker, or is there any standard required under the Act?

Mr. ROWELL: The definition will come up when the other Act is before the House.

Mr. J. E. SINCLAIR: Is not subsection 1 of section 2, which says that "any article of food resembling maple syrup shall not be sold," rather a sweeping clause? If any food product resembles maple syrup, it seems to me it should be sold under its proper name.

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friend will see that the latter part of that clause qualifies the language of the first two lines:

> or being an imitation of maple sugar or maple syrup, or which is composed partly of maple sugar or maple syrup, and which is not pure maple sugar or pure maple syrup.

That is the present law.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: As that section now reads what my hon. friend has just said would apply. If the word "or" after "resembling" were changed to "and" it would meet the objection raised.

Mr. BUREAU: Insert after "syrup which is composed partly." That would be more grammatical.

Mr. ROWELL: I see no objection to the change being made, but this is the form in which the section was originally enacted and it has been in force for six years.

Mr. FIELDING: If we may return to subsection 3, I do not know that I could suggest any better words than those proposed by the minister, and yet I think they are inadequate, as, if added, they will convey the impression that it is the purpose of the clause to allow the minister to consent to some of these adulterations. I know that that is not what is in his mind at all, but it leaves that impression, and he may find himself open to annoying applications of that nature. I am sorry that the Department of Justice has not been able to put some limitation on the consent to be given. I cannot, offhand, suggest the proper form which the amendment should take, but before the matter is finally disposed of I would like the minister to find some happier expression to make it clear that consent shall not be given in the case of any foodstuffs, but is to be given only in connection with the naming of an article which has no relation to the maple trade.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I suggest that the minister make a change in the language of the first section which will remove any doubt as to the legality of selling an article of food that may resemble maple syrup. If he will change the word "or" at the beginning of line 3 to "and," the point will be met.

Mr. ROWELL: I have no objection to making such an amendment. But the word "or" occurs twice in that line, and the meaning is quite different if you change the first and do not change the second.

Mr. J. E. SINCLAIR: Change the second and leave the first.

Mr. ROWELL: If you do that, the clause may be open to different construction.

Mr. DOHERTY: Change the second "or"; then you provide that a man may sell a thing which is not maple sugar, though it resembles or imitates it, but he may not sell it if it is partly composed of maple sugar.

Mr. J. E. SINCLAIR: Why should a dealer not be permitted to sell an imitation which is sold under its proper name, even if it contains no maple syrup? I do not see why he should be prevented from selling it simply because it resembles maple syrup. It may be syrup of some other kind, and a pure article of food.

Mr. DOHERTY: Then some provision should be made that the article should be described by its proper name.

Mr. J. E. SINCLAIR: I agree.

Mr. FIELDING: That clause has been in the law for some time. I think it would be wise for the minister to consult his officials before making the change suggested. A slight change in the wording of an Act after it has been in operation for some years may materially affect it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I know an article of food similar to maple sugar which is customarily on sale in confectionery stores. As this section now reads, it would be an offence to sell that article. I do not think that is the intention of the Act. The intention is to protect dealers against imitations of maple sugar. Under the Bill as it now stands it would be an offence to sell maple cream, for example, an article which is like maple sugar.

Mr. ROWELL: It is an offence to sell maple cream if it is not pure maple sugar.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Under this Act it would be an offence to sell any candy that is at all like maple sugar.

Section stands.

Progress reported.

HONEY ADULTERATION.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Rowell (Minister of Health), Bill No. 29, respecting honey, was read the second time, and the House went into Committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the chair.

On section 2—feeding bees with sugar:

Mr. ROWELL: This is simply the re-enactment of clauses relating to this matter which have been eliminated from the present Adulteration Act.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Is there any change?

Mr. ROWELL: No change. The clauses are taken out of the Adulteration Act because in re-drafting and consolidating the law we think it desirable that where a monopoly is created it should be dealt with under a separate Act and not in the general Act respecting adulteration of foods.

Mr. DEVLIN: Section 2 provides as follows:

> Feeding bees with sugar, except for the purpose of being consumed by them as food, or with glucose or any sweet substance—

And so on. But who is to go after the bees and see if they are fed with these different articles? Has the minister any official in his department who will follow the bees? I can assure him I had only one experience in going into an apiary; I found that there were more bees than I had reckoned upon, and I should not like to be an officer charged with the duty of going amongst them several times. The minister is putting on the statute book words, but he is not inserting any provision by which this law is to be carried out. Who is going to look after the bees?

Mr. ROWELL: If the Civil Service Commission advertise for some one to carry out this law, I shall not expect my hon. friend to be an applicant for the position.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Clause 2 reads:

> Feeding bees with sugar, except for the purpose of being consumed by them as food.

Can the minister suggest any other purpose that the bees would use the sugar for except for food?

Mr. ROWELL: I do not profess to be well versed in the art of caring for bees, but the point is this. A certain amount of sugar is all right as food for the bees, and there is no objection to that; but if they are fed sugar for the purpose of making honey, a lower grade of honey is produced, not at all equal to the honey produced by the bees under normal conditions getting the honey from natural sources. That is the object of the provision.

[Mr. Rowell.]

Mr. CAHILL: I take it that the Minister of Health is interested, not so much in the health of the bee, as in the product of the bee.

Mr. ROWELL: I should think the question of the health of the bee would come under the Department of Agriculture.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

OTTAWA MINT ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Sir Henry Drayton (Minister of Finance), Bill No. 30, to amend the Ottawa Mint Act, was read the second time, considered in committee, reported, read the third time and passed.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Doherty, the House adjourned at 11 p.m.

Monday, March 29, 1920.

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE.

Hon. NEWTON W. ROWELL (President of the Privy Council): I beg to lay on the Table the following draft conventions and recommendations adopted by the International Labour Congress at Washington and communicated to the Government by the Secretary General of the League of Nations, pursuant to Article 405, Treaty of Versailles:

(1) Draft convention limiting the hours of work in industrial undertakings to eight in the day and forty-eight in the week.

(2) Draft convention concerning unemployment.

(3) Recommendation concerning unemployment.

(4) Recommendation concerning reciprocity of treatment of foreign workers.

(5) Draft convention concerning the employment of women before and after childbirth.

(6) Draft convention concerning the employment of women during the night.

(7) Recommendation concerning the prevention of anthrax.

(8) Recommendation concerning the protection of women and children against lead poisoning.

(9) Recommendation concerning the establishment of Government Health Services.

(10) Draft convention fixing the minimum age for admission of children to industrial employment.

(11) Draft convention concerning the night work of young persons employed in industry.

(12) Recommendation concerning the application of the Berne Convention of 1906, on the prohibition of the use of white phosphorus in the manufacture of matches.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Is that in printed form?

Mr. ROWELL: It is in printed form as it has been received from the secretary of the League of Nations. I think that a certain number of copies of the convention were printed after the Conference, but we have not copies available for distribution among the members of the House. I shall be glad to move that these recommendations be printed for distribution among members.

RETURN TABLED.

Copy of the Order in Council dated December 1, 1919, respecting the ratification of the treaties and conventions laid before the House of Commons on Monday, March 1, 1920.

COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Rowell, the name of Mr. Turgeon was substituted for that of Mr. Ross on the Committee on Pensions.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks).

ST. REGIS INDIAN RESERVE—SHEEP ISLAND.

Mr. DECHENE:

1. Has the Government purchased, within the last three years, one or several islands in the River St. Lawrence?

2. If so, what is the name of the island or islands so purchased, where situated and what is the purchase price of each?

3. From whom was the island or islands purchased?

Rt. Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

1. In November, 1919, the Department of the Interior expropriated under the authority of the Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act for Dominion Parks purposes an island in the St. Lawrence river.

2. This island was a portion of the St. Regis Indian Reserve and was known as Sheep or Doran's Island. It is situated opposite the town of Morrisburg, Ontario. The price paid for same was $3,300.

3. The island was expropriated from the Indians of the St. Regis Indian Reserve.

THE CANADA WHEAT BOARD.

Mr. McCOIG:

1. How many members are there on the Wheat Board?

2. How many employees are there connected with the said Board?

3. What is the monthly expenditure of the said Board, including salaries of the Members, employees and operating expenses?

4. Are said expenses paid by the Government out of the general revenues or are they deducted from the price obtained by the Board for the wheat before it is divided among the farmers?

5. Is it the intention of the Government to continue the services of this Board to handle the crop of next season?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1. Twelve.

2. I have not the exact record but probably 70 to 75.

3. Of the monthly expenditure of the board, including salaries of the members, employees and operating expenses, I have no record.

4. None of the expenses are paid by the Government out of the general revenue. The Wheat Board is appointed a board to purchase and sell wheat. It performs the operation, makes the advance cash payments, pays all expense out of gross receipts, and at the end of the transaction, distributes to the original producers whatever sums may be coming to them pro rata.

5. It is not the present intention of the Government to continue the services of this Board.

SMALL FLOUR MILLS.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. Is the report correct that most of the small flour mills in the country are closed down on account of the market being limited to the local market?

2. Are the small mills suffering from the set price of flour, not being able to compete against the large mills?

3. Is there a tax imposed upon flour shipped to the Orient? If so, why?

4. Is there any intention of removing this tax?

5. Is the Government aware that the Oriental market is about the only export market for flour available at the present?

6. If so, why is that market not encouraged?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1. It is not correct to say that a greater number of small flour mills in the country are closed down than in normal times on account of the market being limited. Whether it is due to that or not it is difficult to say.

2. The Government has no information on which to base an answer generally applicable.

3. No.

4. Answered by No. 3.

5. The Government is not aware that the Oriental market is about the only export market for flour available at present. Its information would lead to a contrary opinion.

6. Practically answered by 5, but in no way is the market in the East discouraged.

CANTEEN PROFITS—CANADA'S SHARE.

Mr. ANDREWS:

1. Is it now possible for the Government to estimate what share, if any, of the profits of the Expeditionary Forces Canteens and the Navy and Army Canteens, which operated in areas occupied by the Canadian Military and Naval Forces, will be apportioned to the Canadian Government? If so, what is such estimate?

2. Has an Overseas Board of Trustees been appointed to receive payments on this account? If so, who constitutes such board?

3. What sums, if any, have already been transferred to such Board of Trustees?

4. What is the total amount of Regimental Funds transferred by the Overseas Paymaster General to the trustees of the various units interested?

5. Has any deduction been made from the Regimental or Canteen Funds because of charges for barrack damages?

6. Is it the intention of the Government to deduct from Regimental or Canteen Funds any amount in payment of claims for damages to canteen equipment and stores during riots in Canadian Military Camps? If so, what will be the amount of such deduction?

7. Is the Government prepared to announce any policy in respect to the disbursement of any sum that may be apportioned to Canadian Forces, as accruing from Overseas Canteen profits or Regimental Funds?

8. Is it the intention of the Government to expend such sums for the exclusive benefit of former members of the Canadian Expeditionary Forces and their dependents?

9. Will the Government consult with representatives of returned soldier organizations in respect to the disbursement of such sums?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL, for Sir Edward Kemp:

1. It is not now possible for the Government to estimate what amount of the profits of the Expeditionary Force Canteens (France) and the Navy and Army Canteen Board will be apportioned to the Canadian Government as these institutions have not yet been able to complete their balance sheets to the termination of their period of trading.

2. (a) Yes.

(b) Minister of Overseas Military Forces of Canada, High Commissioner for Canada, in London, Chief of the General Staff, Overseas Military Forces of Canada. This board appointed the Accountant-General, Overseas Military Forces of Canada, Secretary-Treasurer.

[Sir George Foster.]

3. £193,434.13.4.

4. Units of the Overseas Military Forces of Canada have transferred £118,612. 7. 4. to their respective trustees in Canada. The Paymaster General, Overseas Military Forces of Canada, transferred £45,997. 0. 4. of this amount for the units concerned, the balance having been transferred by such units themselves.

5. Units of the Overseas Military Forces of Canada in England maintained a Barrack Damage Fund from which they made payments for barrack damages. Where a unit was disbanded its surplus funds were paid over to the Paymaster General, Overseas Military Forces of Canada, in trust. Any payments for barrack damages or otherwise made thereafter from these funds were made in accordance with the conditions of trust.

6. The amount of damage done by members of the Canadian Forces to canteen equipment and stores the property of the Navy and Army Canteen Board will be deducted by that board from the profits payable by it. The amount has not yet been definitely ascertained.

7. This matter is under consideration.

8. Answered by No. 7.

9. Yes.

FARM LABOUR FOR SPRING WORK.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. Is any effort being made to obtain farm labour to meet the needs for spring work?

2. Is there a scarcity of such labour at the present time?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. The Dominion Provincial Employment Service is endeavouring to secure the necessary farm labour to meet the needs for spring work, and already more than 500 placements are being made on farms weekly. The Employment Service reports 504 unplaced applicants in the agricultural group on Mrch 6, 1920, and 951 unfilled vacancies; 614 applicants for farm labour were referred to vacancies during the week ending March 6, and 530 placements were made, of which 405 were made in the three Praire Provinces.

A conference of representatives of the Dominion and Provincial Employment Services was held at Calgary, March 8, 9 and 10, and the question of securing an adequate supply of farm labour was discussed. There was general agreement that it would be impossible to indicate the farm labour requirements with any degree of accuracy for some weeks' time, as the farmers are waiting until the spring is more advanced before registering their orders. In as far as pos-

sible, however, the situation is being anticipated. Numbers of men are now being released by the lumbering companies in Northern Manitoba and Saskatchewan and by the mining companies in the Crows Nest Pass, and it was thought an effort should be made to divert them directly to employment on farms. Temporary employment offices have been accordingly opened in Manitoba and Saskatchewan for that purpose, and the opening of one or two temporary offices in the Crows Nest Pass is under consideration. As soon as the workers are released from the mines and camps, efforts will be made to register them at the temporary offices and to send each man on reduced transportation to a farm job.

2. There is every possibility that the demand for farm labour will be satisfied.

CANADA WHEAT BOARD.

Mr CHISHOLM:

1. Who are the members of the Canadian Wheat Board?
2. What salary is paid each member of said board?
3. What other allowance is paid to each of them?
4. Is there a tax of $2 or any amount upon a barrel of flour exported from Canada?
5. If so, by whom is this tax imposed and what is its object?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1. Jas. Stewart, chairman; H. W. Wood, F. W. Riddell, W. A. Black, Norman McL. Patterson, Wm. L. Best, C. B. Watts, Frank O. Fowler, William H. McWilliams, Jos. Quintal, Lieut.-Col. J. Z. Fraser, Wm. A. Matheson.

2. Only the chairman and assistant chairman of the board are paid salaries. No salary has yet been recommended to or approved by the Government in regard to these officials.

3. The members of the board outside of those I have mentioned are paid no salary. They get travelling and living expenses and they get a per diem allowance when they are absent from their homes on the business of the board, at Winnipeg.

4. There is no export tax on flour, nor has there been any.

5. Answered by No. 4.

PEACE WITH ENEMY COUNTRIES.

Mr. PARENT:

1. When will the Proclamation declaring under the War Measures Act, 1914, that the war between Great Britain and her Allies and the German and Austrian Empires and their Allies, is at an end, be published?
2. Has the Government of Canada, or any member thereof given any consideration to the question as to whether it is advisable to publish said Proclamation?
3. If so, why has the said Proclamation not been published?
4. Until the publication of this Proclamation are goods coming from or going to Germany, Austria or any other country which was their Ally, allowed to be received by or exported from Canada?
5. Has the Government any information as to whether trade is being carried on between the inhabitants of Great Britain, France and the United States, or any of them, and the inhabitants of Germany, Austria and their Allies, or any of them?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. When peace shall have been legally restored with the last of the enemy powers.

2. Yes.

3. Because the time for it has not yet arrived.

4. With Germany and Austria, yes.

5. The Government is informed that trade is being carried on between the inhabitants of Great Britain, France and United States and the countries with which peace has been concluded.

RIVIERE-DU-LOUP SHOPS.

*Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Of the ninety employees transferred from Rivière-du-Loup shops to St. Malo shops, how many were single and how many were married?
2. How many women and children are dependent on said married men?
3. What is the total population thus taken from Rivière-du-Loup?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. There have been 93 employees transferred, of which 33 are single and 60 married.

2. 227 women and children and 29 other dependents, total 256.

3. 349.

NATIONAL RAILWAYS AND EXPRESS COMPANIES.

Mr. DECHENE:

1. What are the conditions imposed on the Dominion Express Company for the service of National Railways agents and the use of offices in the stations of said railways?
2. Is it the intention to give the same privileges to the Canadian Express Company?
3. The Canadian National Railways taking control of the Canadian Express Company, is it the intention to give to the latter the exclusive privilege of the service of agents and stations on said railways?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. The Dominion Express Company pay the Canadian Government Railways 50 per cent of its gross earnings for the service of that railways' agents and the use of

offices and stations of said railways. Also the privilege of operating on their lines.

2. The Canadian Express Company operates on the Canadian Government Railways on the same basis as the Dominion Express Company.

3. This being a question of policy, it will be considered by the Board of Management.

CANADA HIGHWAYS ACT.

Mr. FRIPP:

1. Upon what date were the regulations called for by the Canada Highways Act (Chapter 54, 10 Geo. V) promulgated in the Canada Gazette?

2. Were these regulations communicated directly to the Governments of the several provinces, or only through the medium of the official publication?

3. Have all the provincial governments accepted the conditions of the Canada Highways Act and the regulations founded upon it?

4. If not, which provincial governments so far have refrained from accepting the provisions of the Act?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. December 13, 1919.

2. The regulations called for the Canada Highways Act (Chapter 54, 10 Geo. V.) were communicated directly to the governments of the several provinces.

3. Five of the different Provincial Governments have filed with the department, their general programme map of a system of selected highways to be constructed or improved conforming to the terms of the Canada Highways Act and the regulations thereunder, and the remaining Provincial Governments are, they advise, working on their general plans in this connection. The department has not been advised that the conditions of the Act and the regulations thereunder are not satisfactory to any province.

4. Answered by No. 3.

NAVY LEAGUE OF CANADA.

*Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. What is the Navy League of Canada?

2. Is it a Government enterprise?

3. What is the object of the League?

4. For what purpose are funds collected in the name of the League?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The answer to the second question is No. The first, third and fourth questions are not answerable by the Government. If the hon. member wishes that information he should apply to the officers of the League. The Government has no information with reference to their aims, objects or operations.

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

WHEAT SHIPMENTS BY FARMERS INTO UNITED STATES.

*Mr. MACNUTT:

1. Is the Government aware that it is reported that some farmers who live too far from the United States boundary to haul wheat from their farms by waggon, shipped same by the carload to some point near the boundary, loaded it into waggons and crossed the line, thus getting the benefit of the United States market?

2. If this report is correct, will such farmers be compelled to pay the Wheat Board the amount received for such wheat, less the initial price fixed by the Board, and receive participation certificates therefor?

3. Will holders of participation certificates receive a proportionate share of any extra price obtained by such farmers?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Government is aware that it has been reported that some farmers who live too far away from the United States' boundary haul wheat from their barns by waggon, ship the same by carload to some point near the boundary, load it into waggons and cross the line, thus getting the benefit of the United States market, but neither the Government nor the Wheat Board has any definite information other than rumour. Question No. 2 is practically answered by reply to No. 1 and the same with regard to question No. 3.

PARTICIPATION CERTIFICATES.

*Mr. MACNUTT:

Will the holders of participation certificates receive any allowance to compensate them for the reduction in value of such certificates by reason of reduced prices for seed wheat, allowed on compassionate grounds to farmers in dried out areas?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No.

*Mr. MACNUTT::

1. Will Canadian farmers near the International boundary who have marketed grain by waggon loads into the United States be compelled to account to the Wheat Board for the amount received by them over and above the initial price fixed by the Board?

2. Will holders of participation certificates receive a proportionate share of any extra price received by Canadian farmers marketing by waggon loads into the United States?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The answer to each question is in the negative.

INDIAN RESERVES IN CANADA.

Mr. CANNON:

1. How many Indian reserves are there in Canada?

2. Where are they situated?

3. How many lots are there in said reserves, and how many buildings thereon?
4. How many Indians are there in Canada?
5. How many in each province?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. 1,625.

2.

Nova Scotia	46
Prince Edward Island	3
New Brunswick	26
Quebec	21
Ontario	157
Manitoba	82
Saskatchewan	116
Alberta	84
British Columbia	1,085
Yukon	5
Total	1,625

3. As many of the reserves are not subdivided into lots, this information cannot be given.

	Stone, Brick and Frame Dwellings.	Other Dwellings.	Outbuildings, etc.	Public Property.
Alberta	228	1,200	1,950	72
British Columbia	4,073	2,951	4,639	299
Manitoba	125	1,847	1,566	119
New Brunswick	321	38	183	31
Nova Scotia	342	61	155	31
Ontario	1,895	2,160	5,826	306
Prince Edward Island	49	22	23	7
Quebec	1,185	259	1,871	68
Saskatchewan	79	1,619	2,402	108
Totals	8,297	10,157	18,614	1,033

Grand total of buildings, 38,101.

4. 105,998.

5.

Alberta	8,837
British Columbia	25,694
Manitoba	11,583
New Brunswick	1,846
Nova Scotia	2,031
Ontario	26,411
Prince Edward Island	292
Quebec	13,366
Saskatchewan	10,646
Northwest Territories	3,764
Yukon	1,528
Total	105,998

CANADIAN VICTORY BONDS.

*Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Is the Government aware that many Victory Bonds of 1919 have not been delivered yet?
2. Is the Government aware that the bonds subscribed through English-Canadian banks have been delivered for over six months, and those subscribed through French-Canadian banks are not yet delivered?
3. If so, what is the reason of the delay?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1, 2 and 3. As far as the Government is aware, all Victory Loan Bonds of 1919, upon which payments in full have been made, have been delivered to subscribers, both in French and English text.

Deliveries are made through the medium of the chartered banks. The various banks requisition the nearest Assistant Receiver General's office to cover the requirements of subscribers through their office. In the case of subscribers desiring fully registered bonds the banks requisition the Department of Finance; all such requisitions have been filled to date. The above applies to the English-Canadian banks as well as the French-Canadian banks.

PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION.

*M. DESLAURIERS:

Has the Government taken into consideration the system of election by Proportional Representation, or is it the intention of the Government to take it into consideration during the present session?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This matter is at present under the consideration of the Government.

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE.

M. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Who were the Canadian representatives at the International Labour Conference last fall?
2. What was the amount expended in connection with this delegation?
3. Who were the Canadian representatives at the Labour Conference at Paris?
4. What was the amount expended in relation thereto?

Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. Government Delegates: The Honourable Gideon D. Robertson, Senator and Minister of Labour of Canada. The Hon. Newton W. Rowell, K.C., M.P., President of the Privy Council of Canada, and Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs.

Advisers to Dominion Government delegates: Mr. F. Acland, Deputy Minister of Labour of Canada. Mr. Loring C. Christie,

Legal Adviser to the Department of External Affairs of Canada.

As named by the Provincial Governments: Nova Scotia—Mr. Daniel A. Cameron, of Sydney, Member of the Provincial Legislature of Nova Scotia. New Brunswick—The Honourable C. W. Robinson, of Moncton, Member without portfolio of the Government of the Province of New Brunswick. Prince Edward Island—The Honourable W. L. Mackenzie King, C.M.G., M.P., of Ottawa. Manitoba—The Honourable Thos. H. Johnson, of Winnipeg, Attorney General for the Province of Manitoba. Quebec—Mr. Louis Guyon, of Montreal, Deputy Minister of Labour for the Province of Quebec. Ontario—Dr. Walter A. Riddell, of Toronto, Deputy Minister of Labour for the Province of Ontario. Saskatchewan—Mr. T. M. Molloy, of Regina, Secretary of the Bureau of Labour for the Province of Saskatchewan. Alberta—The Honourable C. R. Mitchell, of Edmonton, Provincial Treasurer of the Province of Alberta. British Columbia—Mr. J. D. McNiven, of Victoria, Deputy Minister of Labour for the Province of British Columbia.

Secretary of Canadian Delegation (and Adviser): Mr. Gerald H. Brown, Secretary of the Reconstruction and Development Committee of the Government of Canada.

Non-Government delegates, (recommendation as for employers received from the Canadian Manufacturers' Assn., and for employees from the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada.)

Employers' Delegate: Mr. S. R. Parsons, President, British American Oil Co., Ltd., Toronto, Ont.

Advisers to same: Mr. J. T. Stirrett, General Secretary, Canadian Manufacturers' Assn., Toronto, Ont.; Mr. E. Blake Robertson, Secretary, Canadian Manufacturers' Assn., Ottawa, Ont.; Mr. J. B. Hugg, Canadian Manufacturers' Assn., Winnipeg, Man.; Mr. J. G. Merrick, Secretary, Employers' Assn., Toronto, Ont.; Mr. Sam. Harris, The Harris Lithographing Co., Ltd., Toronto, Ont.

Workers' Delegate: Mr. P. M. Draper, Secretary-Treasurer, Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, and President Ottawa Typographical Union, Ottawa.

Advisers to same: Mr. Tom Moore, President Trades and Labour Congress of Canada; Mr. Arthur Martel, Vice-President, Trades and Labour Congress of Canada; Mr. Robert Baxter, Vice-President, Trades and Labour Congress of Canada; Mr. David Rees, Vice-President, Trades and Labour Congress of Canada; Mrs. Kathleen Derry, Member, Boot and Shoe Workers' Union.

2. $20,320.13.

3. Mr. F. A. Acland, Deputy Minister of Labour, was apointed by the Government as substitute for the Minister of Labour to attend a meeting of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office in Paris on January 26, 1920. Mr. Tom Moore, President of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, was chosen by the labour interests as substitute for Mr. P. M. Draper, of Ottawa, to attend the meeting of the foregoing Body in Paris as one of the labour representatives.

4. Mr. Acland's account has not been presented. Mr. Moore's account will be paid by the International Labour Office.

CANADIAN MILITARY POLICE.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. Was a special guard of Canadian Military Police Corps recruited for the purpose of assisting in the transportation of Chinese Coolies across Canada?

2. If so, on what date was this unit mobilized?

3. For what length of period were the first men taken on, enlisted?

4. Was eight months the period mentioned in their contract?

5. Were many discharged previous to the fulfilment of the eight months' contract?

6. Were any fines imposed on desertion cases without a court martial being held?

7. Was this unit a part of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, or the Canadian Permanent Force?

8. Were the discharge certificates issued under the headings of the Canadian Expeditionary Force or otherwise?

9. Under whose jurisdiction was this unit?

10. If members of this unit absented themselves from parade what was the punishment?

11. Were many fines imposed; if so, how many, and what was the total amount of fines paid?

12. What has become of the money paid in fines?

13. Was each special guard given an issue of clothing and equipment when joining this unit?

14. Were handcuffs included in this equipment?

15. Were some of the guards on demobilization in case of deficiency charged $5 for these handcuffs while others were charged $8.10 plus a fine?

16. If so, what amount of money was so paid in fines, and what has become of it?

17. After serving six months, does a soldier's uniform become his own?

18. Were any of the members of this special guard of C.M.P.C. charged in full for their uniform on demobilization or after wearing said uniform six months?

19. Were any members of this special guard given any clothing allowance?

20. If so, what amount?

Hon. Mr. GUTHRIE:

1. Yes, at the request of the Imperial Government, and all expenses connected with this force are paid by the Imperial Government.
2. Septembr 15, 1919.
3. Specially enlisted men were attested for a term of eight months, providing His Majesty should so long require their services, or until legally discharged.
4. Answered by No. 3.
5. It is expected that the entire Guard will be demobilized before the eight months has elapsed.
6. No.
7. Canadian Expeditionary Force.
8. Discharge certificates at first were made out under the heading of Permanent Force, and later that of the Canadian Expeditionary Force.
9. Department of Militia and Defence.
10. A definite answer cannot be given to this question, as it would depend entirely upon the circumstances of each individual case.
11. No.
12. Answered by No. 11.
13. Those men transferred to Special Guard were already in possession of clothing and equipment, and those men specially enlisted were issued with clothing and equipment on joining the unit.
14. One pair of handcuffs per man is issued to each Military Policeman.
15. In all cases where a man was deficient a pair of handcuffs, the stoppage was $8.09. No fine imposed, as a soldier can only be fined for drunkenness.
16. Answered by No. 15.
17. All men serving in Canada only, issued with uniforms and greatcoats since July 1, 1918, are required to turn in the following articles of uniform: Greatcoat (or cloak), trousers (or breeches), jacket, cap, forage. Men issued with clothing prior to July 1, 1918, are permitted to retain uniform.
18. No.
19. Yes.
20. $35.

* Mr. TOBIN:

1. Is there stationed at Halifax a special guard of Canadian Military Police Corps?
2. If so, how many men compose this corps?
3. What are their duties?
4. Is one Capt. Legg attached to this corps?
5. If so, is he a pensioned officer?
6. What pension is he receiving?
7. Did Capt. Legg see service in France?
8. If so, for how long?

Hon. Mr. GUTHRIE:

1. Yes, at the request of the Imperial Government, and all expenses connected with this force are paid by the Imperial Government,
2. Return of strength dated 23rd March, 1920, shows 255 all ranks.
3. Guarding coolies of the Chinese Labour Corps being returned to China via Canada, while they are in this country.
4. Yes.
5. Yes.
6. At present receiving $1,243.45 per annum, long service pension, based on 26 years' service, in accordance with the Militia Pension Act.

His present salary, though advanced by the Canadian Government, is recoverable from Imperial Government, and, therefore, is not paid out of Canadian funds.

7. No.
8. Answered by No. 7.

JAPANESE IN CANADA.

* Mr. TOBIN:

1. How many persons of Japanese origin were residing in Canada in 1911?
2. How many persons of Japanese origin are residing in Canada at present?
3. How many persons of Japanese origin and residing in Canada have been naturalized as Canadian citizens under the old Naturalization Act, Chapter 77, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, and the 1907-1908 and 1914 amendments thereto?
4. How many persons of Japanese origin residing in Canada at present have been naturalized as British subjects under the Naturalization Act of 1914, Chapter 44?

Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

1. 9,021.
2. No information.
3. 7,534.
4. 106.

CHINESE IN CANADA.

* Mr. TOBIN:

1. How many persons of Chinese origin were residing in Canada in 1911?
2. How many persons of Chinese origin are residing in Canada at present?
3. How many persons of Chinese origin and residing in Canada have been naturalized as Canadian citizens under the old Naturalization Act, Chapter 77, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, and the 1907-1908 and 1914 amendments thereto?
4. How many persons of Chinese origin residing in Canada at present have been naturalized as British subjects under the Naturalization Act of 1914, Chapter 44?

Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

1. 27,774.
2. No information.
3. 4,883.
4. 25.

GERMAN AND AUSTRIAN BOOKS.

Mr. CROWE:

1. Is it a fact that certain books printed in the German or Austrian languages are admitted free of duty into Canada while those printed in English or French are subject to duty?
2. If so, why?
3. Is it the intention of the Government to cancel this preference? If so, when?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. Tariff Item 172 provides for the free admission of "books printed in any lan- "guage other than the English and French "languages or in any two languages not "being English or French or in any three "or more languages."
2. By authority of Parliament, Customs Tariff Act, April 12th, 1907.
3. The matter is under consideration.

HIGHWAY GRANTS.

Mr. GERVAIS:

What sums of money were paid up to date to each of the provinces by virtue of the law, 9-10 George V, Chapter 54, entitled: An Act to encourage the Construction and Improvement of Highways?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. No payments have been made to date under the Act.

HUDSON BAY RAILWAY.

Mr. CAMPBELL:

1. When was work on the Hudson Bay Railway commenced?
2. When was work on construction stopped: (*a*) on the railway, and (*b*) on the terminals?
3. Is the grade completed to the Bay?
4. If so, when was it completed?
5. What mileage of steel is laid?
6. When was this work completed?
7. What mileage is yet to be laid?
8. What was the cost of bridge over the Nelson river at Manitou Rapids?
9. What was the cost of bridge over Nelson river at Kettle Rapids?
10. When was Kettle Rapids bridge built?
11. What was the total expenditure at the end of each of the fiscal years, March 31, 1914-15-16-17-18: (*a*) on the railway (*b*) on the terminals?
12. What is the estimated cost of completing the railway by laying steel on the unfinished portion?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. The contract for the substructure of bridge over the Saskatchewan river at Pas was executed Nov. 5th, 1910. The general contract for Section No. 1 was executed September 25th, 1911.
2. (a) 1918 (b) November 1917.
3. Nominally completed. Some trestling and small structures to be built, also settlement of embankments and train filling at various points to be made up.
4. 1917.
5. 332 miles.

[Mr. Sifton.]

6. 1918.
7. 92 miles.
8. $215,596.34.
9. $406,572.65.
10. During years 1917 and 1918.
11. (a) March 31, 1914, $4,569,908.01; March 31, 1915, $7,825,982.40; March 31, 1916, $10,809,407.87; March 31, 1917, $12,601,-598.26; March 31, 1918, $13,890,387.87.

(b) March 31, 1914, $1,517,124.66; March 31, 1915, $3,588,668.03; March 31, 1916, $4,-940,500.56; March 31, 1917, $5,752,590.11; March 31, 1918, $6,343,499.50.

12. The estimated cost of completing the tracklaying into Port Nelson is $1,750,000, but to complete the railway will require $4,000,000.

FLAX FIBRE GRANTS.

Mr. MYERS:

1. Has any grant or aid been given by the Federal Government to any individual, company or companies to assist in the development of flax fibre in Saskatchewan?
2. If so, what amount or amounts have been granted and in what years?
3. What are the names of the persons or companies?
4. Has the Government any report as to the progress made in the development of flax fibre in Saskatchewan?

Hon. S. F. TOLMIE:

1. No.
2. None.
3. No persons or companies.
4. No.

INCOME AND BUSINESS PROFITS TAX COLLECTION.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

At how many places in the different provinces, respectively, are officials of the Finance Department located for the administration and collection of the Income Tax and the Business Profits Tax?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Prince Edward Island—Charlottetown, one. Nova Scotia —Halifax, Sydney, two. New Brunswick— St. John, one. Quebec—Montreal, Quebec, two. Ontario—Ottawa, Kingston, Brockville, Belleville, Toronto, Hamilton, Brantford, St. Catharines, Cayuga, London, Walkerville, Fort William, Stratford, thirteen. Manitoba—Winnipeg, Brandon, two. Saskatchewan—Regina, Weyburn, Prince Albert, Saskatoon, Moose Jaw, Yorkton, six. Alberta—Calgary, Edmonton, two. British Columbia—Vancouver, Nelson, Victoria, three. Yukon Territory—Dawson, one. Steps are being taken to open further offices at Dauphin, Man., Lethbridge, Alta., and Prince Rupert, B.C.

SMUGGLED AUTOMOBILES.

Mr. PREVOST:

In what way does the Minister of Customs dispose of the smuggled automobiles seized by his department?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

The Minister of Customs gives his decision in the matter respecting the seizure, as provided by section 177 of the Customs Act.

If the automobile be forfeited by the terms of such decision, it is disposed of in the manner provided by section 143 of the Customs Act, that is, either by public auction, or as the minister sees fit instead of being sold by public auction.

Section 143 of the Customs Act is as follows: "Sales of goods forfeited or otherwise liable to be sold under this Act shall be by public auction, and after a reasonable public notice, and subject to such further regulations as are made by the Governor in Council; but, in any case, the minister may order vessels, goods, vehicles or things forfeited to be disposed of as he sees fit, instead of being sold by public auction."

INDIAN TRIBES—EMANCIPATION.

Mr. CANNON:

1. Are there any Indian Tribes who, by petitions or otherwise have asked the Government to amend certain clauses of the Indian Act as regards their emancipation? If so, what tribes?

2. Has the Government received any demands by petition or otherwise to amend the Indian Act, in order to emancipate them, from certain municipalities adjoining their reserves, or from certain individuals or corporations located in those municipalities?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. Yes. Moravians of the Thames, Ontario.

2. No.

WAR TAX STAMPS.

Mr. LESAGE:

1. Does the Government intend to amend the law which compels the retailer to affix a war tax stamp upon patent medicines and certain toilet preparations at the time they are sold to the consumer?

2. Is the Government aware that in many cases the said stamps are not affixed as required by law?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. Any announcement as to amendments to the Special War Revenue Act, 1915, will, as is customary in regard to taxation changes, be made in the Budget Speech of the Minister of Finance.

2. In all cases brought to the attention of the Government prosecutions have followed in accordance with the Act.

HOARDING OF FOODSTUFFS.

Mr. LEDUC:

Does the Government intend to bring radical remedies to the high cost of living by investigating as to where food stuff is hoarded or stored?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Government is not in a position to answer this question as put, unless it affirms a certain thing, namely, that the mere investigation of how much butter or other commodities are stored at a warehouse will have a radical effect on the high cost of living.

BUTTER PRICES.

Mr. LEDUC:

1. Is the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture aware that butter in cold storage has made a jump from 57 to 65 cents in one week?

2. If so, is it the intention of the Government to take steps to prevent such increases in the future?

Hon. S. F. TOLMIE:

1. No. I am informed that the wholesale price of butter on the Montreal market varied between 60 and 66c from March 1st to March 25th. During that period butter was sold as low as 57 to 59c and as high as 68c. The high price was paid for butter of the finest quality and the lower prices for inferior quality, which accounts in part for the range in price.

2. It does not appear to be practicable to prevent these increases or decreases in the price of dairy products.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT.

Mr. WHIDDEN:

1. Has the Government or any member thereof received any communication, written or verbal, from the Ontario Branch of the Dominion Alliance, or any officer thereof, in reference to the applicability to the province of Ontario of the legislation of last session known as An Act to amend the Canada Temperance Act?

2. If so, what was the nature of such communication?

3. What answer, if any, has the Government made thereto?

4. Has the Government received any resolution in reference to such legislation from the Dominion Committee on Liquor Legislation?

5. If so, what is the nature of such resolution?

6. Has the Government any information as to what organizations are included in the Federation known as the Dominion Committee on Liquor Legislation?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1. Yes.

2 and 3. On March 5 the President of the Privy Council received the following letter from Mr. C. E. Steele, President of the Ontario Branch of the Dominion Alliance:

Dear Mr. Rowell,—There are one or two points which we would greatly like to have cleared up with regard to Bill 26.

As you know there seems to be conflicting legal opinion as to whether or not it applies to this province. Enclosed are copies of opinions from two eminent counsel.

You will readily recognize the desirability, indeed, imperative need that all such doubts should be removed.

Two things we would like to know:

(1) Was it the intention of the Government that the Act should apply to Ontario?

(2) Would the Government be prepared to bring in legislation removing all doubt?

To which the President of the Privy Council replied on March 8, as follows:

I have your letter of March 5 in reference to Bill No. 26, "An Act to Amend the Canada Temperance Act." You ask two questions, namely:

(1) Was it the intention of the Government that the Act should apply to Ontario?

(2) Would the Government be prepared to bring in legislation removing all doubt?

In answer to question No. 1, would say that it certainly was the intention of the Government that the Act should apply to the province of Ontario, and in the opinion of the Department of Justice the Act does so apply.

In answer to question 2, would say that as the Department of Justice advises that the Act in its present form does apply to the province of Ontario, no amendment would appear to be necessary. In this connection I would draw your attention to the last paragraph of section 154 of the amended Act, which is as follows:

"Provided, however that the provisions of this section shall not apply or extend to the importation, manufacture, sending, taking, delivery, carriage or transportation into or within, or the sale or agreeing to sell for delivery in, any province in which the prohibition is in force, of any intoxicating liquor for sacramental or medicinal purposes, or for manufacturing or commercial purposes, other than for the manufacture or use thereof as a beverage, or to any intoxicating liquor which under the laws of the province or territory in which the prohibition is in force, may be lawfully sold therein."

You will note particularly the concluding clause of this paragraph, viz., "or to any intoxicating liquor which under the laws of the province or territory in which the prohibition is in force, may be lawfully sold therein." The use of this language shows that it was the intention of the Government and of Parliament that the Act should apply to a province in which the general rule was prohibition, but in which some particular class of liquor might lawfully be sold, such as native wine in the province of Ontario.

I might add, however, that in view of the opinion Mr. Ewart has given to you on the matter, the Department of Justice is taking the opinion of eminent counsel upon the question, and my own expectation is that the opinion of such counsel will confirm that of the Department of Justice. Should such not be the case, the question would then undoubtedly receive further consideration at the hands of the Government."

A supplementary telegram was sent to Mr. Steele on March 10 as follows:

"Referring my letter March eighth, opinion received by Government from eminent counsel confirms opinion of Department of Justice that Act of last session clearly applies to Ontario."

The counsel referred to was Mr. Eugene Lafleur, K.C., of Montreal and the following is his opinion:

"This Act provides for the taking of a vote in any province of Canada in which there is at the time in force a law prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquor for beverage purposes, such vote being taken for or against the following prohibition:

"That the importation and the bringing of intoxicating liquors into such province may be forbidden."

"The question submitted for opinion is whether the provisions of this statute apply to Ontario inasmuch as in that province the Ontario Temperance Act, while generally prohibiting the liquor traffic, nevertheless allows manufacturers of native wine to sell their product in wholesale quantities only. The opinion has been expressed that in view of the existence of this permission to sell native wine the province of Ontario cannot come within the language of the above statute because the law of Ontario prohibits only the partial sale of intoxicating liquor and it is argued that between a very limited prohibition such as a statute prohibiting the sale of brandy only, and one which extended to all intoxicating liquor with a slight exception there is no point at which a halt can be made.

"I am unable to adopt this view inasmuch as it appears to me that the context makes it clear that Parliament intended the statute to apply not merely to provinces in which total and unrestricted prohibition exists, but also to provinces in which what is generally understood as prohibitory legislation is in force, even though that legisla-

tion may make certain exceptions to the otherwise general rule.

"Section 154 of the statute enacts that if prohibition is, in consequence of a favourable vote, declared to be in force, no exportation shall be allowed, no sale or contract to sell liquor to be delivered in the province shall be allowed and the transportation of liquor through the province is to take place only by common carrier and no package is to be opened in transit.

"The same section then contains the proviso that its provisions shall not apply or extend to any intoxicating liquor which under the laws of the province or territory in which the prohibition is in force may be lawfully sold therein.

"From this language it seems perfectly clear that "prohibition" may be in force in a province whose law permits the sale of some intoxicating liquor, and that Parliament intended the Act to apply to provinces like Ontario, whose laws contain some exception allowing the sale of intoxicating liquors in derogation of the general principle of the prohibitory legislation.

"In other words, the amendment to the Canada Temperance Act applies not only to provinces which have absolute and unrestricted prohibition, but also to those which have a prohibitory law with qualification and exceptions and in the latter case effect is given to such qualifications and exceptions by the Dominion legislation."

Subsequently, on Tuesday, March 23rd, a deputation from the Ontario Branch of the Dominion Alliance consisting of Mr. Steele, President, Mr. Spence, Secretary, and Mr. D. V. Sinclair, waited upon the Government and requested that in view of the alleged doubt as to the applicability of the Act of last session to the province of Ontario, the Government should remove the doubt by amending legislation, or, in the alternative, should refer the matter to the Supreme Court for decision as to whether the Act applies to Ontario or not. To which the Government replied that as it appeared perfectly clear to the Department of Justice that the Act of last session does apply to the province of Ontario, no amendment to the law is necessary and that therefore the Government could not undertake to introduce an amending Act, nor could the Government see its way clear to grant a reference to the Supreme Court to interpret the Act as the Government has no doubt as to its correct interpretation or its applicability to the Province of Ontario.

4. Yes.

5. The Government has received from Dr. Andrew S. Grant, Chief Executive Officer of the Dominion Committee on Liquor Legislation, the following resolutions:

(1) Resolution passed at the Annual Meeting of the Dominion Committee on Liquor Legislation on January 13, 1920, held in Montreal:—

"That this Committee express its appreciation of the Liquor Legislation passed by the Dominion Parliament providing for a vote in each province on the importation of liquor for beverage purposes.

That this Committee recommends that each province be encouraged to secure a vote on the question of prohibiting importation of liquor for beverage uses.

That the idea of having the vote taken, in so far as this may be found feasible, on the same date in all the provinces be approved.

That the taking of the vote should be upon lists which include women citizens on the same terms as men."

2. Resolution passed at a Conference of Representative Methodists held in the City of Toronto on March 17, 1920 and a further resolution passed by the Executive of the General Board of Evangelism and Social Service of the Methodist Church:

"Rev. A. S. Grant, D.D.,
Excelsior Life Bldg.,
Toronto, Ont.

Dear Dr. Grant,

A conference of representative Methodists was held in Wesley Buildings on Wednesday, March 17th, 1920, to consider the present temperance situation in Ontario. Very careful consideration was given every phase of the subject, including expert legal opinion, and the following resolution was adopted;

"Resolved, that this meeting, after giving consideration to the legal opinions submitted, and having before it the statement of the Provincial Premier, as published this morning.

Recommends the Executive of the General Board of Evangelism and Social Service to render every assistance towards the immediate submission of the referendum as provided in amendment to Canada Temperance Act enacted at the 1919 session by the Parliament of Canada.

The same afternoon the Executive of the General Board of Evangelism and Social Service of the Methodist Church again considered the question, and adopted the following resolution:—

That having considered the recommendation of the morning's meeting, this Executive hereby records its approval of the recommendation, and directs our General Secretary to notify the Referendum Committee.

the Government of Ontario and the Dominion Alliance.

We further appoint the following persons to represent this Board upon the Referendum Committee; The General Secretary, The Treasurer, Dr. Creighton, Dr. J. A. Long, and Mr. J. O. McCarthy, with Mr. Thomas and Mr. Coburn as alternates.

The Methodist Church, through its official representatives, will be ready to act with the Referendum Committee. We shall be glad to be informed as to any way in which we can advance the prohibition movement in this province.

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) T. Albert Moore,
General Secretary."

(3) Resolution passed by the Board of Home Missions and Social Service of the Presbyterian Church at its meeting in Toronto on March 17th;

" This Board of Home Missions and Social Service of the Presbyterian Church record their apprceiation of Prohibition legislation of the various provinces and of the Federal Parliament, express their conviction that it is most desirable that the legislatures of all the provinces should request the Federal Government to take a plebiscite on the question of the importaion of liquor into dry provinces for beverage purposes at as early a date as possible, and, if possible, on a uniform date; and appoint delegates to be named by the Convener to represent the Church and to co-operate with the Ontario Referendum Committee and the Dominion Prohibition Committee in pressing for complete prohibition throughout Canada of intoxicating liquor for beverage use."

6. The following organizations are included in the Dominion Committee on Liquor Legislation:—People's Prohibition Association of B.C.; Social Service Council of Alberta; Social Service Council of Saskatchewan; Social Service Council of Manitoba; Ontario Branch of Dominion Alliance; Citizens' Committee of 100 of Ontario; Anti-Alcoholic Leagues of Quebec; Quebec Branch of Dominion Alliance; New Brunswick Temperance Alliance; Social Service Council of Nova Scotia; P. E. I. Temperance Alliance; People's Prohibition Movement of Yukon.

ORLEANS ISLAND PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR:

1. What are the names of the contractors who tendered for the reconstruction or the repairs to be done at the wharves of St. Laurent, St. Jean, St. Francois and Ste. Famille, Island of Orleans, in the County of Quebec?

2. To whom and for what amount have the works been awarded?

[Sir George Foster.]

3. Does the Government intend to have those works executed at an early date?

4. Is it the intention of the Government to grant the numerous petitions signed by all the population of the Island of Orleans, asking for the expropriation of the wharf at Ste-Petronille, so as to make it a free wharf?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. St. Laurent—J. B. Gallibois, St. Pierre Montmagny, Que.; Trudel and Trudel, St. Irenee; Jos. Gosselin, Ltee., Levis; Thibault and Methot, Montmagny; O. Poliquin, Portneuf; Letourneau and Fortier, Montmagny; Beaumont and Boulanger, Montmagny; K. A. Morrison, Ottawa.

St. Jean—J. B. Gallibois, St. Pierre Montmagny; Methot and Thibault, Montmagny; Veilleux and Lemieux, Levis; J. Raoul Boulanger, Montmagny; Jos. Gosselin, Ltee., Levis; Trudel and Trudel, St. Irenee; W. G. Charleson, Ottawa; O. Poliquin, Portneuf; Beaumont and Boulanger, Montmagny.

St. Francois—Jos. Gosselin, Ltee., Levis; Simeon Ratte, Ste. Anne de Beaupre; Trudel and Trudel, St. Irenee; Thibault and Thibault, and Paquet, Montmagny; Lachance, Ltee, Quebec.

St. Famille—Collin and Coulombe, Montmagny; Simeon Ratte, Ste. Anne de Beaupre; Beaumont and Boulanger, Montmagny; O. Poliquin, Portneuf; Thibault and Methot, Montmagny; Trudel and Trudel, St. Irenee; Jos. Gosselin, Ltee, Levis.

2. St. Laurent to Trudel and Trudel, for $19,042.97. St. Jean, to Methot and Thibault, $28,171.50. St. Famille and St. Francois contracts not awarded.

3. St. Laurent contract to be completed July 24, 1920. St. Francois contract to be completed August 7, 1920.

4. Matter under consideration.

THE LAST NATIONAL LOAN.

Mr. DECHENE:

1. What was the total amount subscribed in the last National Loan?

2. What amount has the Government accepted?

3. What amount has been paid in full by subscribers, and what are their names?

4. What amount has been partially paid and what percentage?

5. What amount is actually advanced by the banks to subscribers who have not paid in full their subscriptions?

6. What amount has the Government advanced to the banks in order to help them to carry the subscriptions not entirely paid?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. $673,000,000 (estimated).

2. $643,800,000.

3. March returns not yet received by department. Estimated about 90 per cent has

been paid up in full. There were some 830,000 subscribers through the various banks; the names of the subscribers are not furnished to the department by the banks except those requiring fully registered bonds.

4. Estimated about 10 per cent.

5. Department has no information.

6. No amount has been advanced.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

What was the value of goods, entitled to the British Preference, brought into Canada during the last fiscal year via American seaports, what American ports were thus utilized, and to what extent?

Mr. TOBIN:

1. Which military districts have been visited by Brig.-Gen. Langton between 1st October, 1918, and the 1st October, 1919?

2. In connection with the work of the Paymaster-General's branch of the Militia Department, were inspectors employed?

3. If so, which military districts were officially inspected by these inspectors, between the 1st October, 1918, and 1st October, 1919, and upon what dates were the inspections made?

4. Did Brig.-Gen. Langton, Acting Paymaster-General make any official inspection duties to the various military districts in Canada, between 1st October, 1918, and 1st October, 1919?

5. If so, how many journeys did he make to Toronto for this inspection work, and on what dates?

6. How many journeys to other military districts did Brig.-Gen. Langton make, between 1st October, 1918, and 1st October, 1919, and on what dates?

7. How many journeys, official or otherwise, to Toronto did Brig.-Gen. Langton make, between 1st October, 1918, and 1st October, 1919?

8. On whose authority did Brig.-Gen. Langton make these journeys?

9. Did Brig.-Gen. Langton obtain leave of absence for any of the journeys he made that were unofficial?

10. What number of these journeys were made on Government warrants or at Government expense?

11. What number of Government transport warrants were used by Brig.-Gen. Langton between the 1st October, 1918, and 1st October, 1919, for the following journeys: (a) from Ottawa to Toronto; (b) from Toronto to Ottawa; (c) for sleeping car accommodation from Ottawa to Toronto and from Toronto to Ottawa?

12. Did Brig.-Gen. Langton submit travelling claims for his expenses for journeys between Ottawa and Toronto and return?

13. If so, for what number of journeys and what was the total amount of his claims for travelling expenses, and what is the total amount which has been paid to Brig.-Gen. Langton on this account?

14. For how many days was travelling allowance of $8 a day paid for these journeys, and did the $8 in such cases cover a full period of 24 hours' absence?

15. Did Brig.-Gen. Langton's family reside in Toronto during the period from 1st October, 1918, to 1st October, 1919?

16. Did Brig.-Gen. Langton stay at his own residence in Toronto for any days on which he claimed the $8 a day travelling allowance?

17. If not, did he incur any expenditure for sleeping accommodation at any hotel in Toronto, or other place outside his own residence?

18. How often, and on what dates, did Brig.-Gen. Langton use Government motor cars in Toronto during this period?

19. Did Brig.-Gen. Langton charge on his travelling claims for cabs, street car fares or taxis during this period?

20. If so, upon what dates were such charges made?

21. Did Brig.-Gen. Langton, when Deputy Inspector-General, carry a name on the Deputy Inspector-General's pay lists and draw pay for a person after that person had returned to his civil occupation?

NOTICE OF MOTION FOR PRODUCTION OF PAPERS

Mr. ETHIER:

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams and reports relating to the re-classification of the Civil Service by American efficiency experts in the employ of the Arthur Young Company; also all documents relating thereto, which have been submitted to, and received by the Civil Service Commission and comprising: (a) a list of names who, in consequence of such re-classification and subsequently thereto, resigned from the service; (b) the reasons given in support of such resignations, and (c) the nature of the duties of each person who resigned.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have already asked that this order be remodelled. Any one can see that the question involves an immense amount of unnecessary work.

BRITISH NORTH AMERICA ACT AMENDMENTS.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH PROVINCIAL ATTORNEYS-GENERAL.

Mr. CASGRAIN:

For a copy of all correspondence exchanged between the Minister of Justice and the Attorneys-General of the different provinces of Canada, regarding the power of the Dominion of Canada to amend the British North America Act by its own Parliament.

Rt. Hon. Mr. DOHERTY: With reference to this motion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the correspondence so far exchanged is in the nature of a purely informal, unofficial interchange of views upon the question and of a confidential nature, and therefore at present there is no correspondence which it would be proper to bring down.

Mr. MORPHY: Mr. Speaker, as this is rather an important question, I would like the minister to repeat this answer, which was quite inaudible in this part of the Chamber.

Mr. DOHERTY: I said that the correspondence so far is in the nature of an unofficial, informal interchange of views upon the question and is of a confidential nature. There is, therefore, at present no correspondence which it would be proper to bring down.

Motion dropped.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. ROBB (for Mr. Archambault):

For a return showing (a) the total production of coal in Canada during the past ten years; (b) how much of said coal was anthracite; (c) the total importation of coal into Canada during the same period; (d) how much of same was anthracite; (e) the total exportation of coal from Canada during the past ten years, and (f) how much of this total was anthracite.

Mr. ROBB (for Mr. Archambault):

For a copy of the specifications and plans for the drydock at Vancouver, British Columbia, for which a subsidy is being granted to J. Coughlan & Sons, Limited, along with a copy of the contract between the Government and J. Coughlan & Sons, Limited, for the construction of the said drydock.

Mr. ROBB (for Mr. Archambault):

For a return giving a list of the names of all the officers employed at the Headquarters of the Militia Department, at Ottawa; their respective salaries; the date of their appointment, and the length of their services in the Canadian Expeditionary Force.

ALIEN IMMIGRANTS AND CANADIAN CITIZENSHIP.

Mr. MICHAEL STEELE (South Perth) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is essentian for the future national welfare of Canada that appropriate measures be taken by the Government to fit and prepare all immigrants of alien origin for assuming the duties and responsibilities of Canadian citizenship.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that this is the first occasion in our history that the subject matter of this resolution has been formally discussed by this House—an evidence, perhaps, of the extreme disregard which we have had in the past of the important subject of the Canadianization of our alien population.

For many years we have been receiving large numbers of newcomers, representing practically every nationality and every known tongue, every variety of dress and embracing both sexes of all ages, from the babe in arms to the grandfather and the grandmother—this motley crowd speaking eighty-five languages and dialects and representing fifty-three nationalities. I need scarcely point out that such a condition has created a problem which, at the present day at least, cannot be ignored by this country.

Let us look for a moment at the number of people who have come to our shores to make Canada their home. In the ten years from 1906 to 1915 inclusive there arrived more than 2,500,000 who came ostensibly to make this land their home, some temporarily, many of them permanently. They came, I believe, nearly all actuated by one idea—to live under better conditions than those which they had experienced in their home lands. But they knew nothing of Canadian life, of Canadian laws, of Canadian customs; many of them knew nothing of Canadian civilization. About one-third of the two and one-half million were from the continent of Europe, and this element especially would be described by the words which I have just used. They, too, came to this country with no knowledge of our language or our history. Many of them had lived under conditions which would be absolutely repugnant to Canadian people, and many of them brought to this country and adopted here the very same conditions under which they had been living in the lands which they had left. So far as citizenship is concerned we have treated these people with utter neglect. We have been too busy building railways, canals, factories and other important public works. We have been thinking of the opening up of our country and the settlement of its vast areas. We have been interested in policies, many of them of national importance, having in view the material welfare of Canada, but we have given very little thought indeed to the citizenship of our country; to the necessity, the importance and the methods of receiving these newcomers into Canadian citizenship. Perhaps the war did something to wake us up from the lethargy into which we had fallen in this regard. It assisted us at least in seeing that the condition that had been produced in this country by the receiving of this vast army of foreign people might give rise to a menace; indeed evidences were forthcoming that in some sections of our land there was such a feeling as would constitute a menace to the welfare of this country. Canada is a young nation, and if her future is to be what we all hope it will be and what we all believe it can be, it is absolutely necessary that this question of citizenship receive greater attention than it has in the past. After all, the people of Canada are Canada's greatest asset. But I must say that we have among our people a large element which are an undeveloped resource, a resource which should be the

subject of great care and thought. The future citizen of Canada must not be the result of chance; he must be created by influences set in motion by the present Canadian people. Professor Fairchild, of Yale University, in his book on immigration, says:

> The recent rapid development of communication has made the ease of immigration so great that we have been overwhelmed by the resulting problems. The movement of millions of people from one region to another is a phenomenon of prodigious sociological import.

In that phenomenal movement Canada has been sharing, the magnitude of Canada's problem is in proportion to the number of people she has been receiving from that movement as compared with her resident population. Professor Fairchild was directing the attention of the American people to the problem which immigration had produced for that nation. Our problem may be better appreciated if we illustrate it by comparing it with that of the United States. The largest number of immigrants which arrived in the United States in any one year was 1,285,349 in 1907. That meant an addition of about 150 immigrants to each 10,000 of the resident population of the United States. Canada's largest immigration was in the year 1913, when 402,432 people came to this country, representing an addition of 500 immigrants to each 10,000 of our population. So that the number of immigrants which Canada was asked to absorb in that year was about three and a half times as great as that which the United States was called upon to absorb in the year of its greatest immigration. Both countries have come to realize the necessity of a more careful selection of immigrants. But the United States has gone further than that; within the last five or six years they have organized a vast effort for the purpose of Americanizing their people—not only the foreigners who come to their shores now, but even native-born Americans of foreign parentage, and perhaps some also of American parentage.

Last year Canada made certain amendments to its Immigration Act, the chief purpose of which amendments was to exclude from Canada undesirable citizens. I shall not take time to enumerate those amendments, but if it is important that this Parliament should by legislation in the form of an Immigration Act take all necessary precautions to exclude undesirable immigrants from our country, surely it is of even greater importance that we should endeavour to reduce to as small a number as possible the undesirables who are now in our midst.

I think that a man would not be unreasonably optimistic who would believe that in the very near future we shall have a large immigration to Canada. If I were to give my own opinion—which, of course, would not be of much value—I would venture to predict that by the year 1940 we shall have 20,000,000 people in Canada, the greater portion of which will be newcomers to our shores.

Let me direct the attention of the House to another phase of this question. During the twenty-year period from 1900 to 1919 there were received into Canada 3,311,498 immigrants, of whom 1,188,946 were British. 1,268,793 American born, and 853,039 from other countries, but all of non-English parentage. Let me put this in another way: 1,188,946 were British-born and 2,121,832 were non-British. This means that in the past twenty years we have had to absorb a number equal to twenty-five per cent of our total population. Not only is the problem one of number, but we can well understand that while a country of limited population such as Canada is may successfully absorb a certain number, when the number exceeds that to a very large degree, it may become quite impossible for us to absorb and assimilate the new comers to our country.

Another phase of the situation which exists in Canada is brought out by the figures of the Canada Registration Board. Their report shows that on June 22, 1918, there were in Canada of males sixteen years of age and over, 2,656,548, of whom 561,650 were alien born, and of those so born only 200,580 had become naturalized, so that we had in this class of males 361,070 who still acknowledged allegiance to a foreign country. I think every one will admit that this is not a desirable condition to exist in our country; that people who come to our land, especially those who come intending to make Canada their home, should become part of our life, should become naturalized citizens and should put themselves in a position to take upon themselves all the responsibilities of citizenship in our country.

Another phase of the situation is shown by these figures. According to the census of 1916 taken in the three Western Provinces, we find that out of a total population of 1,240,374 there of those of ten years of age and upwards, 102,425, or 8.3 per cent were unable to speak English. This included, of course, native-born as well as foreign-born, and they were distributed fairly equally throughout the three provinces, with 37,504 in Manitoba, 40,126 in

Saskatchewan, and 24,795 in Alberta. Of the different nationalities there represented, the Ukrainians show the largest percentage who do not speak English, with a percentage of 39.8 of those ten years of age and over. Of the Austro-Hungarians 35 per cent did not speak English, of the Poles 27.2 per cent, and of the Russians 27.1 per cent. These are the figures as regards inability to speak English; but there is a still further phase of the question which I wish to bring to the attention of the House, and that is the number of illiterates in our country. In the three Western Provinces, out of a population of 1,240,374 of ten years of age and over, 92,732 or 7½ per cent were reported as illiterates, the foreign-born furnishing 62,559 or 67½ per cent of these. Each province seems to have its share of this class. Manitoba with 32,978, or 8.1 per cent of its population of ten years of age and over; Saskatchewan with 36,021, or 7.7 per cent, while Alberta had 23,733, or 6.4 per cent, and Winnipeg alone had 4,642 unable to read or write. I do not refer to the Western Provinces with the intention of showing that they are any worse than other parts of Canada. I use these figures merely because I have them and they are more up to date than any other figures I have for the country. But if we look at the condition of Ontario as reported in the census of 1911, we shall find, when we consider the age of the province and the comparatively small number of its population that are foreign-born, that the condition there is even more deplorable than that of the Western Provinces. According to the census of 1911 there were in Ontario 147,225 who could neither read nor write.

Mr. BURNHAM: How old were they?

Mr. STEELE: I cannot give the ages.

Mr. BURNHAM: We must have the ages, because some of them might be so young that they could not be expected to read or write.

Mr. STEELE: Yes, that would be expected. But 6.5 per cent of the total population was in that class. There are in Ontario to-day large numbers of foreign-born residents, and it is estimated that one-fifth of the present population of Toronto is foreign-born. Even old conservative Quebec is not free from this same condition, because figures of at least two or three years ago showed that about 105,000 of the population of Montreal were foreign-born.

In all this I am not casting one word of reproach on the foreign-born. I am using these figures simply to show the situation which exists in Canada to-day, and this situation, as I said, creates a problem which we cannot ignore. This condition of illiteracy, this condition of non-English speaking—and when I use the term "non-English," I include with that the other official language "French;" but I may be pardoned if throughout my remarks to-day I use the term "non-English" as illustrating the condition which exists in the greater portion of Canada at least. The fact that we have so many illiterates so many who do not speak and are not learning to speak the English language, so many who apparently do not desire to become naturalized citizens, creates a problem which we must face, and so long as this condition exists in Canada we cannot have a unified country. But to remedy the situation we cannot trust to the happy-go-lucky methods of the past.

The solution of this problem involves not only the commercial prosperity of Canada, but even the safeguarding of our national life. Whatever policy is adopted in Canada should have for its sole object the making of Canadians who will be absolutely one hundred per cent Canadian in spirit. We should endeavour so to assimilate this population that we shall have one common standard of nationhood. To all the foreign-born who come up to the standard of admission Canada extends a hand of welcome, but every immigrant should be made to understand that this is a British country, that while he may continue to love his homeland, which in many cases has had a glorious history and demands the admiration of its people, while he must not necessarily give up the use of his own language, in this country Canada's methods of life must be maintained. The inferior civilization of the native lands of these people cannot be transplanted to this country, and they should be made to understand that our laws and institutions must be respected, that in future Canada will be their home, and that their duty and allegiance and responsibility is no longer to the land of their birth but to the land of their adoption.

Canada as a nation has a duty to the foreigner. While she has a duty to the foreigner she has perhaps an even more important duty to herself and her future. In my opinion there are three prime requisites in our methods of dealing with the foreigners who come to our shores. First, we must fit them for industrial life. A very large proportion of the immigrants from southeastern Europe come here as un-

skilled labourers. They come largely for the purpose of making a little money, and when that is made they purpose returning to their own land where they have left their families to reside during their absence. They serve a good purpose in this country, without a doubt, but even these temporary residents should be compelled to contribute their utmost while in Canada to the country's needs, not only by their labour, but by their mode of life and their influence as citizens. All our immigrants who are engaged in industrial life in this country, especially Europeans, should be compelled to observe our laws of health and of society, for otherwise our social organism will suffer. The illiterate, non-English foreigner provides a fertile field for anarchy, Bolshevism, and the many other "isms" and manias that are cursing the world to-day, and from which no one suffers more than the same common labourer of foreign birth. Just in proportion as we remove his illiteracy and teach him to read and speak the English language, and teach him proper methods of living, do we increase his value as a national asset, and increase his value to himself and his family. Men who cannot speak our language are generally condemned to the hardest kind of labour and the lowest wages, and they will generally be found in the lowest ranks of our industrial life. It is manifestly unfair that the labour of the low-living illiterate foreigner should enter into competition with that of the Canadian; but it is much worse when conditions are such that Canadian labour is driven to compete with that of the Asiatic or European foreigner. In the first case, the condition of the foreign labourer may be raised to some extent towards that of the Canadian, but in the second case the condition of the Canadian labourer is sure to be brought down lower, towards that of the foreigner.

I said that by compelling the foreign labourer to live under Canadian conditions we will be doing him a service. Employers of labour testify that as soon as the labourer can speak and understand English, that moment his earning power and usefulness is increased. Testimony is given by American employers of labour that a man who knows, speaks, and reads the language by which he is surrounded is worth on an average five dollars per week more than before he acquired that knowledge.

The second requisite, to my mind, is to fit these people for naturalization. We define the terms upon which a foreigner can secure naturalization in this country. We say to these people: We desire you to become naturalized subjects of His Majesty, and when you are able to comply with certain conditions you will be received into the Canadian family. We say further, by our actions, at least, that we disapprove of a refusal or neglect on the part of any newcomer to become a full Canadian citizen, and yet we put forward no effort to fit them for taking upon themselves the duties and responsibilities of citizenship. We make no effort in fact to acquaint them even with the requirements of the naturalization law, not to make them familiar with what we expect them to do. If we say, as we do, that a person seeking naturalization in this country must have a knowledge of English or French, it seems to me it is our bounden duty to give them an opportunity to learn either English or French. In the United States a few years ago a concerted effort was made by Congress to remove some of these disabilities in respect of the foreigner, and to provide means whereby they could become familiar with the need and the methods of securing naturalization. The results were amazing. Let me give a few figures taken from United States records. In 1910, there were 222,264 applicants for naturalization, and in 1915, 354,132

4 p.m. —an increase of over fifty per cent.

In 1919 there were about 650,000 applicants for naturalization. There is no doubt that much of this increase was due to the efforts put forward to give the foreigner such conveniences and opportunities as would enable him to comply with the requirements of the naturalization law.

The third requirement, I think, is to fit these men for the franchise. One of the chief responsibilities laid upon the newly naturalized citizen is the exercise of the franchise. Canada, we delight to say, is a democratic country; we are a democratic people, but if we as a democratic people are going to govern ourselves in a democratic way, we must do so wisely.

Mr. BURNHAM: Does the hon. gentleman mean that if we are to govern ourselves wisely, the better we govern ourselves the better example we will furnish to the foreigner because the foreigner is already able to judge of our standard?

Mr. STEELE: No, I had not that in mind. I will allow the hon. gentleman to expand that idea which, I am sure, is a very interesting one. But what I had in mind was that if we claim to be a democratic country and are ruling in a democratic way, we must see that we do not reflect upon democracy by giving Canada a rule which is not truly democratic in all

respects and which does not represent a wise democracy. If we are going to keep up the standard which we have set we must as one of the methods try to keep up the standard of the individual voter. If upon the present electorate we are going, within the next few years, to unload as it were a large volume of unprepared voters, who have had no preparation for exercising the franchise wisely, then I think we must admit that probably to the degree that the standard of the electorate will be reduced the problem which we have to meet will be made more difficult of solution because of the lowering of that standard. The lower we make the standard of intelligence of our voters the less capable they become to solve the problems that are facing us.

I have thus far been speaking of our duty to the foreigner in the interest of the State. We also have a duty to the foreigner in his own interest. It seems to me that we have resting upon us the duty of protecting the foreigner and the new immigrant from the agitator and the exploiter. For example, in our industrial life, I believe that no employer should be allowed to herd his employees in shacks. The law should insist that they should have comfortable homes with sanitary surroundings and that their persons and homes should be reasonably sanitary. There should be no herding together in foreign quarters. The modern slum is one of the most convincing evidences that even yet democracy woefully fails at times to govern itself. There is no more reason for slum conditions existing in our Canadian cities than there is for a cesspool to be established in the centre of this beautiful Chamber. Intelligence and authority will prevent both. Where slums persist there is a lack of intelligent government on the part of someone. These conditions which I have described do exist and perhaps the chief offenders is the foreign-born employer. I do not say that he is the only one by any means.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Does the hon. gentleman recall any city where there are no slums?

Mr. STEELE: The conditions which have existed in the past should not be allowed to exist in the Canada of the future and because slums existed in ancient cities and have existed in nearly all cities up to the present, is no reason at all why they should be allowed to exist in the cities of Canada. The homes of the foreigners, their surroundings and the field of their labour, should be according to Canadian standards. They should not be permitted to bring into this country the standards of life in the lands which they have left or to adopt these standards here and live according to them. They should be compelled to approach the Canadian standard. Not long ago, it is reported, a strike occurred among the foreign workmen in an American plant. They sought a conference with their employer and their demands were under three heads, as follows: They said they wanted a place to hang their hats and coats; they wanted a place to wash and they wanted an arrangement by which the foreman should stop kicking them. Whether that really occurred or not I cannot say but at all events it illustrates reasonably well, the conditions that exist in many of our labour fields in our country. The foreign labourer is not always properly treated and especially is he not properly treated by his own foreign employer.

But not only should the labourer of foreign birth be looked after; the foreign-born woman needs attention and all the more so now that in a few years at most she will probably be adding her voice to the solution of Canada's problems. She has been entirely ignored in the past and little or no provision has been made for her instruction—little or no thought given to her citizenship. These women will be the mothers of hundreds of thousands of boys and girls who will be brought up to be future Canadians. Statistics show that the foreign-born woman rears just about twice as many children as the native-born woman rears and if the old saying is true that the hand that rocks the cradle is the hand that rocks the world, we say that the hand that rocks the Canadian cradle should be the hand of a woman possessed of the Canadian spirit.

The foreigner should also be protected as far as possible from the exploiter and the imposter. His ignorance of our language, laws, customs, institutions and business methods should not be taken advantage of by any person. Many of these people come from countries where the system of government is unlike that which exists here. In the homeland of many of these people government means tyranny, taxation and terror and it is easy for them to believe that all governments are the same and to become imbued with a feeling of opposition to all government. It is then that the agitator gets in his work and sows the seed which too often leads him to lose confidence not only in the Government but also in society, in the church and in his fellow men. Bol-

shevism and revolution are held up by the agitator as the only remedy. The man who comes under that influence cannot be expected to be a true Canadian; he is apt to lose the spirit.

Then there is the man who exploits the foreigner commercially, and robs his pocket, and the foreigner thus exploited in apt to lose the Canadian spirit and to believe that all Canadians are equally dishonest. There was drawn to my attention a few months ago a case which illustrates this point effectively. In a certain part of the province of Ontario a middle aged man, who came from Germany a few years ago and has during his residence in this country proven himself an industrious well-behaved fellow, desired to become naturalized. He knew that lawyers are the men who are supposed to be able to advise on legal matters and he consulted a lawyer.

Mr. GAUVREAU: That is the man.

Mr. STEELE: The lawyer advised the man and incidentally, before he left his office, asked him for $6 in payment of his fees. The application for naturalization was filed in the proper way and although the Naturalization Act of 1919 says distinctly that no person of German birth can secure naturalization in this country for a period of ten years after the passing of that Act, the man in question was not so told. His application for naturalization was filed and about the time report was passed upon it he received an additional bill from his legal adviser for $14. It just cost this man $20 to consult a lawyer who did not tell him the truth.

Mr. PROULX: Who was the lawyer.

Mr. STEELE: Can we expect that man to feel kindly towards Canadian institution? Now offenses of this kind are not confined to lawyers. That profession is responsible for quite sufficient we know; but even some of our judges in Canada to-day are receiving the applications of German and Austrian citizens, are passing upon them, and are recommending the applicants for naturalization, well knowing, or at least they should know, that no naturalization certificates can be granted that class of people. What is the result? The applications are sent on to Ottawa, but naturalization certificates are not forthcoming, and the man who has made application naturally desires to know why he is not receiving a certificate. Then the political exploiter comes in. "Oh," he says, "you cannot expect to get anything from that Government at Ottawa." I am not making these remarks with any political significance at all because perhaps if any other government were in power the same story would be told. The result is that that man becomes an enemy not simply of the present Administration but of any Canadian Government. There is no doubt such a man has been badly used and I would call upon the Government to see that this practice among the lawyers and the judges of our country in deceiving German residents who are applying for naturalization, is stopped.

But perhaps the most dangerous exploiter is the political type, whether it be a person, or a newspaper or, as sometimes happens, the two combined. They plead the cause of the foreign born, appeal to their prejudices, stir up whatever racial feeling there may be, and in this way antagonize these people against prevailing Canadian conditions. They are constantly endeavouring to persuade foreign born that they are unjustly treated, that those in authority are their enemies, that their liberties are being interfered with—that, in fact, Canada is more Prussian than Germany. I venture the opinion that a very large measure of the antagonism of the foreign-born to things that are Canadian is due to these two classes of people—the social agitator and the political exploiter. They are both imposters and future events will prove that they are, and have been, the worst enemies of the communities they are to-day professing to guide. Both these classes make their appeals in the name of British fair play knowing well that they are only doing so in order that they may, so far as they are able, destroy that same spirit of British fair play. The man or newspaper which seeks to excite the prejudice of the foreign-born at this time of our history against Canadian law in order that for selfish purposes he or it may claim to be the friend and protector of the alien, or the alien born, acts unworthily and is one of the chief instruments in destroying Canadian unity.

The Government to my mind should at this time set on foot a great movement for the Canadianization of the foreigner in our land. We owe this to the people who come among us, and we owe it to the nation itself. The future welfare of our nation is largely dependent on the ideals of its citizens. Canadianization is not only an intellectual process but it is closely associated with our economic, industrial, social and political progress and prosperity, and

it makes for the very life of Canada. The foreigner should be made to feel that he will get a square deal in Canada, but he should also be made to see that Canada must also get a square deal from him. He should be taught that his children have greater opportunities in Canada than anywhere else in the world, and that is so because of our resources, our laws, and our free institutions. I would go further and say that the foreigner as he lands in this country should be made to feel that he is here on probation, and that if he does not make good, back he will go in the course of time to the land he has left.

There have been rather extensive efforts made in this country along these lines by certain bodies who, however, are unable to co-operate and unite their efforts. Perhaps no organization in the country has made a greater and a more genuine effort to do something for the Canadian foreign born than the Daughters of the Empire. I am glad on this occasion to be able to say a word on behalf of that society, and to commend the splendid efforts that it has been making during recent years to bring under the influence of our Canadian life and spirit the young people of our country.

The Toronto Board of Trade have for several years been studying this matter and are bringing it to the attention of the authorities wherever it can be done. Our churches and our settlement workers have also taken the matter up, and our Western provinces are giving it very great consideration. I think that every person who looks into it feels that these agencies are unable to adequately handle the situation as it exists. Some paramount unifying body is needed which can induce all the existing agencies to work in co-operation, and even then the task will be one that will be almost impossible to overtake. I would therefore urge the need and the wisdom of the Federal Government undertaking a thorough and extensive Canadianization programme which, with the aid of the provinces and the municipalities, will produce results which will materially promote the future unity and prosperity of our people. The task of preparing this army of foreign born people for a full and intelligent appreciation of the higher social, industrial and political life of Canada, and to produce within them a right point of view with respect to their relationship to the State, is difficult at the best. But if this mass of raw material now in our land is to be remodelled into good Canadian citizens, Canada must pay the price. This is a service we owe not only to the foreign-born and would-be Canadian citizens, but owe also as a matter of self-protection to the state.

And I bring this subject forward not with the thought of restricting the opportunities of the foreign-born nor of restraining them from making the best of their life in Canada, but rather for the purpose of enlarging their opportunities and of assisting them in securing their full part in the blessings and privileges and opportuities which Canada so lavishly possesses and which she offers so generously to her people.

Mr. SAMUEL CHARTERS (Peel): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word or two in support of the resolution of my hon. friend (Mr. Steel) . I think the House will agree with me that he is to be commended for placing so much valuable information before us. The Canadianization of the foreign element is a question of interest to the people of the whole Dominion, and it will not be settled until it is properly settled. Doctor like, my hon. friend very carefully and, I think, very accurately diagnosed the disease and then proceeded to suggest many remedies that might be employed in order to ameliorate, if not cure, the disease. There are very many conditions, he said, which called for immediate action, if such action is at all possible.

Reference was also made to the question of the naturalization of our foreign element. Let me suggest one or two instances in addition to those which have been already given. In 1918 the registration made of all males over sixteen years of age showed that there were 110,000 Austrians, of whom 70,000 still retained their nationality; 32,616 Italians, 27,000 of whom had not been naturalized; and 47,777 Chinese, of whom only 625 were naturalized. This is evidence that the foreign population is not here for the purpose of becoming Canadianized, but rather for the purpose of making what money it can and, in the great majority of cases, returning to its native land to live in happiness and contentment. When that is so we have a right to consider what is the duty of Canada in connection with a solution of the problem.

The foreign element is responsible for very many of the unatisfactory conditions in the slum districts to which reference has been made. For instance, in 1907 in the Province of Ontario there were no fewer that 6,120 undesirable immigrants dealt with by the authorities, with this result: 1,51[illegible] patients were sent to hospitals for the insane, at a cost to the province of $227,550;

there were 4,314 prisoners in jail, which cost the province $61,329.23; and there were 289 prisoners in the central prison at a cost to the province of $25,425.80, making a total cost for those 6,120 persons—every one of whom had been brought into the province under the laws of the Dominion—$314,315.03 for that one year. Since that time many deportations have been made, and the Immigration laws have of course been improved, but notwithstanding that the undesirable element continues to flow into the larger cities, and it is a very conservative estimate to say that upwards of $3,500,000 has been expended upon this class of people during the past twelve years. They are responsible for a very large proportion of the crime that exists in the country, and they are also responsible for a great deal of the agitation that is disturbing the Dominion at the present time.

Following the conditions in Ontario, I might give you, Mr. Speaker, an example of what is happening in one of the western provinces. A press despatch dated from Yorkton, Sask., April 8, 1919, is as follows:

> Thirty criminal cases, including murder, incest, illegal shooting, assault, perjury, comprise the criminal docket of the Court of King's Bench which opened its sittings here this afternoon. Foreigners are involved in every one of the thirty cases.

The same conditions are brought out in the report of Mr. Perry, Commissioner of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police, which was tabled a few days ago. Speaking of the action of the foreign element in the West he says:

> They have shown little appreciation of the just and fair treatment meted out to them by the people of this country. They have shown themselves to follow and support the extremists who play upon their ignorance and appeal to their national prejudices and sympathy for the Central Powers. Bolshevism finds a fertile field among them and is assiduously cultivated by the ardent agitator.
>
> The assimilation of our large alien population is of the greatest importance and it demands wise and sympathetic action and constant attention.

Speaking of the literature that is being circulated, he says:

> A number of convictions have been secured but there is a flood of pernicious and mischievous literature not on the prohibited list. Under the cloak of freedom of thought and speech, this literature is being spread for the avowed purpose of overturning democratic government and destroying the foundation of civilization. Appeal is made to British fair play to protect them in their efforts to destroy British fair play.

In spite of these conditions a considerable number of our people are anxious to bring into Canada very large numbers of foreigners in order chiefly that our farms and factories may be supplied with very much needed help. Important as it is that such help should be provided, I think it would be a very great mistake indeed if conditions were permitted to be created under which twenty or thirty millions of foreigners should be brought into Canada in the next twenty years. We must have Canadians. We cannot Canadianize these people sufficiently fast to enable them to be assimilated as Canadians. So the greatest mistake we could make would be to bring in such a very large number of people. What we must do is to bring in picked people—men who are in sympathy with Canadian aims, and with its British institutions. If we do that we will succeed. If we proceed along the other line, I am convinced that we will have merely a population instead of a nation—we will be a house divided against itself; and we have the strongest authority for the statement that such a house cannot stand.

That thinking people all over Canada are taking steps as I suggested a moment ago to meet and deal with this question is evidenced in many quarters. For instance, the president of the Board of Trade of Toronto, Mr. Kenneth J. Dunstan, at their annual meeting last January, made this statement:

> Canada may expect large foreign immigration within the next few years and it is imperative that adequate steps be taken to teach not only the English language, but also the fundamental principles of our Government and our ideals of citizenship. It is intended to actively aid in the organization of a national movement in favour of a Canadianization policy, which will help the foreign-born and their children to appreciate our form of Government, our laws and their administration, and also to appreciate the responsibilities and duties which go with the privileges of such citizenship.

I think his statement will meet with a very ready response. Every campaign that has been carried on unitedly by our people has succeeded. That campaign, if inaugurated, will succeed in doing a very great service not only to the foreign element but in arousing the interests of our people to the necessities of the situation. To make such an effort successful there must be some backing from the Administration. Therefore I would suggest that the Government deport all foreigners found engaged in unlawful agitation and enforce the law to the letter against all citizens who are convicted of similar conduct.

The Government should assist by substantial federal grants the provincial author-

tise in the education of the children of foreigners. Such grants should be conditional upon the flag flying over every school, and every day there should be some exercises to emphasize the meaning and value of Canadian citizenship. Every newspaper printed in a foreign language should be required to print in English translations of all articles dealing with national Canadian questions. The Immigration Department should give special encouragement to immigrants from the old lands and from those countries whose people have shown a disposition to become Canadians. These suggestions are worthy of consideration by the Government and by the members of the House. The Government of the day and all those who have to do with the enactment of laws should have before them as far as possible the old Gladstonian declaration to the effect that all Governments must pass legislation to make it easy to do right and difficult to do wrong. To the extent that we follow that course we shall speedily succeed in creating a sound, united Canadian nationality.

Mr. H. H. HALLADAY (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, to my mind, this is one of the most important motions that has come before the House this year, because on the success or failure of our educational system depends the success or failure of ourselves as a nation. Education is to-day a matter of provincial jurisdiction, and rightly so. But to my mind the Government would be well advised to start a federal Department of Education for the purpose of bringing together the heads of the Departments of Education in the different provinces and formulating, if possible, some uniform plan. The curricula in the different provinces vary almost as much as the systems of education in some of the foregn countries. Pupils who move from one province to another find the systems so changed that they are sometimes put back two grades. If a Department of Education were established in Ottawa we could get these educational men together and bring about some uniformity in that regard. We could also correct a fault which is found in all provinces, and which I call the one-man system. Under our present educational system, every student who enters school and does not complete his course must struggle through the same routine as that which applies to the man who reaches the top. In fact, we are educating the graduate but not the multitudes who never become graduates. Of the thousands who enter our public schools, from fifty to seventy-five per cent never enter High School; of the thousands who enter High School very few pass on to the university, and of the thousands who enter university many never graduate. Our system is so set that the multitude must struggle along the same route which is followed by the man who completely finishes his educational course. If we had a Department of Education at Ottawa, with the proper man at the head of it, we could start a system throughout Canada which would tend to develop in the body who leaves public school an idea of what kind of work he ought to engage in. Not one in a thousand men finish their careers in the line of work upon which they first started out; they stumble along from year to year and from job to job, and sometimes they finally land in the job that the good Lord intended them for. I believe that we could establish a system under which we could develop in the boy who leaves school the tendency towards a particular line of work—his ability to saw to a line; to use a square; to weld a piece of iron; to use—in a simple way, perhaps—a surveyor's instrument; to keep books; and so on. In that way he has some idea or his parents have some idea of what work he is best fitted to do. Our girls, too, would know more about the work that God intended them to do.

Then, we have another difficulty which to my mind is worse than the one I have mentioned. Up to the age of six or seven years our children are told every day to go out and play; their whole education up to that time consists in what they get from play. But when they go to school they are put in a straight row of seats and if they attempt to move or to speak to their little companions on their right or left, they are immediately corrected. The strictness of our discipline takes the individuality from the child. It is true that we must have discipline, but in our method of enforcing discipline we are taking away the child's individuality. I believe that these little children could sit around the school room in moveable seats and their education carried on in such a way as not to do away with all the benefit they have received through their play in the days before they started going to school. The child must know what discipline is, but he must still have that freedom, that opportunity for his love of play, that individuality, which have been instilled into him up to the time when he first enters school. For these reasons I think that the Dominion Government would

be well advised to exercise some supervision over our educational system through a Department of Education at Ottawa.

Mr. H. C. HOCKEN (Toronto West): Mr. Speaker, the House and the country are indebted to the member for South Perth (Mr. Steele) for bringing to our attention a question which is, to my mind, of very great importance. The motion deals with something which this Government should have taken up long ago. In the past the Governments of the day have been satisfied to bring people to Canada from Central Europe, set them in colonies, and leave them there. They have treated them about the same as we might treat imported horses or cattle which were brought here to perform agricultureal work and receive no further attention. The Governments of the past have failed to realize the necessity of Canadianizing these people, and on that account they deserve strong condemnation. But the leaders of these people who have been neglected by the Government have in their own colonies carried out a policy of segregating their followers from Canadian-born citizens for the purpose of exploiting them in elections and otherwise, and the result has been very serious to the foreign-born population of our country. I understand that throughout the Northwest to-day you can find large numbers of people who have been in Canada many years, yet who do not sufficiently understand the English language to carry on business. This segregation of the foreigner from the native-born citizen of Canada has enabled the foreigner's selfish leaders to develop prejudices that are very difficult to remove and which are often carried on to the second generation. Unless some steps are taken by this Government—steps that are beyond the reasonable responsibilities of Provincial Governments—this condition of affairs will not be improved with any rapidity, and the state of things which we find to-day will be perpetuated. So that the member for South Perth has made a distinct contribution to the work of the session by bringing this matter forward. Most of the provinces have done something, but the Federal authority has entirely neglected its responsibilities in this regard. The first really effective measures which have been adopted in any part of Canada for Canadianizing the foreign-born are to be credited to the Government of Manitoba, and the success that that Government has had in its new school legislation with respect to the Canadianizing of the foreigner warrants us in believing that similar measures adopted in other provinces with assistance from this Government in other directions would produce the quickest and most important results. What Manitoba has done is having its effect in the other provinces of western Canada, and it will not be very long before Saskatchewan and Alberta will follow the example of Manitoba, because force of public sentiment will compel them to do so. Already those provinces have gone a considerable distance in that direction, and the Governments of those provinces are showing their sense of responsibility. In the United States it has been recognized that the Americanizing of the people of foreign birth is a proper federal responsibility. That opinion rests on sound ground, and the Canadianizing of the foreigners of this country is likewise a federal responsibility. It is necessary and wise that the provinces should co-operate in this work. The authority they have in regard to schools places the provincial power in a very strong position ot assist in this work; but I do not think that this Government has done its share; it has certainly never taken any initiative in inaugurating and carrying through a broad policy in this direction.

The Canadianizing of the people of Canada is perhaps one of the most important thiugs that this Government has to do. It is fundamental in a new country like this that the people should understand our institutions; that they should learn our standards of living and understand something of the fabric of our society. This country to-day is in the making. If we allow those who have come to us to go on as we have been allowing them to drift in the past, without proper instruction as to our institutions or the character and duties of our citizenship, and if we add to them other hordes of foreigners who may come to this land in the years that are approaching, we shall have no ground whatever to anticipate that we shall have anything like a unified country in this Dominion. Unless those hundreds of thousands who have come in and those who may come in are Canadianized, we shall have in this country a serious situation, and with every year the problem will become more difficult of solution. Already this is a problem of very great magnitude in Canada. We have it in our large cities to a limited degree, but it is much more serious in the wide agricultural areas where the people are isolated and segregated into communities of their own race and speech. And every year that passes adds to the difficulty of a final solution of this question.

In may sections of Western Canada the electors of foreign birth are in control of local affairs; they exercise a great influence on provincial policies at the present time, and they form an important element in deciding the policies of the Dominion. It seems to me that it should be very plain to every man who has the power to think that the education and instruction of those people is one of the first and primary obligations of this Government. It is bad enough to have a big foreign population in a city, but there they have an environment that assists very materially in giving them information and instructing them in our principles of government. Their children go to public schools where they mix with children of British parentage; they are surrounded on every side by those who understand our institutions; they see the standards of living that have been set up, and little by little they are inevitably influenced thereby. But in those sections of the West where they are segregated into isolated colonies, they have none of this environment; they have extremely limited opportunities of studying Canadian ideals, and it is not surprising that they should be slow in acquiring anything like an adequate knowledge of the duties of Canadian citizenship. My judgment is that Federal aid should be given in generous measure for the purpose of instructing the adults of foreign nationalities who are in or who may come to this country, both in the language of the country and in the principles of citizenship of this country. This is a responsibility which rests primarily upon this Government and upon this Parliament. When this work is added to that done by the schools conducted by the provincial authorities, it would be possible to have every member of a household of foreign birth being instructed at the same time in those things that make good Canadian citizens. In my limited association with foreigners in our city and elsewhere I have found that they show profound appreciation of the kindness of those who take an interest in their welfare. They are most responsive to kindly treatment, and they are quick to take instruction when it is offered to them by those who, they have reason to believe, are not serving any selfish purpose. But, unfortunately, so little interest has been displayed by the Dominion Government and such scant consideration has been shown by society at large to the problem of bringing the foreign-born citizen up to the standard set for the native-born, that we have made very little progress in that direction. Progress has been made by the slow process of example; and while I admit that it is potent, something more than that is necessary in order that results may be achieved in a short period of time.

This response to kindly treatment is illustrated in a very special and remarkable way in Manitoba. The Manitoba Government under the Premiership of the Hon. T. C. Norris, has been able to convince the Galicians, Poles and other foreigners in that province that by insisting upon their children going to school, the Government is doing them a great kindness. It has taken a little while to convince them of that, but since the Act was passed three or four years ago the great majority of the Galicians and Poles and other foreigners in Manitoba have been brought to see that the measures enacted by the Provincial Government for the instruction of their children give them a better chance to compete in every walk of life, add to their prosperity and help to bring them up to the same level as the native-born in business and social intercourse. These people place a very high value upon this instruction, and the parents who are unable to converse in the language of the country take great pride in their children being able to do so. They have found that by taking their children who have learnt the language of the country with them when they go to market or to the store, they make very much better progress in their dealings, and they are naturally proud that their children can take their part in ordinary conversation wherever they may happen to be. This is a most gratifying feature of the Canadianizing efforts that have been put forward in the province of Manitoba, and it should encourage this Government to take this question under very careful advisement to determine just what steps can be taken by this Parliament to supplement what is being done by the provincial governments, particularly in the West, where the work has been done to the best advantage, and where it most needs to be done, because of the isolation in which many of these people live. The time has passed when this country can bring in Mennonites, Doukhobors, Galicians or any other class and after planting them down in a wide agricultural area, say to them: Now, we have no further interest in you. You cannot make a country in that way. The character of a country depends upon the character of its people, and if we leave these people to themselves we cannot expect to build up in Canada the kind of a country we are capable of building up by intelligent effort. I remember

a time when even the British-born newcomer to Canada found himself isolated in this country, and in the city of Toronto we found it necessary to organize a league, which we called the British Welcome League. We had a building open to receive men and women of British birth the day they reached the city, and they found friends at once in the officers of the league who would advise them where to go, when to go, and what to do to get a start. That is what should be done with every man and woman of every family that comes to Canada, whether they be British or Galicians. It would start them off with the idea that they had come to a country where they were welcome. I hope that every man, woman and child who comes to Canada in the future will be welcomed in that way, and will be instructed as rapidly and as fully as possible in the requirements of good citizenship. We must, of course, insist upon obedience to the laws of this country, and that of course means that we must instruct the newcomers as to what the laws of the country are. We must teach them in the kindest and the most efficient way what they must do to perform their full duty beside the native-born citizens.

I agree with the mover of this resolution (Mr. Steele) that in the future we must deal with our new citizens very differently from what we have done in the past. I believe this is a matter of self-preservation. I believe it is also a plain duty that we owe to those who come here to make their homes in this country. We in Canada have the greatest opportunity that has ever been given to any people since history began. My vision of Canada is that at the end of this century she will be one of the greatest nations in the world, one of the most populous, most powerful, and most prosperous nations in the world. Canada enjoys the finest climate that can be found anywhere, and advantages of soil and climate and natural resources that make it possible for us to build up in this country the most virile race that can be found in any part of the globe. But those who come to us not understanding our institutions must be instructed and educated and inspired with the high ideal of service to this country as Canadian citizens, and it is the bounden duty of this Government to take the initiative in this work .

Mr. F. B. STACEY (Fraser Valley): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Steele) deserves the congratulations of this House for bringing before us the subject matter of his resolution. I think that is due him because primarily his resolution has to do with the social and mental and moral life of citizens, and indirectly with their economic welfare. It requires no argument to-day, I am sure, to prove that men are worth a great deal more than money, that boys are infinitely more valuable than business, and that girls are to be considered before goods,—in a word, that people are of vastly more significance than either their possessions or their politics.

The resolution speaks of alien immigration, and the proper education of alien immigrants. The immigration question is not a new one, but, as has been pointed out, any education looking towards citizenship on the part of these people is practically a new thing so far as this and
5 p.m. other Parliaments of Canada are concerned. The war has taught us among other things that the quality and character of our citizenship has a great deal to do with the spirit that will be manifest when the nation is in danger—the spirit that is necessary for the perpetuation of our national life. In the closing years of the last century, and indeed until the war began, it would seem that the only consideration in immigration was the question of numbers; how many can we induce to come to the Dominion of Canada? I think to-day we are not emphasizing quantity; the tendency is rather to emphasize quality.

In order to understand the matter aright it seems to me that we should be agreed at any rate upon one thing, namely, the viewpoint from which this whole subject of immigration should be considered. In a word, what is the ultimate object in securing immigration to this country? What have we really in mind? What is the goal in view? In the last analysis we might agree that the national welfare is the fundamental consideration and that any policy that has to do with immigration should have in view not sectional welfare or local interest but the national welfare and prosperity. If that be so, and I think possibly we could agree upon that, our aim in the securing of immigration will become somewhat clearer. We will realize that it is not necessary to relieve the old nations of any surplus population which they may have. It may do that and from their standpoint they will certainly favour a policy which will relieve them of their surplus population. They would like to have their social problems solved but I claim it is not our business to undertake an immigration policy that

necessarily solves the social problems of other nations which are the result of conditions attributable to their own management or mismanagement as the case may be. They must solve these problems themselves.

Our policy must not be on the other hand the result of any false philanthropic spirit. Sometimes the idea is advanced that this country should be a home for the vast numbers of sufferers in foreign lands, the vast numbers of people in foreign countries who are in want, in trouble and are suffering from social conditions which are of a very sad and serious character. That may be so but not because of that should we open our doors to foreign citizens. Why should we do so? I believe for the reason that has been, I suppose, the motive assigned in past days. We do so because we think we need them. We believe that we need these men. If so it would seem to follow that our policy should run along the line of restricting admission to those whom we do need and of prohibiting the admission of those whom we do not need. We need those who will make some contribution to the national life either from the economic, the mental, the moral or the social standpoint, and whose presence is a distinct advantage to the community and will conduce to the national welfare. I want to emphasize this idea because if we desire to have immigrants who will make a distinct contribution to the national life of this country it follows that we must reject those who are either physically, or mentally, or morally, or socially, unfit to make such a contribution. That has been, I believe, the recent policy adopted by the Government of Canada. In view of the fact that there are large numbers in our country who were admitted when this restrictive policy was not in operation but rather when the doors were wide open and who came to Canada in response to a sort of blanket invitation; in view of the fact that there are many of these men at the present time in this country, there arises the necessity for the consideration of the question that was presented to us this afternoon. There is need for some kind of education. Admission to this country does not necessarily mean—and I agree with the hon. member who presented that idea—enfranchisement. It may mean that; we trust it will mean that, but it should not necessarily follow that because a man comes to Canada he will become an enfranchised citizen of Canada. That should depend upon himself, upon his conduct, upon his giving evidence that he is qualified to assume the highest position a citizen can hold in this country—that of exercising the franchise.

Our past policy has not been free from criticism. We brought great numbers of people into certain portions of the country, they have been housed together, they have been segregated and the results have not been at all satisfactory. The practical results in certain portions of Canada have not conduced to the welfare of this great and growing nation. I believe it is true that we have not less than 100,000 illiterates in the three prairie provinces. In those three prairie provinces there are at least 75,000 children living in homes where the English or French language is never spoken. The war revealed to us the fact that there were large communities that were absolutely un-Canadianized, communities consisting of men and women who were living the identical life which they had lived in the old country and the life which we supposed they would leave behind but which, on the other hand, they have brought with them and which has been perpetuated for one generation, and perhaps in some cases two.

If it is true that some of our foreign element did not give us the co-operation that we expected during the war is it after all to be wondered at? Have we real ground for surprise? Whose fault is it? —largely our own fault for we took very little if any means to Canadianize the people who came to us from foreign countries. I believe that while we cannot undo the past it should hereafter be recognized as an essential of our immigration policy that certain basic principles must be accepted by every man who comes to this country. First I would give him to understand that he must accept the fact of a Canadian school system; that while he may not be able to speak English or French himself his family must attend such a public school in the community and learn to speak either one of the official languages of the nation. There must be no exemption from the public school of the country being established in his community and each of the members of his family of school age must take their place in it.

Then again there are certain fundamental laws of this country which we must recognize, and I mean by this, Sir, that there should not be a too narrow interpretation put upon this idea of Canadian citizenship. We are not to take the position that we are the only people in the world and that wisdom will die with us, but that on the other hand, there is a certain ideal of life in Canada—the result partially of our tradi-

tional training and partly the result of our experience—which influences us to such an extent that we believe that certain things are essential to the well being of this Dominion and that those who come here must not simply live among us but become part of ourselves—in other words become Canadian people and not simply inhabitants of the country.

Mr. Speaker, what is our conception of a Canadian citizen? I believe that a Canadian citizen is a man who is willing first to live for his country and secondly, if necessary, to die for his country. These two ideas are capable of development and elaboration but I shall not attempt the task at this time. I simply mention these two points to show what a field is open in the way of proper and necessary Canadianization on the part of those who come to us. Now this Canadianization involves education. It necessitates a broad kind of education which need not be undertaken solely by this Government but, as has been pointed out, may be carried out in co-operation with the municipal and provincial governments and other organizations which are seeking to help in this laudable purpose. The result of the experience and of the labours of certain social, moral and religious organizations teaches us that the foreigner is not necessarily opposed to our system. He does not know it, he has not been taught it, and he was never given to understand that he would really have to assimilate himself to the Canadian people. Some efforts, along this line, have been made. After all, Sir, I believe that the fundamental principle, the underlying and perhaps that basic solution, is to be found in the public school system of this Dominion; and there is a great deal of truth in the remarks made by the hon. member (Mr. Steele) this afternoon regarding the necessity of some Federal department of education which need not necessarily infringe upon the rights of the provinces but will give the Dominion the opportunity to make some contribution toward the Canadianization of the citizens of our provinces. I do not think, Sir, that the Canadian people as a whole take seriously as yet the question of the importance and possibilities of its public school system. Quite recently in a local daily newspaper there appeared three Want advertisements. One of them was to the effect that an icecream maker was required at a salary of $2,000 per annum. A second was to the effect that a barber was needed at a salary of $1,500; and the third intimated that a school teacher was required, holding a second-class certificate, at a salary of $950 per year. Now, Sir, if that is any indication of the relative values of occupations of men and women in this country it is certainly a sure index that we need to take more seriously than we have yet done the supreme importance of fundamental education and the value of services rendered in our public school system. Much of the trouble that has come to us in the West has been owing to the fact that there is often a misinterpretation there of the statement that Canada is a free country. Now we in this House may understand that term. We may think we know what a free country means, and doubtless we do, but it does not mean to many of the foreigners what it means to Canadians. Some of them think this is a country where they can come and talk, and generally speaking act as they please. Our conception of freedom does not permit of any such license. We believe that this is a free country, inasmuch as every man and every woman in it is morally bound to develop to the very utmost all the possibilities with which God has endowed him or her, in order that they may make their highest and best contribution to the State as well as to the family which they may have. But when men come to this country with the idea that because this is a free country they can do absolutely as they please, they are distorting the meaning of the word freedom and such a conception of Canadian citizenship, I am sure, will not be tolerated by the people of the Dominion any longer than is absolutely necessary.

Now, Sir, let me discuss for a moment the question of the alien in my own province and I do not wish to do so at any length. If we may base this consideration upon the proposition which I laid down at the beginning—the Canadianization of the immigrant, his contribution to the national welfare, and the necessity of his becoming a part and parcel of our Canadian life, then, Sir, I fear and believe there has to be taken into very serious consideration the question of further permitting of the immigration of the Oriental. I do not forget such contribution as Orientals may have made to the life of our country. I am well aware that they have performed that type of work which is required from those who do manual labour only. But if you enlarge that question and consider the future place of the Oriental in the province of British Columbia you are beset with very grave difficulties and very serious problems. In considering this question we

must remove it from the realm of sentiment and place it upon a big, broad, and national basis. As I see it, Sir, the question in the last analysis amounts to this: Is British Columbia to be maintained for a white Canadian citizenship, or is it to be held in reserve for an Oriental population? if the former is conceded then the influx of Orientals must be restricted; and another great question in that province to-day, coming to us from all kinds of organizations, is along the line "Shall we any longer permit land to be held in fee by the Oriental or shall he even be allowed to lease it?" I recognize the fact that the settlement of this question may involve somewhat serious international complications. Probably it does, but so far as our province is concerned the question is one which must be faced, and faced bravely and fearlessly, in the very immediate future, so that we in the far West may be able to make some provincial contribution to the Canadianization of our entire citizenship. At present there is no prospect whatever of our being able to do that if any large immigration on the part of settlers and residents from the Orient is permitted. Again I wish to say that I am exceedingly glad that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Steele) has introduced this resolution which has primarily to do with the social, moral, and mental life of our coming citizenship, and I congratulate him upon his course.

Mr. JOHN W. EDWARDS (Frontenac): I do not intend to occupy more than a few minutes this afternoon, Mr. Speaker. I merely rise to add my commendation to that which has been already tendered to the member for South Perth (Mr. Steele) for his most interesting and instructive speech, and to say that I place myself in accord with his resolution. I shall refrain from making any extended remarks, for the reason that I have a motion on the order paper which I hope to bring up after the Easter recess, and which necessarily follows to some extent along the lines of the argument which has been advanced this afternoon. However, I did not want any hon. member to understand that I was withdrawing my motion, because it seems to me it is somewhat different from that now before the House in proposing means to bring about the same ends which my hon. friend has in view. I shall therefore wait until that occasion to place before the House some arguments in favour of a Federal Bureau of Education, which I think is essential in the interests of the country.

[Mr. Stacey.]

Mr. JOHN H. BURNHAM (West Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, this is probably the most important question that could be brought before the House of what one might call "indirect nationality." I regret very much indeed, Sir, that the Opposition seems to take no interest in this important question.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh yes, we do.

Mr. BURNHAM: The afternoon has worn itself away and the discussion seems to be drawing to a close, yet none of the oracles of wisdom on the other side of the House have ventured on this important question to make a remark which would be of the least benefit to the country at large. We expected something from them; perhaps we expected too much. They stand excused if they have not any ideas, but I did give them credit for having at least one idea on this important subject.

But what am I to say about the Farmers' Party? They seem to be absolutely oblivious of the whole matter. They represent primarily the West, but they have not even awakened to the fact that there is discussion proceeding on this subject. This is, to my mind, the saddest feature of all, and it shows that education in this country above all things must begin at home. Let us begin here in this House and educate hon. members who sit opposite us up to the high possibilties of their station.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. BURNHAM: If we do not place before our aliens the civilization which we wish them to adopt when we invite them to this country, then we have merely transplanted from the anarchy of Eastern Europe anarchists to repeat the same anarchy in this country. And we have had some fair samples of it. We do not wish to bring from the countries of Europe Russians, Ukrainians, Poles, Esthonians, Lithuanians, Galicians, Czecho-Slavaks, Hungarians, Germans, Austrians—I might name a number of others—and after placing them in a sort of hodgepodge in a seething cauldron as it were, expect them to settle down and be nice, good citizens. We do not show very much intelligence in permitting existing conditions in this respect.

Perhaps when we appreciate the fact that the Federal authorities really have no jurisdiction over education, that any proposition to that end is futile while the provinces control education, we may adopt different methods. For example, we might construct some sort of microcosm, so to speak, at Quebec or at some other port on the At-

lantic and along the shores of the St. Lawrence, and also at Vancouver on the Pacific, so that when these people come to Canada they may see in small what it is they have got ahead of them, and what is expected of them.

I would show them the genius and the spirit of the institutions of this country. First of all, I would take the House of Commons, and I would have the hon. members or their representatives show these people what the House is like, how it conducts itself, how hon. members accuse each other of being the greatest blackguards in the world! That would be the first illustration to show the foreigner that he is in a country in which one-half of the people believes the other half is the worst in the world! Having accomplished that, we might show to him our religions, we might show him that he may have any kind he likes—"you pays your money and you takes your choice";—but you pays your money anyhow.

Now, it must be remembered that the foreigner comes to this country relying upon British institutions. He has heard about the wonders of the West, he expects great things, and he finds that, after all, every thing is in an inextricable mess. He finds that the people of the country are fighting like cat and dog—nothing more and nothing less. He hears advice given to him to be good and let who will be clever, and to comport himself as becomes a great and noble citizen like ourselves—who are not. These contradictions no doubt impress him as they would impress anybody who for one moment pondered them and exercised his common sense.

If we show the strength of a good example and the belief in our own destiny that we ought to show, we would very soon impress the foreign element. But what is bothering them most and injuring them most in Ontario at any rate is a laxity of the enforcement of the laws and a disposition on the part of some of our people to take away the liberties of their fellow citizens, utterly regardless of the fundamental principles of liberty and simply because they think they ought to have their own way. In them rises and falls the moral law —and I agree that it certainly falls.

The way all these things are set before them furnishes the mainspring of the fact that it is very difficult to hold these foreigners to their contracts. The greatest curse of Ontario to-day is that in commercial affairs the great bulk of the foreigners pay no attention whatever to their engagements in matter of employment. They are engaged, furnished with money, utensils and implements, but because there is no means of punishing them or bringing them to a sense of their duty, they walk off with these utensils and implements and equipment, engage themselves to someone else, get a fresh advance of pay, and then walk off again. In a word, they become like gypsies wandering over the face of the land. It is well known, Sir, that a great portion of Northern Ontario is in a very serious state from this failure on the part of foreigners to appreciate the solemnity of a contract, and whatever the blame upon the foreign-born may be, the blame upon the Canadian citizen, upon the provincial Governments and also upon the Federal Government is quite plain. First of all, we have not shown them anything like a reasonable example. Having brought them here, we should as one gentleman said, at least tell them what the laws are; and having told them what the laws are, give them to understand that those laws must be obeyed. You cannot expect that this country will become better—it must become worse—if we do not improve ourselves and our method of dealing with these people. It is a most serious thing to contemplate if the prophecy of the mover of the resolution is correct that we may become a nation of twenty or thirty millions by 1940. If we do, largely from immigration, this country will be a seething hot-bed of anarchy, and it will not be worth living in for any civilized Christian if things are allowed to drift as they are drifting at present. We must surely bring ourselves to some great comprehensive understanding of the question. First of all, having established a basis of liberty, we must pay some attention to it, and having invited these people to Canada and having required certain things of them, let us instruct them what to do and make them obey. If we do that we can possibly realize a condition in the future which ought to be realized; otherwise we shall only drift on as we are doing at present.

Mr. J. A. MAHARG (Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Burnham) expresses great surprise that the members from the West who have a particular interest in this matter have not seen fit to take any part in the discussion. Well, though we were not taking any part in the discussion we were indeed much interested in what was going on. Hon. members must have noticed the attitude of gentlemen on the other side in regard to this particular question. We have not in the past heard very much from the hon.

gentlemen by way of suggestion or assistance to the foreigner in Western Canada. Only a few months ago a plea which I made for a little more toleration toward the foreign element in the West was immediately followed by a remark which was thrown across the floor of the House,—I am not going to repeat the words; but they were such that you, Mr. Speaker, asked the hon. gentleman who uttered them to withdraw them. It has hardly been safe for a member on this side of the House to show any inclination to express even a slight measure of appreciation of the foreigner; if he did so he would be treading on very dangerous ground. Only a few days ago the word "traitor" was hurled across this floor because an hon. member had asked for a little sympathy and tolerance in respect to the foreigner when the matter of the franchise was under discussion. Now, we who come from the West are glad indeed to see the interest that is being taken in these people by members on the other side. I too wish to commend the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Steele) for introducing this question. I only wish that it had been introduced three or four Parliaments ago; if it had, things might have been very different. However, better late than never.

Now, I want to mention one or two things in connection with the foreign element in Western Canada. It seems to have been the opinion in this House, as expressed on former occasions when the matter was discussed, that these people are very undesirable citizens; that they are not the class of people who would build up our country along proper lines. Well, I have lived very closely in touch with these people ever since I first came to Western Canada. I have had probably as much to do with them through our large farmers' organizations as any one else, and I know that it is the exception, not the rule, to find among them those who are not desirous of becoming good Canadian citizens. We have just as good and loyal citizens in Western Canada among those who have come from alien enemy countries—not alien countries, but alien enemy countries— as can be found anywhere. They have conducted themselves just as well as, in some cases a little better than, many who could not under any construction be termed aliens, but who have come from other lands. If we but treat these people fairly and squarely, we do not need to worry, but if we treat them with suspicion we shall not get the best out of them. To treat them with suspicion seems to be the only thought in the minds of a great many people, and this they resent very much. They are not simple-minded people, as seems to be the opinion of many. They have a conscience; they have, just as we all have, a spirit which is susceptible of being wounded by slight or what might be termed insult. In that respect their spirit is just like the spirit of good Canadians. Now, we have to treat these people on terms of equality with other Canadian citizens. There may have been a time when it was necessary to adopt some restrictive measures. Please note, Mr. Speaker, that I say "there may have been" a time; I do not say that there actually was. Our experience in Western Canada would not lead us to the conclusion that such measures were absolutely necessary. But if there ever were such a time, it has passed and if we are to get the best out of these people we must treat them with generosity, sympathy and tolerance. True, they are not familiar with our ideals—that is, as we express them—but not by any stretch of imagination could I say that they are lacking in ideals. These people have just as high ideals along certain lines that are fundamental to good citizenship as the people of any other race. We have seen that demonstrated more than once in Western Canada. They are not to blame if they have fallen by the way. Nor is the trouble all on the prairies; it has been accentuated in our cities. Let me give you an illustration by citing the experience of a gentleman known as a social worker of the best standing in one of our largest cities. During an election a foreigner came forward to register his vote. Of course, they told him that he was not a Canadian. "Oh yes," he said; "me good Canadian." "Oh no, you are not a Canadian;" and they undertook to explain to him why he was not a Canadian. Then the foreigner replied "me good Canadian—me smoke; me drink; me swear; me good Canadian." Now, that was his conception of a good Canadian, that was the ideal that had been held up before that man in one of our large cities. They do not get that out on the prairies, by any means; that is not the education they get from us. A few years ago, speaking before the Presbyterian Synod assembled in Toronto, a gentleman of high standing, one who had charge of religious work in Western Canada for many years, said from the platform that the farmers' organization in Saskatchewan was doing more to socialize and assimilate the foreigner into the community than was the Church of the Living

God. All we ask is that we be given an opportunity to say conscientiously to those people: We are going to give you a square deal. That is what they are looking for, and they resent it just as much as any one else when they think they are not getting a square deal. From now on let us forget the trouble we have had and let us give them a square deal. Let us not treat these people with a spirit of suspicion; let us not give them to understand that it is going to take them ten or twelve years before they can become full-fledged citizens and able to enjoy all the privileges of citizenship. The desire is expressed that those people should be assimilated with our own; but hon. gentlemen opposite are retarding assimilation just as much as they possibly can when on the statute book of our country we say to the people with whom we would like them to assimilate: These people are not your equal; we are not going to take any chances with them for at least ten years from the time they enter this country. There is not much encouragement for a policy of assimilation if that is the attitude we are going to take.

It was not my intention to take up any of the time of the House; but I just wanted to let the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Burnham)—I think this is the second time he has given us the idea that he or they should instruct us as to what subject we from the West can speak on—know that we are probably quite able to decide amongst ourselves just what questions we wish to speak on and what questions we do not. We may also be credited with a little political sagacity, as I believe the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) gave us credit for in this House the other night. We may possibly be allowed at least to act on our own dictates in the matter of what subjects we wish to speak on and what we do not. Apart from all this, it is not always a lot of talk that counts; people can talk a whole lot and say very little at times, and we do not want to be accused of talking too much, in case somebody might say that we had talked a whole lot but said very little. We are working our way along; we are not a very large group; but there is a long time ahead yet; there is a large future before this country of ours; and, as the hon. gentleman said, inside of twenty years we might have a population of twenty million in Canada, so that it is not necessary to attempt to revolutionize and to force your ideals all at once. It is better to attain one's ends by a process of evolution rather than by revolution.

A six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. H. P. WHIDDEN (Brandon): Mr. Speaker, in rising to continue the discussion of the resolution moved by the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Steele) I desire to express my appreciation of its importance, and to give expression at the same time to two or three ideas that have been in my mind for a number of months. In the first place, while the problem of immigration is closely related to the resolution submitted to us, it is hardly contained in that resolution. It would seem that this resolution is an attempt to get at the problem of assimilation. It deals more particularly with the foreigners we already have in this country. With that in mind, is it not well for us to recognize the fact that we have a considerable body of foreign-born people in this country, and that these people may become a great liability, or a great asset? Much depends upon how we treat them, what we do with them, what we make it possible and necessary for them to do with themselves. I do not believe that we can Canadianize a million and a half of foreign-born people by mere mechanical processes. If they are to live with us, we want to make it possible for them to become part of us. If we do not want them to live with us, the sooner we get rid of them the better. While, personally, I have fairly strong convictions with regard to the need of a rather severe immigration policy, and while I am satisfied we should see to it that naturalization laws of a strict character are put into force, I am inclined to think that with regard to the better type of foreigner living in Canada we cannot coerce him into the possession of the Canadian spirit. We can show him with all seriousness, and in a very definite and positive way, what the laws of the land are; we can explain to him the difference between our institutions and the institutions that he was glad to escape from on the other side of the Atlantic; but with it all, I am inclined to believe, we must in some way or other, as a nation, as communities, and as individuals, endeavour to make use of a broader and a deeper socializing process than can be contained merely in legislation. All the legislation that we have in connection with the admission of foreign-born peoples I think I believe in, but now, what are we to do with those who are here? Has not the Federal Government some responsibilities in connection with the prob-

lem of initiating the foreign-born people into real Canadian citizenship? They brought these people to Canada. Surely this is more than a provincial problem. The fixed educational institutions of our country are provincial, that is, those that we call educational institutions; but I am inclined to think that the educational process is a much greater one than is usually considered to be linked up with, and the purpose of, the so-called public school. I believe, as every member of this House doubtless believes, that at the centre of the Canadianizing process for the foreigner there will always be the public schools; but there are other influences at work, and there should be still other influences, operating to the end that these men and women who have come to our shores may come to understand what Canada is, and what it is to become a Canadian. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) urged, all too briefly I think, the importance of the education of the adult alien. Merely giving attention to the training of the child in the school will never enable us to overtake the problem that is on our hands. There are the grown-up boy and the grown-up girl, who will never go to school again and who have never gone to school in this country. There are the impressionable young man and young woman and there are perhaps a very few of the older foreigners who are susceptible to instruction along the lines that will make possible their understanding of the simple fundamentals of Canadian history, Canadian institutions, Canadian customs, Canadian laws and Canadian community life at its best. The details of any such programme certainly are not for us to consider here to-night, but I am yet to be convinced that it is impossible to help, especially in the cities, a larger number of the grown-ups by evening classes, and by the use of moving pictures of the kind that will make them understand. I have been informed on good authority that in our greatest city, the city of Montreal, out of a total foreign-born population of 105,000, only 6,000 are reached through social educational classes at the present time. Is it not possible also to reach the grown-up foreigner in rural Canada? The mothers are being reached in many western communities through instructors who go out at the direction of the Health Departments of the provinces. Mothers' clubs and similar groups have been organized with splendid results. But this does not of necessity make for Canadian citizenship. It appeals to the mother, let us say; the teaching she gets makes it possible for her to conduct in a more modern way the little new home, so that there will be fewer deaths of young children in that home. But is there not possible this larger recognition of the opportunity—yes, of the necessity—that lies right at our hand at the present time of telling these people in such a way that they cannot mistake what it means to live in our country. I am interested in the double column printing of many articles in the non-English periodicals of Western Canada. I believe that for certain articles there should be in parallel columns an English translation, but I submit that merely legislating into the foreigner's press a translation is not sufficient to Canadianize him. I look upon their papers as a necessary evil for the time being. I think they should have them if they are conducted along right lines. I am of the opinion that some of them are not conducted along right lines because in some of them I have had the honour to be accused of being very much opposed to all foreigners in western Canada. But why could we not have the non-English press —the foreign press, if you will—of Canada publishing weekly or monthly articles in the language of the majority of the readers of these papers, conveying to the minds of these poor Canadians in some cases,—non-Canadians and new Canadians in a great many others—what is in the mind and in the heart of a sympathetic Canadian-born citizen who appreciates the foreigner in the land. Syndicate these articles if you will, in the less formal sense; let these people know, week after week and month after month, something of our past history; make it possible for these adults to read this in their own homes. They are not going to school. In the rural districts they will not go to the night schools, where there are night schools, for many weeks in the year at any rate. There are scores of different ways whereby we might touch for their betterment the lives of the foreigners who would be Canadians if we would give them all the opportunities that are possible.

I do not wish to convey the idea that I am among those who believe that all the foreign-born in Canada have the right spirit. Nor yet should any of us be so foolish as to think that all the foreign-born are not going to be good Canadians. There were some of the neutral aliens and some of the friendly aliens who were very far

from being with us during the period of the war. We simply have to take them as we find them. Those who are the most impressionable we will teach in one way; those who are the least impressionable we will try to get at in another way; and those who are not impressionable at all should not be allowed to continue in Canada.

May I, before resuming my seat, illustrate what I mean by referring to a question asked by a Ukrainian. Many of us think that Ukrainians and Ruthenians are pretty much the same. The young man to whom I refer insists that he is not willing to join a Ruthenian club but has become a charter member of a Ukrainian club. He understands the difference if we do not. This is the question that he put to me: "What do you Canadians think of us people anyway?" My answer was: "John, it depends very much on the Canadian who is doing the thinking and on the foreigner that he is thinking about." That has always been so and I suppose it will be so more or less to the end of the chapter. But I found in that man's mind, and in his heart too, questionings and desires that proved conclusively to me that he for one was anxious to know how to be a good Canadian. The first man to leave his work on the morning of armistice day, after he had secured permission, in order to get into the hall where there was to be a celebration, was this same Ukrainian.

But in Canadianizing him or any of his class are we to think that we can for one moment make Anglo-Canadians of them? Their viewpoint, their temperament, their disposition, their fibre, are different from ours. I do not want to see them hyphenated Canadians. I am not so much afraid of the word "Ukrainian-Canadian," as I am of the hyphen in the thing. It is the hyphen that is the menace, Mr. Speaker, and we must have none of it. But taking it for granted always that there will be a difference in the outlook and in the conception in regard to many things, is it not in the letter and in the spirit of this resolution, is it not in the heart and in the minds of the majority of the members of this House of Parliament, to make it more easily possible in future than it has been in the past to speed up the process whereby we can help the best of these foreigners in our country to become intelligent and thoroughgoing Canadians? For the old people, they will always see some things differently from the Canadian-born. For the children who are in the schools now, and for the children who are yet to be born, I think we can reasonably hope that they will become, if educated, if socialized, if assimilated in ways that are fair—that are strict, or exacting, if you please, but nevertheless fair, and consistent—a part of the very best sections of the body politic. I believe in the resolution of the hon. member for South Perth.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Minister of the Interior): Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that this resolution has come on in the absence of my hon. friend the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) whose duty it would have been, had he been present, to speak to the resolution from the standpoint of the Government. It concerns a subject the administration of which until 1917 was under the Department of the Interior but has since passed under a separate organization and a separate minister.

The character of the immigration that has come to Canada in the last years is pretty well reflected in the census figures of 1911, but as to Western Canada is more closely reflected in the census of 1916. It is a matter of major consequence to this country that in these western provinces there lives to-day a population forty per cent of which, speaking roughly,—much larger in Saskatchewan and smaller in Alberta and British Columbia—is non-Anglo-Saxon-born and very little relatively French-Canadian. To say that that percentage is not Anglo-Saxon-born is not to express the whole truth. A great proportion of the balance is of those born in the United States of America. These two classes of immigration have been so great that we find two of our western provinces to-day populated to the extent of virtually seventy per cent, and more in one case, by non-British born.

This is a consequence of the rapid development of the provinces; it could scarcely have been otherwise. Had those provinces waited for their growth until the overflow from the more populated regions of the East should have achieved that result, the growth would have been exceedingly slow, the development exceedingly tedious. On the whole a fairly useful class of citizens has come into that land. The emigration from countries who were the enemies of the British Empire was large and constituted, I should say, over half, much over half, of the non-Anglo-Saxon population. I have no comment to make on those references in the debate to the conduct of that portion of the population during the progress of the war.

These people were in this respect at least much like others—they differed very very widely according to the place to which you went and according to the men you met. Nevertheless it is abundantly evident that we would have had a more spontaneous and a more practically useful war result from those provinces had the population all been Canadian or all British born. That was only in the nature of things; that is the only result one can expect, having regard to considerations of sympathy and of blood. That Canadianization of the immigrants in Canada is a necessity, all of us frankly and enthusiastically admit. We would all subscribe to the doctrine, too, that no matter what the country's effort may be, no matter what means it may adopt or what propaganda it may carry on, no matter what money it may spend, to Canadianize an immigration of that character, it can only absorb and take care of a certain number, proportionate to the already Canadianized population year by year. The body politic can only digest a certain proportion of the foreign born immigrants. Only by slow degrees can our foreign-born population grow to the full stature of Canadian citizenship. We cannot possibly take care of more than a certain flow of immigration. We are all ready to admit now that in past years the doors have been opened too wide, that we have not sufficiently considered our capacity to bring the principles of Canadian citizenship home to our population in deciding what should be the extent of immigration we should welcome here. In recent years the attitude of the Government has been to contract and to select, rather than to follow the open-door policy of days gone by.

I join in the commendation so generously given to the hon. member (Mr. Steele) in raising a discussion which impresses upon Parliament and, through Parliament, upon the country, the necessity of bringing, as I expressed it previously, our immigrant population to the full stature of Canadian citizenship. Very many ideas have been brought forward upon which we can with advantage reflect. There have not been a plethora of concrete suggestions as to what functions could be adequately or efficiently discharged by the Federal Government in taking care of this work. Not only is the House indebted to the hon. member for South Perth, to those on this side, and one hon. gentleman in the third party, who have contributed to the discussion, but I am sure all will join with me in a word of encomium upon the valuable contribution to the debate that has come from the official Opposition. It would really appear—having in mind the keen solicitude of hon. gentlemen opposite in the debates of two and a half years ago and of two and a half days ago on the subject of the foreign visitors to our shores—that they would have been keenly interested in the problem launched for discussion this afternoon. That they have very carefully and sedulously refrained from taking part may perhaps be an indication that after all their chief interest in the alien, naturalized and unnaturalized, is in his vote.

The task of Canadianizing the foreign-born is fundamentally and solely a question of education. The provinces, under the Canadian constitution, have jurisdiction in matters of education. Not only have they jurisdiction but their authority is exclusive on that subject: Section 93 of the British North America Act gives them distinctly exclusive jurisdiction on all educational matters. It is true that a Federal administration may come to the assistance and work through the medium of the province in advancing any educational programme. We have availed ourselves of that opportunity in the policy of the Government on technical education. We have done likewise in matters of agricultural education. But in all matters that are essentially educational, the direct and immediate jurisdiction and machinery must constitutionally be provincial. I am not finding fault with the efforts put forth and the provisions made by the provincial legislatures of the Dominion toward this end. It has not been at all times what we would like it to be, but it has improved with the years, and I believe there has been marked improvement of late, particularly in Western Canada. It has been for the provinces a question not easy to solve, a question surrounded with many and great difficulties, but they have attacked it, and they are, in the main, discharging that obligation well.

Now I should speak with considerable circumspection for the reason that I am not the minister in charge of the department under which this matter comes, nor am I aware of just what the mind of the minister is in this regard. I believe though—indeed I know for that matter—that he has given considerable thought to the problem, and I do not believe I exceed the mark when I say that he has more or less definite plans in mind for dealing with it. I cannot go further at the present time. I do feel justified, however, in bringing this consideration to the attention of Parliament: If the Dominion moves along the lines suggested it means federal assistance to the provinces in

discharge of distinctly provincial obligations To take that course would by no means unprecedented; in fact, it would be following a procedure that in my judgment has been too often followed in this Dominion. The federal Government and Parliament have on repeated occasions stood behind provincial governments and legislatures and have come to their aid with federal funds for the advancement of policies the control of which and the responsibility for which were essentially and solely provincial. So long as the federal treasury is in a position to take care of that extra responsibility the same objection cannot be urged. But it has always appeared to me somewhat unreasonable that avenues of taxation which have all along been open to the provinces and adopted by them to get revenue, should be invaded and taxes duplicated by the federal authorities for the sake of collecting through the same means and from the same people more revenue, and then paying it back to the provinces on account of obligations which were essentially their own. The wisdom of procedure of that kind always seemed very doubtful to my mind, and it does appear manifest, to me at least, that now at the close of a great war, with the financial obligations of the war centred on the back of the federal authorities, and with the necessity of stretching out the hand after various sources to get revenue to meet and discharge those obligations,—it does seem to me that if we are to get those revenues from provincial channels and by the duplication of provincial machinery, it would be wise to reflect whether it would not be better to leave the provinces full responsibility for obligations which are distinctly theirs, and at the same time leave them means for providing the revenue to meet those obligations, we confining ourselves to our own sphere, which we all confess is wide enough and big enough to meet the most ambitious schemes.

I simply mention that consideration in passing—not that it has any particular reference to the suggestion embodied in the resolution before the Chair, but on the question of federal policy with regard to matters that are provincial and that have been in past days helped out to a very substantial extent from the federal treasury, I believe it has distinct relevancy, having regard to the whole principle of the obligations of this Dominion in that field.

Now, as to the resolution itself, it emphasizes a very important matter as regards the duty of the individual citizen, as regards the duty no doubt of the provinces fundamentally and primarily, and possibly in some degree as regards the duty of the Dominion itself. I have not given sufficient thought to the subject to even indicate upon what lines money might profitably be spent and effort expended by the Dominion authorities to achieve the end desired. I say again I have no objection to the resolution passing. I believe that some proposals —I would expect limited in scope—may be made in this regard in the not distant future. But anything in the nature of a definite and official statement on the subject should await the return of the minister who is responsible for the administration of the department.

Mr. ANDREW R. McMASTER (Brome): Mr. Speaker, the subject before the House this evening is one of the greatest interest to all of us, because upon a proper consideration of the subject, and upon proper means taken to arrive at the desirable end outlined in the resolution, depend in very large measure the success of the Canadian nation.

The problem, Mr. Speaker, is no small one. We people of English, Scotch or Irish blood and of the English tongue have no necessity to voice the Scottish mother's prayer that the Lord would give her children a good conceit of themselves. We have that without any divine aid. We are accustomed to regard ourselves as an English-speaking, Anglo-Saxon nation. We are nothing of the sort. I suppose English is the native tongue of barely a little more than half of our population, and the rest of the population is composed of people whose tongues are almost as numerous as those spoken at the building of the Tower of Babel.

The minister who after some kindly words directed at this side of the House—quite in his usual manner before he resumed his seat, said that in the past we were all agreed that the doors had been opened too wide. I do not know whether we are all agreed in that. I do not know whether the people who have come into this country in the past fifteen or twenty years have not been on the whole good citizens and done a great deal by their labour, mental and intellectual, to build up the Canadian nation. But I would say, Mr. Speaker, that after they got here quite possibly we did not do as much for them as we should have done.

I know that in the city in which I live during the last fifteen years numbers of these people have come from Central Europe,—largely Hebrews from Roumania, Russia and Poland,—and I am afraid that

we have not been as careful as we should have been to see that they lived in as healthful physical surroundings as were essential to their proper development. But we have done something to educate them, and some of our schools in Montreal are almost entirely attended by the boys and girls of these newcomers. And, Mr. Speaker, it makes one's belief in the innate goodness of humanity—in spite of the remarks made by the Minister of the Interior who has just taken his seat—to see how these people quickly respond to education. An old college friend of mine, a principal of one of our city schools, assured me that in these families one saw a remarkable difference from the eldest child to the youngest who had attended school, and that in the course of one short half a generation the improvement was most strongly marked.

Out in the West I cannot speak with any degree of authority, but I remember an address delivered to this House last year by the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Andrews), if I mistake not, in which he said that in many places the folks out there had more or less shown the seamy side of the West rather than the best to the newcomer. The story which I once heard rather illustrates this point. A man was asked whether he was a Doukhobor, and he said, "Oh, no, me smoke, me drink, me swear—me a Canadian." I am afraid that very often it has been the seamy side of our life which we have shown to the newcomer.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what do we need to do in order to make these people good Canadians? First of all, we have to give them an example of Canadianism; we have to be Canadians ourselves. We have to do less talking about the Empire and more talking about Canada. The member for Brandon (Mr. Whidden) made a very just and true observation when he said that if we attempted to make Anglo-Canadians out of these people we attempted an impossible task. The ideal we have to hold up before these people is the ideal of Canadianism. We should have our own flag in order that the children in the school-houses all over the country might learn to honour and salute the flag that belonged to us—just as Australia, New Zealand and the Union of South Africa have their own flags. It is not that we love the Union Jack less, but because we love the Canadian ensign more.

And the next thing we should show them is a Canadianism which is a kindly Canadianism. We want to get away from the spirit of bitterness and into that spirit which was so well exemplified by the Acting Prime Minister (Sir George Foster) the other day in this House when he pleaded that we get together. We want to get away from that spirit exemplified so amply in the House to-night by the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Meighen), one of whose purposes in intervening in a non-contentious debate is that of insulting the Opposition. We want to choose the better and leave the worst part. They are there, both before you; you will choose.

Next, if we want to have a good Canadian sentiment; if we want people to love our country, we must make our country lovely. That is something which Parliament cannot do, though it may help; something which provincial legislatures cannot do, though they may help. But it is something which individuals can do. After all, it is easy enough to talk high sentiment, but it is much harder to live in accordance with high ideals. We have to see to it that we who belong to the larger families of the Canadian people, we English-speaking folk and French-speaking folk, have the proper attitude toward each other as well as to these men and women who from other countries have come here to seek a larger freedom and better living conditions. We have to see to it that these people find Canada a kindly place to live in. We have to see to it that we regard them as our fellow-citizens, just as dear to us as our own folk, and to whom we shall extend the same even-handed justice as we extend to our own folk. We have to see to it that our national thought runs along channels which will appeal to the newcomer and which will be as deep and as wide as humanity itself. We have to develop a broad and a generous spirit in Canada; and I believe we can do it.

I find myself in entire agreement with the Minister of the Interior, when he suggests that it is unwise for the federal Government to collect from the Canadian people sums of money and then hand them over to the provinces to be expended. I would, as far as possible, put upon the provinces who have the responsibility for spending the money the onus of raising it. That, I believe, is sound economics, sound constitutional practice, something we should cleave to as far as possible. A great deal can be done by public bodies and by private agencies to bring together men and women of different races and different beliefs.

If a mistake has been made in the great West, it has been perhaps, in allowing groups of these people to settle together. Of course, there are two sides to the question. These people come to this country,

to them a foreign land; they heard only a tongue which was foreign to their own, and it was natural that they should want to group together. Why, it is said that if two Scotchmen were left on a desert island they very soon would form a Caledonian society. That spirit of clannishness is a natural spirit; it has its good side, though it has also its dangerous side.

Work has been done among the new Canadians by many people in Canada. I hold in my hand a work by Mr. Alfred Fitzpatrick who has made up a book which is a partly historical, partly geographical, partly a pictorial way of teaching the English language. This shows that men are at work on this important matter.

After all, there is little that is controversial in this discussion. Appropriate measures should be taken,—I would rather say by "Government" than by "this Government," because, after all, this Government is only indirectly and in a very slight degree involved in the question of education, and it is of doubtful wisdom for us who have a very large field for our endeavours to trespass on the field occupied by the provinces. So, if it could be understood that this resolution is to be regarded as meaning "Government" rather than the federal Government, I believe I could give it my hearty support and approval.

Mr. R. C. HENDERS (Macdonald): Mr. Speaker, the resolution presented this afternoon opens up for consideration one of the most important questions, I think, that will come before Parliament this session. Not having been here during the afternoon I do not know what ground has been covered by preceding speakers, but at the risk of repeating some of the statements made during the afternoon I desire to express in a few words the view that I hold in regard to this importaant matter.

If anything of value is to grow out of this discussion we shall have to get down to particulars and apply the principles laid down in the resolution in some way that will bring practical results. The government of our country naturally divides itself into three different departments, municipal, provincial and federal

In the discussion of this question it would be well for us to keep in mind that each department of government makes its contribution to the building up of citizenship in those who are to live in this country. And as we bring people into this country expecting to make citizens of them, each of those departments of government must make a contribution towards the education of those prospective citizens. Hitherto, we have been, in a large measure at least, vague and indefinite in our method bringing in of the foreigner and in the invitation we extend to immigrants to come to our shores. We have sent out immigration officials to different countries of the world, and particularly to the old world, and our ambition has been to induce men and women to come to Canada. Our success has been measured by the numbers we have succeeded in bringing into this country, and we have put a financial value, perhaps, on the number in proportion to the largeness of that number; but we have not selected as carefully as we ought, and after they have been brought to our shores and have taken their place among us as citizens of this country, we have done worse than that; we seem to have treated them much as Topsy was treated by her friends; we have just left them to grow up. We have paid very little attention to them after we have brought them here except perhaps at election time when, if we thought we could make a good Tory or a good Grit vote, we might interest ourselves sufficiently to secure their naturalization and their registration. But we have not approached the question with the idea of placing before those foreigners as they come to our country, the responsibility of citizenship and the honour that should attach to the privilege of being a citizen of Canada. I was thinking about that the other day and this incident came to my mind. There was a time in the history of the Christian church when conflict arose between the followers of Christ and some of the church officers with regard to the views they held on certain questions, and one of them was arraigned before a court for trial. It was learned that he was a Roman by birth and when he appeared before the court, the officer of the court said to him: "Art thou a Roman?" He replied in the affirmative: "With great price have I obtained this citizenship" said the officer. He felt that it was an honour to be a Roman citizen and he was prepared to pay a price for it; he was proud of his citizenship. We have failed on this point, in that we do not place before these people as we ought to the responsibility and the honour of citizenship in this country, and the privileges that go with that citizenship.

Canada is a confederacy and we have Dominion Day as the great day on which we celebrate Confederation. It seems to me that Confederation Day ought to afford us a great opportunity in connection with the development of citizenship, not only in the

children that are growing up, but in the foreigners that are coming to our land. If we would properly use that day, we could make it a day that would be educational in its value and influence along this line. I had in mind an arrangement something like this. It is thought that perhaps we should extend the terms of residence in this country before we would grant full citizenship to the foreigner who comes to our shores. We could use this terms of years in an educational way to great advantage to those foreigners. Upon reaching our shores, the immigrant makes a certain declaration and assumes certain responsibilities—declares his intentions. Supposing we start in on the first Dominion Day after the immigrant reaches our shores by saying to him: On Dominion Day, we shall expect you to appear with the multitude of the people who are gathered for celebration on that day, and one hour of the day of celebration programme shall be devoted to education on citizenship. Somebody should be present to speak on the flag and what it stands for; somebody else should be there to speak on the institution and laws of our land. Then I would say that an opportunity should be given to the candidate, after having heard those explanations, to declare himself publicly whether he desired to proceed further and at a later date, enter into citizenship in our country. A splendid opportunity would be given to lay all the advantages of Canadian citizenship before the immigrant and also to place before him the honour of becoming a Canadian citizen. I would follow that course until the first three years had passed, and then I would say to him: Now you have proven yourself worthy and we believe that the time has come when we can entrust you with part of the responsibility of citizenship. Government might be divided into three departments, viz: municipal, provincial and federal. You as a candidate having signified your desire of becoming a citizen; having lived amongst us so long, and during that time having proven yourself worthy. Therefore, we give you the first step towards citizenship in this country, and by this ceremony we publicly give you the right to vote in municipal affairs. In connection with this ceremony—I would explain all about our municipal institutions and laws, the privileges and the responsibilities connected with municipal life. After the expiration of the second term of years he would again appear before the properly constituted board and publicly be instructed with regard to the duties and responsibilities of provincial citizenship. Having satisfied the board that he understood what was involved in such an examination and having publicly declared that he desired to proceed further, I would confer on him the right and responsibility of a provincial voter. Then at the end of the term he would come up for full citizenship.

9 p.m. At that time I would have the meaning of federal institutions, federal laws and federal responsibilities explained to him, and he would then publicly declare himself as to his desire to enter into full citizenship. If we adopted this course, we would not have so many mistakes made by these people afterwards, nor so many misunderstandings in regard to what it means to be a citizen of our country. We would have a citizenship that would be intelligent, that could not be played with, and that would be able to understand public questions as they came up from time to time. I am glad that the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) called attention to the fact that the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) is not here and I hope that when definite action is taken he will be present to give us the benefit of his thinking along these lines. I believe the problem of what we are to do with the non-English and non-French speaking aliens who are coming to this country to assume citizenship will be solved by our taking them into our confidence and explaining to them our institutions and our laws. Let us talk these matters over with them and mix more freely with them. Let us play with them more, let us sing with them more, and then we shall bring them to feel they are one with us, and I do not think we shall have any trouble in making them good citizens.

Mr. S. F. GLASS (East Middlesex): Mr. Speaker, the object of the resolution before us, to create and develop a better citizenship amongst the foreign-born in this country, is certainly to be commended, but that the responsibility should in a large measure devolve upon the federal Government, as is intimated in the resolution, is a conclusion with which I am unable to agree. The hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Steele) in introducing the resolution this afternoon drew attention to the fact that from 1906 to 1915 some two and a half million immigrants came to this country. Going into the figures a little more closely, I might point out that from 1910 to 1914, 1,662,025 immigrants came to this country, and of that number 1,270,000 and more came

from the British Isles and the United States.

Just here I wish to express my pleasure at the remarks made by the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Henders). He is really the first member of the House speaking to this resolution who has given us any constructive programme by which the object of the resolution might be attained. I also wish to say that notwithstanding the criticism that has been levelled at the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Maharg) I know from experience that what he suggested this afternoon, that we should assimilate these people by getting them into community circles and clubs and making them feel they are at one with the citizens of the surrounding district, would go a long way towards establishing proper assimilation and promoting a good understanding and feeling amongst these people. It has been a gross error in the past that so little care has been taken in the proper examination of these people before they were admitted into this country. I do not mean a perfunctory examination at the border, possibly sometimes by an inexperienced or inefficient member of the Immigration or Health Department, but their whole record in their own country should have been closely inquired into before ever they were allowed to set foot on a steamer sailing for these shores. If we had taken that precaution in years gone by, instead of herding them here like so many cattle, we should not have had so much misery and suffering, nor so much of that element that has been a disturbing influence to our social and moral fabric. I can speak to some extent from experience on this question because in the country of Middlesex, and it was also done by our friends in the county of Lambton, in the year 1912 we organized a publicity association to bring immigrants to that district. We published a pamphlet of forty-eight pages, very nicely illustrated, describing farm and city life in that community, and we endeavoured to have only honest statements made to these immigrants so that when they arrived they would find nothing misrepresented. We also sent over an immigration agent from the county whose duty it was to go into the rural communities in these different countries and personally select for farm life in this country men who had been trained to agriculture, men of character, good morals and of sound health. Farmers in the community from which I come were ready to advance the money to bring these men out, and when they did arrive we went one step further. After we were satisfied that these men would fulfill the duties of citizenship in this country, we raised a fund and advanced money to them to enable them to bring their families out so that they could settle here and be happy and contented.

I do not at all doubt that the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) intends to make ample provision for a proper examination of every immigrant who is allowed to sail for this country, and that the intending immigrant's record will be known before he leaves his native country for his destination in Canada. This work devolves, I understand, not only on the Department of Immigration and Colonization, but to some extent also on the Department of Health, of which my hon. friend the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) has supervision. I saw not long ago in the Civil Service sheet that is sent out, advertisements calling for efficient and capable men to go to the border and to seaports to examine immigrants coming in; and here the old trouble comes up again. How are we going to get capable men for this work if we do not pay them the salary to which they are entitled? Colonel Amyot, the head of the Health Department, is a most capable and efficient man, and if he has at his disposal a sufficient sum to meet the requirements of proper supervision in this matter, I have no doubt that as regards the physical health of the immigrants we shall get a class of citizens whom we shall be glad to welcome. It is an old saying that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure, and I do not know of any matter requiring our immediate consideration to which that saying is more applicable than the subject now under consideration. If we take proper precautions to guard against admitting undesirables into this country we shall get the kind of people we can welcome. I happened to pick up since dinner a pamphlet published in April by the Commission of Conservation in which reference is made to the character of some of the immigrants who come to this country not long ago. It says:

> Dr. C. K. Clarke, medical director, Canadian National Committee for Mental Hygiene, points out in the Toronto Globe of January 27, 1919, that out of nineteen girls introduced into Canada by one society, eighteen were mothers of illegitimate children—that was the case in one community. Out of four hundred admissions to jail in one western province, only 23 per cent were of Canadian birth. The Austrians contributed 33 per cent, although their normal proportion should have been 8 per cent. Of 266 cases of unmarried mothers, which passed through one Ontario hospital, 191 were feeble-minded, 4 were insane, 42 were border-line cases, and only 26 were classified as normal.

In Manitoba and Ontario the proportion of unmarried mothers was but slightly over 25 per cent Canadian.

It is not necessary to refer to statistics; there can be multiplied a hundredfold and on every hand evidences that the type of immigrant we admitted to our shores in the past has been an injury to the moral and physical health of our people. I would just urge again that the Department of Health which exercises supervision over the admission of immigrants will see that only men of probity, efficiency and ability are entrusted with checking the inflow of immigration as it reaches our shores.

Mr. STEELE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer just a word in closing this debate and to express my very great satisfaction at the interest that the subject has aroused in this House to-day. A few things have been said which I would like briefly to reply to. Emphasis has been laid on the question of this being a matter of education and, that being so, the federal Government should not interfere. It seems to me that it is not absolutely a question of education. The federal Parliament decides what immigrants shall come into this country and it decides who shall be kept out of this country; we define what each applicant for naturalization must comply with before he can become naturalized; and surely it will be inconsistent to take the ground that, when the federal Government has done all this, and with a perfect right, it should in no way whatever take action in regard to training the newcomers to be intelligent citizens upon naturalization.

If we take the narrow view of education as we commonly speak of it, perhaps there would be some strength in the argument; but if we take the wider view, that the diffusion of any and all knowledge is a process of education, where do we land ourselves? What could we do in our Agricultural Department in the way of sending out information to our farmers? Surely that is educative. The federal Government does that. If we argue that this Canadianizing of immigrants being a question of education we should not interfere, the reply must be that neither should we interfere with educating the farmer in proper methods of farming. I do not admit that at all. I believe that the federal Government is doing a good work in the education of the farmers, and I believe it ought to be doing a good work in the education of foreigners for citizenship, not for the purpose of simply giving them an "education" as we usually speak of it.

I do not know that I could entirely agree with the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster), when he expressed the opinion that a mistake had been made in the West in allowing the foreigners to group together. If we are going to continue to show the indifference towards foreigners that we have done in the past, I would be inclined to agree with him; but if we as a federal Government are going to take the interest in the foreigner that I think we ought to take, probably it would assist our efforts to Canadianize him if those of a class are allowed to settle in groups. If that effort is made to Canadianize him it can be more effectively made when these foreigners are settled together and we can reach them through their own leaders, schools, churches and social organizations.

I do not think there would be any objection by the provinces to the federal Government taking part in this work. In fact, I noticed that when the National Conference on Character Education was held in Winnipeg last summer, most of the Western Provinces, if not all of them, and some of the Eastern Provinces were represented. That conference passed a very strong resolution calling upon the federal Government to assist with this work. I am not aware that any province made any objection to the passing of the resolution. I should think that the provinces would welcome the aid of the Government. We know that in Saskatchewan last year 750 teachers were called for more than could be obtained. Do you pretend to say that the provinces would not be glad of the assistance of the federal authorities in providing teachers to assist foreign groups and communities in securing not only education through the public schools, but also education in citizenship, civics and all other matters which are necessary in order to make them good Canadian citizens?

Some criticism was also offered that no constructive programme had been suggested except by the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Henders). I do not think that this is the stage for suggesting definite programmes. What we are concerned more about here to-day is to get this federal Parliament interested in the great question of Canadianizing the foreigner. When the interest of Parliament is secured there will be some way of deciding what method shall be adopted in order to give effect to the

expressed will of Parliament; definite methods will come later.

I was struck with one or two of the remarks made by the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Maharg). He was glad to see, he said, the interest being taken in this matter by members opposite, referring, I presume, to the members on this side of the House. At that time the hon. member for Brome and no other member on that side of the House had spoken; so I presume that the member for Maple Creek could feel like Pollyanna; he was glad also because of the interest that was being taken in the subject by members on the opposite side of the House, and he had two reasons for his gladness. But, in his succeeding remarks he expressed regret that this resolution had not been introduced three or four years ago.

Mr. MAHARG: Three or four Parliaments ago.

Mr. STEELE: I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon?

Mr. MAHARG: I had no reference to this House; I said it should have been introduced three or four Parliaments before.

Mr. STEELE: I stand corrected; I quite agree that it might have been better if it had been introduced at any time in the past. The hon. gentleman referred also to the point that we should not treat foreigners with suspicion. Now my impression of the foreigner is that suspicion is not one of the qualities of his mind, and that any suspicion which develops there is the product of the seed which is sown, generally by Canadian citizens who do it largely with a selfish purpose. If the foreigner becomes suspicious it is not because he is naturally inclined that way; it is because he is led to become so from the seed that is planted in his mind.

Mr. MAHARG: I would like to be sure that the hon. gentleman does not misunderstand me. When I mentioned suspicion I had no thought whatever of suspicion in the mind of the foreigner. I said it was we who were treating him with suspicion. The reference I made was to our own attitude and not that of the foreigner.

Mr. STEELE: In that case I would still disagree with the hon. gentleman in his belief that we are treating the foreigner with suspicion. I would like the members of this House to be given credit for being sincere when they discuss questions relating to the foreigner. I do not think it is at all necessary that the members of this Parliament should be accused, every time that questions relating to the foreigner come up, of having ulterior motives in the discussion. Many of the questions relating to our foreign population are great national questions and fraught with the greatest importance to the future of this country. While members on one side may differ from those on the other, and even members on each side may differ among themselves, as to what is the proper policy to pursue towards the foreigner, I should think we might each give credit to the other for being at least sincere in the ideas we entertain and the policies we advocate. I therefore trust that the word "suspicion" will be omitted when we are discussing what our treatment of the foreigner should be. I know very well how easy it is to create suspicion in his mind. Very often all that is necessary is to tell him that the Parliament of Canada, or some one else, is looking upon him with suspicion. That is sufficient to develop in his mind suspicion of this body or that person. I am very glad indeed that this resolution has been accorded such a favourable reception, and that its presentation has led to such a wide and interesting discussion.

Motion agreed to.

FISHERIES OF CANADA.

MR. DUFF'S RESOLUTION IN FAVOUR OF IMMEDIATE DEVELOPMENT.

Mr. WILLIAM DUFF (Lunenburg) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, fish being a highly nutritious and palatable article of food, greater production is most desirable, and as the fisheries of Canada are capable of much greater development, which can be best carried out by an aggressive policy on the part of the Fisheries Department of the Federal Government, in co-operation with the fishermen and others interested in this great industry, it is desirable that the Government take immediate steps to formulate and put into effect a vigorous policy so that the fisheries of Canada may be prosecuted to the utmost possible extent.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this resolution is one which contains truths which are of vital importance to all Canada at the present time. In view of the fact that the nations of the world are desperately in need of food products I feel that it is incumbent upon me at this time to endeavour to place before this House reasons why the Government should in every way possible develop one of the major and great industries of the country.

The fisheries, Mr. Speaker, is not a new industry. It is as old as the world itself.

If you will turn to the book of Genesis, you will find it says there in the 19th and 21st verses of the first chapter that "it was the evening and morning of the fourth day and God created great whales and every living creature that moveth, which the waters brought forth abundantly after their kind. And God blessed them saying 'Be fruitful and multiply and fill the waters of the sea.' " Again in the same book, when the flood was to be sent upon the earth, and Noah was warned thereof, and when he was told to take into the ark every clean beast by sevens and every unclean beast by two, including the animals of the earth and the fowls of the air, no mention was made of the fishes of the sea, I presume for the reason that the waters which were to cover the earth could not affect the fishes of the deep. But we also find that when the waters had subsided and the ark had rested on Mount Ararat, the same book says that God blessed Noah and his sons and said unto them "Be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth." And he further said "And the fear of you and the dread of you shall be upon every beast of the earth and upon every fowl of the air, upon all that moveth on the earth and upon all the fishes of the sea, into your hand are they delivered." So we see that in the olden times the fishes of the sea were put there for man's use.

Coming further down the ages, we find in the New Testament that the Sea of Gallillee was a very prolific fishing ground and that when the Saviour of the earth desired disciples to do his bidding he went to the fishermen of the Sea of Gallillee and commanded them to follow him and he would make them fishers of men. We all remember that beautiful chapter in the gospel of St. John where Peter said unto his brother disciples "I go a fishing." They also said unto him, "We go with thee." We remember the story goes on to say that they entered into a ship and that night they caught nothing, but when the morning came the Master stood on the shore and said "Children, have ye any meat?" They answered him "No," and He said unto them "Cast the net on the right side of the ship and ye shall find." They cast therefore and now they were not able to draw it for the multitude of fishes."

The same is true to-day as it was then, that despite the quantities of fish taken from the sea and the sums of treasure derived therefrom, that if we cast our net on the right side of the ship we will bring it back filled with a multitude of fishes.

[Mr. Duff.]

Coming to more modern times let me say, Mr. Speaker, that our fisheries have the distinction of being the only Canadian asset which was tendered even a passing notice by ancient historians, one of whom avers that five hundred years before Columbus started on his eventful voyage of discovery, Norwegian and Icelandic fishing fleets operated in the bays of Newfoundland and along the coast of Labrador, whilst by the recorded correspondence of diplomats and treaties drawn by French, American and British statesmen, it is made positively clear that as early as 1450 Portuguese and French fishermen pursued the codfish on the Grand Banks. John Cabot justifies this contention when in 1497 he reported to his Government that on arriving at Newfoundland he found foreign fishermen operating in the waters surrounding that island.

As early as 1632, when Nova Scotia was under French rule, two cargoes of fish were shipped from Lunenburg county to Portugal, and whilst describing the fisheries of Acadia as they were in 1699, Villebun, the French historian wrote as follows:—"If rightly managed this Province is a Peru." If more be necessary to show the antiquity of this invaluable asset of Canada that more is set out in detail in an international record covering the negotiations between Great Britain and the United States, when they entered into their first fisheries treaty. It is a well known fact that for years the British Government spent large sums of money to retain the Atlantic fisheries and that for many years American and French had no rights there.

Coming to the present age it is my desire to give facts and figures to show not only the value of the Canadian fisheries, but to give figures of the value of the fisheries of other countries so as to make comparison and to show what they are doing. I also intend to place on record some information which I have gathered from time to time as to what the other countries of the world are doing to encourage and help this great industry. My only regret is that I cannot devote sufficient time to properly give to you, Sir, and the House, all the information which I have accumulated in many years of experience of this business. I have therefor to apologize not only to the House, but to the fishermen of Canada and the others with whom I have been closely connected during my whole lifetime.

I desire first to place on record some figures with regard to the fisheries of Canada and the various other countries of the world which place fishing in the forefront of their

industries. In giving those figures it will be noticed that most of them are for years previous to the war. My reason for doing this is that Great Britain and the countries adjacent to the North Sea were greatly handicapped in their fishery operations from 1914 to 1919, due as we all know to the fact that these countries were engaged in the great struggle which convulsed Europe and the world.

The value of the fisheries of the whole Dominion of Canada for the three years, 1910, 1913 and 1917 is as follows: In 1910 the total value was $29,965,433; in 1913 it had increased to $33,207,748, and in 1917 the value had jumped to $52,312,044. The increase in value for the year 1917—and that also holds good for the three years previous for which I have not given figures,—was not due to the increased quantity of fish caught, but was entirely due to enhanced prices which were obtained during these years. Owing to the fact that other countries were not producing as much fish as usual, and owing to the further fact that all other commodities increased in value, prices of the different classes of fish also advanced in some cases 50 per cent, in some 75 per cent and in others 100 per cent. If time permitted I would like to give detailed figures of the fisheries of the different provinces, but this would take too long and is not really necessary for my present purpose. However, I would like to give to the House a synopsis, first of the value of fisheries in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Quebec for certain years, and also the value of fisheries of Ontario, Western Canada and British Columbia.

For the eastern provinces the value of the fisheries in 1900 was $14,283,679; in 1910, $17,099,570; in 1913, $15,737,207 and in 1917, $25,812,094. For Ontario and the western provinces, including British Columbia, the value in 1900 was $6,353,560; in 1910, $12,747,498; in 1913, $17,402,276 and in 1917, $26,432,549. The value for Eastern Canada as given for 1910 is probably over a million dollars too high, as it is well known that the accuracy of the annual departmental report for that year of the dry cod returned was greatly doubted.

It should be remembered, Sir, in comparing the value of the Canadian fisheries with that of other countries that the Canadian value is given as the value of the product prepared for market, with all the expense of curing and packing added to it. In European countries and in the Atlantic coast districts of the United States the value quoted is the value of the fish as landed by the fishermen. Reckoned on the same basis as in Europe, therefore, the value of our fish in 1917 for example would not be more than $34,500,000, and of course the value in other seasons would be relatively less than the value shown. The increased value, as I said before, during the war years is due to higher prices caused by the shortage of European supplies and is not due to development.

In comparison I would like to place on Hansard the following statistics and information with regard to the quantity and value of fish landed in the chief fishing countries of Europe, which will give an idea of the increase from 1907 to 1913, the year before the war.

	1907.		1913.	
	Cwts.	Value.	Cwts.	Value.
Norway	9,308,840	$12,152,250	14,630,500	$15,585,750
Sweden	1,821,120	3,102,250	1,456,640	4,521,750
Denmark	911,840	3,890,000	1,288,600	4,980,500
Germany	2,582,380	7,236,250	3,627,980	11,589,250
Holland	2,561,480	7,577,250	2,941,140	11,216,500
Belgium	223,920	1,375,000	262,460	1,196,500
France	3,818,020	20,841,500	3,863,000	26,529,750
Great Britain	24,150,580	58,692,250	25,050,080	73,464,750

The above figures are very illuminating and show to what extent these countries were endeavouring to develop an industry which meant so much for the health and prosperity of the people. Let me say here, in case I might miss it later, that one of the greatest competitors which the fish merchants or the fisheries of Canada have in their dry cod is Norway and Sweden,—or I might more truly say they had this competition previous to the war, as in the years previous to the great war Norwegian fish were sent to New York and Cuba in great quantities and came into competition with Canadian Atlantic cod, which had to find a market in these places. Let me also say that this competition was very serious in view of the fact that the Norwegian people paid more attention to the curing and drying of their fish than our Canadian fishermen did. I am pleased to say, however, that soon after the war started, when it was practically impossible for the Scandinavians to send their fish across the

Atlantic, our merchants on the Atlantic coast, principally at Yarmouth, Lunenburg and Halifax, erected artificial dryers, and in these dryers they are able to hard-cure their fish for the Cuban and New York markets, with the result that Canadian Atlantic cod is practically to-day supplying the whole demand of those great markets to the south.

It will be noticed from what I have just given you, Mr. Speaker, that Great Britain's fisheries did not increase to the same extent proportionately as those of Norway. The reason for that is the very high state of development which has been already reached by the British fisheries, whilst those of continental Europe were in a backward state and their people had only awakened to the great asset which they had in the seas adjacent to their coast line. It is interesting to note here that most of the fish caught by the countries mentioned a few minutes ago were caught in that little strip of water called the North sea, and despite the fact that day after day and year after year the fisheries are prosecuted in this small body of water with the utmost vigour, yet the sea is still teeming with food for the nations. I might also say, Sir, that during the last two years, since the British people have built larger vessels, they go further afield, and to-day during some seasons of the year they are fishing as far north as Iceland and Greenland.

More than sixty per cent of the fish taken from the North sea consist of herring, fourteen per cent of haddock, and about eight per cent codfish. Of the herring taken from the North sea, more than fifty per cent are landed by British fishing vessels known as drifters—and let me say here that there is no good reason why our herring industry in Canada cannot be developed in the same way. At the present time our fishing for herring is done mostly by nets, anchored in the sea. It would be a good policy for the Government to give to the fishermen of the Atlantic coast the trawlers and drifters which were in service during the war and which are now anchored and out of commission, so that they could further develop the herring fisheries by this method, a new method to Canada, but a method which has brought such great results to the fishing industry of Great Britain and other continental nations.

As an example of the growth of this industry in Great Britain, let us take the landings of herring at one port, that of Yarmouth, England. In 1890 there were landed at this port 575,640 cwts., and in 1913, 3,122,280 cwts. The neighbouring port of Lowestoft, where the landings were almost as great, shows a similar advance. Steam herring drifters were first introduced in 1900 and motor drifters in considerable numbers in 1910. The number of steam and motor drifters operated in 1913 from certain countries bordering on the North sea was as follows: Norway, 202; Germany, 65; Holland, 67; and Great Britain, 1,774. The greater proportion of such fish as cod, haddock, etc., landed in countries surrounding the North sea, excepting cod in Norway, is caught by steam trawlers, commonly called beam or otter trawlers. Steam trawlers were first used in the early eighties of the last century, and the number in operation in the North Sea countries in 1913 was as follows: Norway, 3; Denmark and Iceland, 24; Sweden, 58; Germany, 256; Holland, 158, and Great Britain, 1,677. These steam crafts use a large net which is dropped over the stern by the fishermen, and sinks to the bottom of the sea. The vessel keeps steaming ahead until such time as the skipper thinks or feels by the ropes attached to the net that he has a catch, when the steamer is stopped, the net hauled on board, and the fishes taken from it.

As an example of this branch of the fishing industry in Great Britain, let us look for a moment at what is being done at Grimsby, England. In 1890 the fish traffic amounted to 1,427,640 cwts, in 1910 to 2,576,820 cwts., and in 1913, 3,595,840 cwts. To appreciate Grimsby's huge fishing industry it has to be borne in mind that its fleet of steam trawlers in 1913 numbered 650, the value of which alone amounted to over $26,000,000. I might say here that within the last month I received from a young fishing captain from my own county, who is at present in Grimsby, England, learning the business of steam trawling, a number of photographs showing the city of Grimsby and the fishing fleet tied up at the docks. The photographs certainly picture a remarkable scene, as at the time the views were taken the fishermen were asking for better terms and consequently the great fleet was not in commission. I am glad to say that the fishermen and the fish merchants amicably settled their differences and that the Grimsby fleet is again plowing the North Sea. The landings of this fleet are mostly consumed fresh throughout England, the number being so great that ten special fish trains are dispatched from Grimsby daily all the year round.

As is well known, Mr. Speaker, cod constitutes our main fishery in Eastern Can-

ada, whereas the proportion of cod taken from the North Sea amounts to only 8 per cent of all fish taken therefrom. It is interesting, therefore, to compare the landings of cod in Canada with those of certain North Sea countries. The following are the quantities landed in European countries in 1908 and 1913:

	1908	1913
Norway	4,534,060 cwts.	7,184,980 cwts.
Germany	333,400 "	626,760 "
Great Britain ..	2,810,460 "	3,962,660 "
France	2,116,252 ',	1,924,570 "

It is important for Canadians to note that of the total quantity of cod landed in France in 1908, no less than 1,644,996 cwts. or quintals were taken from the Banks near the Newfoundland and Canadian coasts. At least as large a proportion of the 1913 catch was taken from the sea on the western side of the Atlantic. France, as is well known to us all, Mr. Speaker, owns the islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon, which are adjacent to the south coast of Newfoundland and close to the fishing grounds, and each year French fishermen in great numbers are sent out in large fishing schooners to prosecute the fisheries there during the summer months.

The quantities of codfish landed in all Eastern Canada and in the years 1908, 1911, 1913 and 1917 is as follows: 1908, 2,149,611 cwts.; 1911, 2,072,195 cwts.; 1913, 1,635,379 cwts; 1917, 2,215,455 cwts. Compare the figures of 1908 with 1917, and you will see that there was practically no increase in the catch.

Now, for a few moments I will take you to the adjoining Dominion of Newfoundland, where the fisheries are the principal industry and where, perhaps, fishing is done more intensively, considering the population, than in any other part of the world I might, perhaps, be a little personal here, Mr. Speaker, and say that this is the country where I learned the difference between the different kinds of fish and where I received my early training in the fish business.

As an illuminating example, the increase in the valuation in Newfoundland's staple fishery exports for the period ending June, 1918 and June, 1919, is worth noting. In 1918 there was shipped from that country 1,821,306 dry quintals of cod valued at $18,829,560, and in 1919, 1,894,023, valued at $25,860,112. In 1918 there were shipped 216,048 barrels of herring, valued at $2,067,697 and in 1919, 211,555 barrels valued at $2,429,403. In 1908 there were shipped 4,327 tierces of salmon valued at $91,805 and in 1919, 4,111 tierces valued at $112,442. The Newfoundland fishermen do not confine their activities to the waters adjacent to the coast of Newfoundland. A migration of many fishermen and their families to the rock-bound coast of Labrador starts in the early days of June. There they fish until the month of October, when they again return to their homes in Newfoundland. I had the privilege of watching the fishermen on the coast of Labrador during two summers, catch and dry their product for market, and it was an experience which was of great value and which gave me an insight into the life and work of these people.

Another great fishing industry in the Dominion of Newfoundland is the seal fishing. The seal fishery has shown a decided drop for the last few years. The total catch for 1918 was 151,431 seals valued at $863,552 and in 1919 the total catch was 81,293, valued at $278,145. This is a decided decrease from previous years. I am told that only ten ships prosecuted this fishery in 1919 and only thirteen in 1918. This is a great falling off, Mr. Speaker, from the years I remember, when some 25 steamers left the city of St. Johns and the town of Harbor Grace on the eastern coast on March 10 and prosecuted this great industry. I had the privilege of spending two springs at the seal fisheries. I saw about 250,000 seals on ice at one time—an experience which only few in this world have had, and one which I would not have missed for a great deal. A little seal fishing is carried on in Canada, but not very much. However, for a number of years a steamer has been leaving Halifax every spring for the purpose of engaging in the seal fishing business. For several years the "Harlaw," owned by J. A. Farquhar, prosecuted the seal fishing industry. During the last few years, the same firm have sent out the steamers "Seal" and "Sable." Fishermen on the Magdalen Islands and around the Cape Breton shore sometimes get a few seals, but as I say, the industry is not very largely carried on so far as Canada is concerned.

The Newfoundland fisheries, in addition to finding employment for the Newfoundland people and providing food for numerous foreign countries, is also a great benefit to Canada. It is almost impossible to realize what would happen the great Lunenburg fleet, which operates from my own county, if it were not for the fact that during the summer months the Newfound-

land harbours are teeming with bait fishes known as caplin and squid. Then, a great many Canadian schooners manned by Canadian seamen—who by the way are some of the best in the world—are chartered by Newfoundland merchants to proceed to different ports in Newfoundland and there load codfish for Europe, West Indies or Brazil. I might say that throughout the whole of the war, vessels belonging to Nova Scotia were chartered to Newfoundland merchants and took the Newfoundland fishery catch to Europe in spite of the submarine menace.

A number of vessels are sold each year to Newfoundland merchants. These vessels are sometimes four or five years old, and in other cases the Newfoundland merchants make contracts with New Brunswick or Nova Scotia builders for new vessels, so that the fisheries of Newfoundland are a great benefit to a part of the Canadian people.

The United States authorities do not issue annual statements of the quantity and value of fish taken all over the country. The Bureau of Fisheries at Washington, however, collects and publishes the annual statistics regarding the landings of fish at the chief Atlantic ports, at Seattle on the Pacific, and Alaska. The quantity of all kinds of fish landed at Boston and Gloucester in the years 1910, 1913, 1917, and 1918, was as follows:—

1910	1,622,629	cwts.
1913	1,448,364	"
1917	1,567,850	"
1918	1,836,515	"

From these figures it will be seen that the United States is not making as rapid progress on the Atlantic coast, notwithstanding its recent adoption of the steam trawlers, as several European countries. The Alaskan fisheries, however, are developing rapidly. In 1917 there were 21,491 persons employed in the Alaskan fisheries, and the value of the product when prepaired for market amounted to $51,466,980. That was a record up to that time. But in the year 1918 a much higher record was established, when 31,213 persons were employed and the value of the product amounted to $59,154,859, which was a sum nearly eight times the purchase price of the territory fifty years ago.

The country which has perhaps shown more rapid progress in the years immediately preceding the war than any American or European country is that of Japan. For a number of years the Government of Japan has sent its scientists and experts to the different fish producing centres where a great deal of valuable information with regard to our fisheries has been gleaned. This information, which no doubt is afterwards returned to the Government, has been taken advantage of by this wide-awake little nation across the Pacific. In the year 1907 only one steam trawler was operated out of Japan. In the following year there were two at work, in the next year thirteen, which was followed by 23 in 1910, 76 in 1911 and 110 in 1912; which shows conclusively that Japan is in earnest with regard to the development of her fisheries. The value of Japanese fisheries ran from $33,177,750 in 1908, to $45,063,250 in 1912, and to $48,295,250 in 1913. The disturbing feature with regard to the situation is that dry codfish from Japan has now definitely entered into competition with the product of Canada and the United States. The Japanese have studied the Canadian and United States markets and have given closer attention to the best methods of curing and handling the fish than we have. In 1918, 40,000 cwts. of Japanese fish were brought into San Fransisco, and up to the end of October of last year 20,000 cwts. had been brought into Seattle, whilst as many more were on the way. This competition is a very serious menace to the dry fish trade of this continent, by reason of the fact that the cost of production is so much less in Japan on account of smaller wages and lower standards of living.

10 p.m.

The Fishing Gazette of New York, which has a wide circulation and which represents a large fishing clientele, sounds a warning note about Japan codfish entering the American market. In its issue of November 22, 1919, it prints full particulars and gives reasons why Americans should wake up and endeavour to combat Japanese aggression.

I think this shows conclusively that if we are to compete in the markets of the world with the fisheries of other nations we have to pursue a much more progressive policy than we have in the past.

Mr. PECK: I should like to ask the hon. gentleman a question before he proceeds with the question of the fisheries of Japan. Could he give us the number of other nationalities who operate the fisheries of Japan, in comparison with the number of Japanese who operate the fisheries of Canada? I am not saying this in any spirit of criticism.

Mr. DUFF: I have not those figures. I would presume that the Japanese fishing vessels are operated by Japanese only.

Mr. PECK: Hear, hear.

Mr. DUFF: Is that right?

Mr. PECK: Yes.

Mr. DUFF: I see that the hon. member refers only to the men who fish in Japanese boats. It is only Japanese that sail on Japanese fishing vessels.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like, for a few minutes, to speak of what has been done in other countries to help this important industry. With the exception of the help given to the herring fisheries in Great Britain over 100 years ago in the shape of bounties on properly cured herring and some assistance to outlying poor districts in the shape of loans to secure boats and the building of piers and shelters, the great fishing industry of Great Britain has grown up practically without direct Government assistance. The reason for this is found in the fact that the business has been a highly organized one for such a long time that private capital has always been freely procurable for putting into practice advanced ideas and for developing the industry generally. As an instance, all the harbour, docks, and fish markets in Great Britain have been built either by private companies, such as railway companies, with a view to reaping an increased traffic or by city or town corporations who levy dues on the landings for maintenance purposes.

Just before the outbreak of the war, however, fishing vessels grew so much in size and number that the Government, through what is known as development commissioners, gave grants of money in aid of harbour extension works, especially at the smaller ports. But be it said to the credit of the British people that the greater part of the cost in each case is borne by the town or community by borrowing at a low rate of interest from the Government. Since the war, the development commissioners are assisting demobilized fishermen with loans to secure new motor fishing boats and to instal motors in existing boats, and trawlers and drifters are being made available to demobilized fishermen or groups of fishermen on very easy terms of payment. This is one way in which Canadian fishermen or Canadian young men can be encouragd to go into the fishing business, namely, by the Government helping them in the manner just mentioned; and as there are a number of small steamers owned by the Government now out of commission, it would be good business to endeavour to induce fishermen to take them over and operate them. Both in England and in Scotland attention has been given to the education of fishermen for a number of years. At several centres and in many of the public schools, courses of instruction in navigation, net making and mending, cooking and coopering, have been provided. I was very much interested in a booklet which came into my hands a few days ago and which is worth putting on Hansard; but as it is rather long, I will quote only a few paragraphs from it. This pamphlet was issued by the National Sea Fisheries Protection Association of London, and the first thing it says is that the fishermen of Great Britain catch 7,500,000,000 fish dinners each year. The next heading is:

Why we demand a Ministry of Fisheries.

The Prime Minister's pledge. The Prime Minister has stated:—

"We must see that the national resources are developed to the full, and that the State renders all the assistance in its power for the attainment of that object."

Then it goes on to say:

Our fisheries are to-day the greatest of our potential national resources. Very few people realise this. But it is true. One hundredweight of fish will give a meal to 150 people. Before the war British fishermen caught more than 24 million hundredweight of fish a year (3,600,000,000 square meals). We exported ten and a half million hundredweight, and imported about three million hundredweight. The country consumed 16,500,000 hundredweight. The fishing industry provided:

2,400 million meals for Britons.

1,500 million meals for foreigners.

During the war our 50,000 best fishermen and 3,000 best fishing steamers were busy hunting mines and submarines. The old men and the boys and the unfit men in old fishing boats contiued to fish. They caught on the average 8,000,000 cwt. a year. The German Navy sank 672 fishing vessels, and killed 416 men while they were catching this food for us. Many hundreds were wounded and taken prisoner. They never shirked their job. They often fought and defeated U-boats.

It goes on to say:

On our fisheries we depend:

(a) For a supply of the finest seamen in the world.

(b) For a supply of the most wholesome form of flesh food. In fact:

(a) Without the fishermen we should not have been able to defeat the German U-boat in four years. Because no other seamen are trained from boyhood to hunt their prey under water.

(b) We must now either eat fish or become (very largely) vegetarian. Why? Because even before the war (since 1900, in fact) the population of the world has grown more quickly than the beef herds. The population of the eleven chief cattle raising countries had risen by 20 per cent before the war; their herds had decreased 4 per cent. This shortage of beef will be much more marked after the war. In fact,

the development of the fisheries is as important a factor in the food problem as the development of agriculture.

There are a number of other important statements in this booklet which was published by the British Admiralty in November shortly after the armistice was signed, but I shall content myself by just quoting the statement on the cover:

Our Debt to Fishermen.

In all their varied work round the coasts of the United Kingdom, in the North Atlantic, on the African Coast, in all parts of the Mediterranean, and in Egyptian waters, the auxiliary patrol service have shown an adaptability and readiness both for hazardous deeds, and for steady arduous effort.

That is what the Admiralty says of the work the fishermen did during the war not only in catching fish, but on the patrol boats that operated in the North Sea. The same thing might be said of our Canadian fishermen. While, of course, they did not have to undergo the same risks as the British fishermen, not for one minute did they stop their work on account of the German submarines when they were on this side of the Atlantic.

Now let us see for a few minutes what Continental Europe has been doing to cultivate this great industry. In Norway a number of schools have been established and subsidized by the Government at suitable localities on the coast, where fishermen are instructed in navigation chiefly. Some attention has also been given to the instruction of cooks for the larger fishing boats; to instruction in the use of motors on fishing boats. Also in three special schools instruction has been given in fishery legislation, fishworking, and the natural history of important sea fishes. Funds have been created at various times for provision of loans to fishermen, to aid them in obtaining large vessels for deep-sea fishing, and installing motor engines in sail boats. The funds were pooled in 1907 and amounted to $275,000. There is also a separate fund amounting to $50,000 for the provision of decked boats in Finmarken, the most northerly and poorest province of Norway. The Norwegian fishery is largely an inshore one, in sheltered waters. For that reason loans were not extensively used to provide large vessels and steamers for deep-sea fishing; but for the inshore fisheries loans have been very freely used in securing larger boats with oil engines.

The deep-sea fisheries of Germany are carried on by steam trawlers and herring luggers and steamers. The vessels belong to joint stock companies. No particular state aid had been given to trawling companies, but up to 1910 an annual bounty of $1,500 was paid to herring companies on each vessel built and sent to the herring fishery. After that year, state aid took the form of a guarantee of 5 per cent dividend on the capital invested in the companies. In 1911 the Imperial Government voted $175,000 for the development of the herring fishery and the other deep-sea and inshore fisheries. In that year also the city of Hamburg voted an annual sum of $75,000 for three years to provide loans, under easy conditions, for the inshore fishermen of the lower Elbe, to enable them to purchase boats and gear of an improved type. In the Baltic, state aid was given in the form of a loan without interest for an amount up to three-fourths of the cost of a boat and engine.

In the matter of education, fishery schools or classes have been established since 1895 by the German Sea Fisheries Society, acting for the Government, on the following general lines: (1) That a school be set up in every fishing centre so long as the cost of instruction compared with the number of pupils is not too high; (2) Instruction to be free and all costs paid by the society; (3) Instruction to be arranged to suit the particular industry of the locality. In 1910 there were 23 such schools or centres. The instruction given consisted (1) of navigation and seamanship; (2) construction and use of marine motors; (3) the natural history of important sea fishes; (4) instruction on improved models of boats and vessels, improved fishing gear, preservation and handling of fish on board and on land.

If our fisheries department at Ottawa had arranged some years ago to carry out just such a programme, this would have done away with the difficulty we have today of getting certificated masters and mates to man our ships; as, had these schools been established in every large fishing centre, the fishermen when at home during the winter could have attended them and passed the necessary examinations. Lectures are also given once or twice a week during suitable seasons on all matters connected with the fisheries. Another feature of the educational facilities provided in both Norway and Germany is the fishery museum established at various centres, in which are displayed models of boats and vessels, and specimens of nets, traps and other fishing gear used not only in Norway, but in other countries as well. There are also collections dealing with the treatment and curing of fish, including models of

fish and smoke houses and the utensils used in curing and canning various kinds of fish. Since the war, the Germans are striving to supply themselves with a greater proportion of the fish they consume. To that end companies have been and are being formed which aim at building and outfitting additions to the trawling fleet that will bring it up to 400 vessels at once, while fishing harbours are being extended and new ones planned. At Cuxhaven $1,750,000 is being spent in extending the fishing port. Large sums are also being spent in the same way at Hamburg, Altona and Geestemunda.

It should be noted that schools and lectures, whilst they are doing good for navigation, are not bringing about the desired improvement in the treatment of dried fish in Norway. However, we on this side must admit that Norway fish are far better cured than some of the fish caught on the Atlantic coast and make serious competition for us in the foreign markets. I might say that the best fish we have in Canada is the Gaspe cod, cured along the St. Lawrence shore.

The Government of Norway are evidently not satisfied, and recently they appointed a commission to investigate and prepare a plan and finance proposals for state aid for teaching fishermen and curers the best methods of curing split fish, and also to inquire and report whether a system of official inspection and marking of the fish would be desirable.

Of all the European countries France gives the greatest amount of financial aid for the development of the sea fisheries. The amount spent by the Government in 1911 was $1,125,000, and by the way this amount should be carefully noted and compared with the sum spent annually in Canada, as well as the different manner in which the amount is spent.

Of that sum $980,000 was expended as bounties for the encouragement of the deep sea fisheries, $90,000 was for equipment and $66,000 was spent on the product itself. The balance amounting to $145,239 was expended on the coast fisheries, on superintendence research work and experiments. Regarding the bounty granted to the French fisheries, it is to be noted that the bounty is paid per quintal and amounts to 10 francs or $2 on each quintal caught. We, in Canada, are paying our Atlantic coast fishermen, both deep sea and inshore, the paltry sum of $160,000 and the amount does not really come out of the Canadian people, as it is the interest on five and half million dollars paid by the United States Government some years ago for certain privileges which the British Government on behalf of Canada gave them.

As a result of the aid which is given the French fleet it is fitted out and sent across the Atlantic and fishes on the Grand Banks of Newfoundland and the fishing banks off the island of St. Pierre on Bank Quero and the Middle Ground. This French fleet has increased from 178 vessels in 1905 to 254 vessels in 1912, some of them being steam trawlers. A new policy has been adopted by the French Government lately, and as they cannot build sufficient ships themselves they have placed contracts in a number of shipyards in the county of Lunenburg and in Queen's and Shelburne for the building of large numbers of wooden fishing vessels of 400 tons which will be used to prosecute the fisheries on the Grand Banks and will be manned by French fishermen. These ships come across the Atlantic in April and return in October and November. They have mother ships which lie at anchor in St. Pierre until the fishing vessels come in from the Banks to that port with their catches, which are put on board the mother ships, and when they are loaded they return to France, and the fishing vessels then again proceed to the fishing grounds. Their last trips are taken home in their own bottoms.

Now let us take, for the sake of comparison and to show what Canada is doing for the fishermen, the amounts paid out in the last ten years by the Federal Government.

1910	$ 760,734
1911	843,856
1912	921,953
1913	1,229,519
1914	1,465,360
1915	1,115,241
1916	1,053,155
1917	1,111,277
1918	1,031,767

These amounts are exclusive of $160,000 which was paid to the fishermen of the Atlantic coast each year as a bounty. That amount, as I said before is derived from the interest on the fisheries award which was made at the Halifax conference some years ago and was paid for certain fishing privileges. Consequently this cannot be put down as an expenditure of this Government towards fisheries.

Since 1909 what is known as the fisheries protection service, carried on by the larger vessels, such as the Constance, Canada, Curlew and Petrel has been charged to naval expenditure. Since 1911 what is known as the fisheries patrol service carried on by the smaller craft, mostly gasoline boats, has been charged to fisheries expen-

diture. There should be charged to the amounts which I have just given the sum of $200,000 per year which is an additional expenditure and does not appear in the statement. I have to say however, that a great deal of this money spent on small patrol boats is absolutely wasted and it would be good policy on the part of the department to sell the boats and pay off their crews.

For the sake of comparison I would like to give to the House the amounts voted by the Government for aid to agriculture, since 1910.

1910-11	$ 988,507 75
1911-12	1,220,099 91
1912-13	2,276,172 31
1913-14	2,879,861 22
1914-15	3,190,465 27
1915-16	3,257,992 66
1916-17	3,522,859 82
1917-18	3,777,882 75
1918-19	3,975,919 53

I have no fault to find with this large expenditure; in fact as long as we are obtaining good results and the farmers are being helped and more people are being encouraged to settle on the land I would not object to further expenditure.

In past years large amounts have been spent on agriculture, and it is also a fact that the provincial governments are helping the farmers in a great many ways by establishing colleges and experimental farms and doing a great deal of work necessary to promote a knowledge of agriculture. This Government has also granted $5,000 under the land settlement scheme, to each soldier who is willing to settle on land with which to purchase his land and also $2,500 to purchase the materials necessary to enable him to go on the farm. In addition to that they have established credits whereby the farmers are enabled to sell their products to foreign lands. If I am rightly informed credits to the amount of $300,000,000 have been established by this Government in aid of agriculture.

It will be remembered that a few years ago the Government voted a lump sum of $10,000,000 towards the encouragement of agriculture and I might here say that a smaller special grant should have long ago been voted towards fisheries to help in their development. Most of the expenditure on fisheries at the present time is for salaries, patrol service and hatcheries and there is very little of this amount spent in either scientific or practical work for the encouragement and development of the great industry.

[Mr. Duff.]

Some years ago the Government built two dogfish plants, one in the eastern end of the province of Nova Scotia at Canso and one at Cape Sable Island. Two or three years ago the Fisheries Department decided to abandon the work of exterminating the dogfish pest and sold the plants. This was a great mistake, as instead of selling the two plants already established, it should have been the policy of the Government to place additional plants along the coast of Nova Scotia and give a bounty to the fishermen to exterminate the pest which interfers with their work during the summer season. It is quite true that these plants did not pay their expenses or make any money for the Government, but it is not usual for plants erected for the assistance of the people of the country in any industry to pay dividends or interest on the investment. But I will say this, that if these plants had been kept going for the last two or three years, owing to the prices which would have been received for the oil and the fertilizer, the Government would have received a handsome profit on the investment, and with proper business management, these plants could also have taken care of a large quantity of the offall and by-products of the fisheries.

In the March, 1919, issue of the Canadian Fishermen, several recommendations were put forward for the reconstruction and development of the Canadian fishing industry. Many of the recommendations will necessitate the expenditure of a good deal more money, and as money is a somewhat scarce commodity and rather hard to secure in these days, the question should be first considered of turning the amount at present voted for fisheries administration to better use.

It should be clear to any one who intelligently studies the departmental blue books —and the more they are studied, the clearer becomes the fact—that a large sum of money is positively wasted annually on the artificial propagation of fish. Especially so in view of the much larger sum spent in the shape of salaries and travelling expenses for the maintenance of an army of outside officers, numbering nearly 1,000, besides 40 permanent and 18 hired patrol boats with their crews, whose main duty is police work, i. e., enforcing the observance of close seasons and other restrictive measures for the protection, chiefly, of the very kinds of fish that are artificially propagated at such enormous expense in our numerous hatcheries. Any sane man is bound to conclude, if he looks at the thing below the surface,

that either the enormous expenditure on fish protection, or that on fish breeding, should be largely reduced. There is neither room nor necessity for both expenditures on a large scale at the same time. With such a huge output of fish fry from the hatcheries, the protection afforded by close seasons, and the elaborate system of licensing and controlling in vogue, one would naturally expect our fisheries to have been showing, years ago, a very greatly increased annual production. But what has actually occurred? The lobster fishery we know is barely holding its own, notwithstanding the output of hundreds of millions of fry from the hatcheries annually, especially in the last ten years; and now all the lobster hatcheries have been closed up as useless.

The Fraser river as a producer of salmon on the Pacific is played out, notwithstanding artificial propagation of millions of fry annually, mainly as a result of over-fishing by Americans at sea and in Puget Sound, and can never be restored except by the proper regulation of the means of capture and the season for fishing in salt water on both sides of the international line. The artificial propagation of a species of fish like the Pacific salmon, which has to be maintained in such enormous numbers to keep the canning industry going, as a means of restoring this fishery, is about as futile as pouring a bucket of water into the Pacific ocean with a view to swelling it a little.

A glance at page 102 of the Census of Industry, Part 3, Fisheries Statistics for 1917, shows clearly that the total quantity of salmon canned in British Columbia from year to year is being maintained by the very kinds, such as pinks and chums, that are propogated artifically in very small quantities; while the sockeye, the kind that is produced in the hatcheries in enormous quantities, has been decreasing.

Leaving out the Fraser river altogether, and taking the figures for the rivers in the north, that are far removed from the destructive operations of American trap fishermen, we find convincing proof for the statement just made. The pack of the various kinds in the different districts was as follows for the years named:

SALMON PACK—NORTHERN RIVERS OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.

NAAS RIVER.

	1908	1912	1917
	cases.	cases.	cases.
Sockeyes	27,584	36,037	22,188
Pinks	6,612	12,476	44,568
Chums	.....	3,245	24,938

SKEENA RIVER.

	1908	1912	1917
	cases.	cases.	cases.
Sockeyes	139,846	92,498	65,760
Pinks	45,404	97,588	148,312
Chums	.....	504	21,516

RIVER INLET.

Sockeyes	64,652	112,884	61,195
Pinks	479	8,809	8,065
Chums	.....	3,845	16,101

OUTLYING DISTRICTS.

Sockeyes	48,367	79,464	32,902
Pinks	23,538	128,296	112,209
Chums	.....	37,734	112,364

The figures which I have given prove beyond question that the pinks and chums which were propagated in small quantities increased much more rapidly than the the sockeye salmon.

Now take the case of Atlantic salmon—

Mr. PECK: Do I understand from the hon. gentleman's argument that pinks and chums were not propagated in hatcheries but that they increased more rapidly than the sockeyes and the cohoes that are propagated in hatcheries?

Mr. DUFF: The chums and pinks were propagated in small quantities and the sockeyes in large quantities. The pinks and chums increased very much more rapidly, or more of them were caught, than were caught of sockeyes. The catch of sockeyes decreased and the catch of pinks and chums increased.

Mr. PECK: Do I understand the hon. gentleman's argument to be that the hatcheries were not beneficial?

Mr. DUFF: Yes, that is what I am trying to prove. Take the case of Atlantic salmon, of which also millions have been propagated annually for very many years, from ten regular hatcheries and six subsidiary ones. This fishery is scarcely holding its own as may be seen from the following figures which show the annual catch on the whole Atlantic coast, from 1913 to 1917:

Atlantic salmon fishing catch.

1913	40,237 cwts.
1914	38,202 "
1915	39,805 "
1916	41,801 "
1917	39,865 "

The catch for 1918 is believed to have been very considerably less than for 1917, while that for 1919 was practically a failure.

Compare this with the salmon fisheries of Scotland, for example, the perpetuation

of which has depended altogether on restrictive measures as to fishing periods and the strict enforcement of such. In round figures, the blue books show that the weight of salmon carried by rail and steamboat in Scotland, the produce of Scottish salmon fisheries, prior to the war, was 40,000 cwts. annually. There are only two small private hatcheries for salmon in the whole of Scotland. Both are maintained by the proprietors of the rivers on which they are located, with a view to increasing the salmon supply therein. Neither of these rivers, however, has shown any better results than those that have been without hatcheries. In fact I believe one of the two hatcheries was closed recently. The superintendent of Scottish salmon fisheries, who is an expert in his line, said in 1916: "We in this country do not rely on artificial hatcheries for the upkeep of the stock of salmon. We have magnificent natural spawning grounds in our Scottish rivers and we prefer to rely upon the process of nature for the replenishment of the stock." The point is this: The few comparatively small Scottish rivers, without the aid of hatcheries, maintain a yearly production of salmon rather greater than that of the whole Atlantic coast of Canada from the Bay of Fundy to the Labrador, with its many huge natural salmon rivers into which are dumped annually the output of no less than sixteen hatcheries.

What of the Great Lakes? Eight hatcheries in the province of Ontario have been turning out many millions of whitefish and pickerel fry annually for a number of years.

Mr. PECK: Is the hon. gentleman comparing the propagation of whitefish in Canada with the propagation of salmon in Scotland?

Mr. DUFF: No I have been comparing the propagation of Atlantic salmon with the propagation of salmon in Scotland.

Now for a few minutes let us consider the following figures which show the quantity of fry liberated in the lakes from Lake Superior to Lake Ontario since 1911.

	Whitefish Fry.	Pickerel Fry.	Herring Fry.
1911	146,200,000	56,549,500	.....
1912	64,000,000	42,000,000	.....
1913	140,000,000	40,000,000	.....
1914	175,490,000	54,000,000	.....
1915	281,620,000	95,550,000	.....
1916	178,288,000	128,833,000	39,585,000

Here let me give the House the quantity of these fish taken from those lakes annually since 1912.

	Whitefish. Cwts.	Pickerel. Cwts.	Herring. Cwts.
1912	58,897	26,656	170,677
1913	52,263	26,564	130,718
1914	57,964	39,173	91,474
1915	67,100	26,718	115,715
1916	60,711	20,029	106,872
1917	49,498	19,569	201,801

The great increase in herring in 1917, could not have been due to artificial propagation, because 1916 was the first year in which the fry of such fish were liberated and they would not have reached a catchable size in the following summer. The increase is attributable rather to the fact that this fish is more abundant than the others and that the high prices of 1917 impelled the fishermen to make greater efforts at catching and landing them.

Further comment as to the uselessness of fish hatcheries from a commercial standpoint is unnecessary; all the figures bearing on the matter proclaim it loudly. These are facts that cause thinking men to marvel greatly at the stupidity of permitting in a comparatively new country with a sparse population, and with what are practically virgin fisheries in lakes and rivers of huge dimensions, the expenditure of so much money on the artificial propagation of fish for so long, without question. Even casual observers, however, are now beginning to doubt the wisdom of spending large sums on this service.

In the United States artificial propagation of fish has been conducted on a great scale for many years. Yet Canada relatively has been doing far more than the United States in this line. In 1913 Canada had 61 main and subsidiary hatcheries, while the United States had not any more. But, as the United States authorities do not regularly collect statistics as to the catches of the various kinds of fish throughout the country, they cannot determine the results of their fish cultural work. As proof of this, let me quote the Commissioner of Fisheries at Washington, who, in a recent report, says:

> The Bureau has given greater attention to the collection of fishery statistics which afford the only reliable basis for determining the condition of the fisheries, and indicating the need for and results of fish cultural work.

Even in the United States, however, where fish culture has been looked upon as a kind of fetish, its value is now being questioned.

In the report of the Bureau of Fisheries for 1916 the following occurs:

> In some sections an almost idolatrous faith in the efficiency of artificial culture of fish for replenishing the ravages of man and animals is manifested, and nothing has done more harm than the prevalence of such an idea. While it is an exceedingly difficult thing to prove, the consensus of opinion is that artificial culture does considerable good, yet the very fact that this cannot be conclusively proven ought to be a warning not to put blind faith in it. The best way in which to conserve the fisheries of the coast is by enacting and enforcing laws, making a close season, under which a certain proportion of the salmon runs will be enabled to reach the spawning beds. If this is done there can be no question of the perpetuation of the industry.

This good advice from Washington, Sir, should be followed by our officials.

The report of the Bureau of Fisheries for 1919 intimates that lobster hatching in the United States has practically been abandoned.

The great development of the fisheries of Norway is sometimes quoted as an example to this country, but the Norwegians place no reliance on artificial propagation of fish and do not waste money on it. One small hatchery, and no more, has been in existence at Flodevig since 1882 for hatching and distributing cod along the nearby coast. It is supported in part only by government funds. Its practical usefulness was so frequently called in question owing to the difficulty of proving any beneficial effects from it, that a commission was appointed in 1910 to investigate and report as to whether it should be continued. The commission consisted of scientists, a majority of whom, largely from a scientific view point, recommended its continuance. No one, however, believes it is of any benefit to the fisheries, and no doubt if practical men had been on the commission they would have recommended its abandonment.

The sum spent for the protection of the fisheries in Canada, in the shape of salaries to fishery officers and the maintenance of patrol boats is a huge one. According to the blue books it amounted to over $400,000 in 1913. That, for negative work, is surely much too much. But when to that large sum is added $400,000 more for artificial fish breeding in that year, without the slightest visible sign of the supplies being increased thereby, the thing to any one capable of understanding the figures dealing therewith assumes something of the character of a scandal. Perhaps no one in particular is to blame for this condition. It has evidently grown up under the system of administration past and present, which has blundered along guided by impracticable theorists. If the bull were now taken by the horns, so to speak, and the artificial propagation of fish and police work reduced to their fitting place in the scheme of reconstruction, hundreds of thousands of dollars would be available for more useful and necessary work without Parliament being asked for an increased vote.

Amongst more useful work might be classed the maintenance of a completely equipped steamer, like the "Michael Sars" of Norway, for scientific investigation of all kinds at sea bearing on the fisheries; also the establishment of what may be called fishery museums or schools at centres on both coasts and inland, in which models of all modern fishing crafts and appliances used throughout the fishing world would be on view, together with models of modern fish-curing, smoking, and canning establishments and the implements used therein. To such museums or schools fishermen and those directly concerned might be taken periodically to listen to lectures on and explanations of the various exhibits, by duly qualified experts, and to witness practical demonstrations in fish-curing and barrel making.

Money would be well spent in periodically sending a duly qualified expert or experts to cured-fish consuming centres abroad to study their desires and report to the trade. The money spent in the shape of bounties, amounting annually to $160,000, should be increased. Under the present system of distribution, the owner of a boat under 13 ft. keel gets $1; a boat fisherman gets about $4; owners of vessels of from 10 to 80 tons get $1 per ton, and those of vessels over 80 tons get $80 and vessel fishermen about $6.50. The aggregate sum paid is large, but the amount in each case so small as to make the avowed intention of the Act, namely "to encourage the development of the sea fisheries and the building of fishing vessels," a huge joke. How far, for instance, would an $80 bounty, which is the limit, go on a vessel costing say $30,000? A decent sum would help shipbuilding as well as fisheries. How much encouragement for the building of bigger and better crafts is there in the payment of $10 or $20 to the owners of small vessels of 10 to 20 tons, of which there are a great many on all parts of the coast? The other payments to boat owners and to vessel and boat fishermen are simply doles and can not be looked upon as encouraging the development of the fisheries.

Then money should be spent on improving the quality and consequently the value of all cured fish, by setting up a standard

of quality and paying a substantial bounty on all fish and packages found after proper inspection, up to that standard. No amount of lecturing and demonstrating could compare with this as a means of encouraging and developing our fisheries.

It is not for lack of money being spent by the Canadian Government on Canadian fisheries that they are not progressing as they should. It is rather due to the money being wrongly expended. The total expenditure on fisheries services in Canada in the year 1913 (all such expenditures were of course more or less curtailed during the war years) amounted to $1,229,518, including the bounty. Now, we have seen that the expenditure of France, which spends more on its fisheries than any other European country, amounted in the year 1911, to not more than $1,125,000. But, whereas Canada on the one hand spent over $800,000 of the total on superintendence, policing and fish breeding, and only $160,000 on bounties, France on the other hand, spent $980,000 on bounties for the encouragement of its deep sea fisheries and only $145,000 on superintendence, research work and experiments. These comparisons are very striking and should lead to a call for radical and sweeping changes in Canada.

There is not much hope for real practical assistance being given, however, as long as the administration of the fisheries services of Canada remain as at present, both inside and outside, almost entirely with a few notable exceptions in the hands of men who may be good clerks, but are, through lack of a working acquaintance with the industry, incapable of sizing up its real needs or of directing any practical efforts towards its development.

The further development of our fisheries is dependent upon several things:

1. An increased demand for fish at home.
2. An increased demand for our cured fish abroad.
3. Increased production.
4. Utilization of all by-products.
5. A fisheries department, manned by practical business men, and scientific experts.
6. Sufficient moneys to carry on necessary development.

The first can be brought about only by supplying the consuming public with real fresh fish in the shortest possible time after it is taken from the water. The quality of such fish would be their own best advertisement and would very quickly lead to greater consumption. No amount of lecturing nor of newspaper or other advertising will induce people to continue the use of fish or to increase their purchasing when as at present, they frequently find them so long out of the water as to fill the house with an offensive odour when being cooked. This was made clear in the evidence of inland dealers at the inquiry in 1916, as to the spread in prices. In Ontario the chief demand is for lake fish, because if its much fresher condition when offered for sale.

Sea fish can never be delivered in prime condition in the interior markets of Canada until a refrigerator or chilled car is made available on express trains, for all sizes of shipments; not once a week or three times a week, but every day of the week. The trade is not of sufficient volume at present to warrant the provision of such a daily car at a rate that would make it possible for shippers to make full use of its without assistance. But if adequate financial aid were provided by the Government for the operation of a daily refrigerator express car service, concurrently with a publicity campaign, the business would very quickly grow large enough to justify special express facilities without governmental aid. Until some such plan is adopted I have not much hope of seeing a great expansion of our fresh and semi-fresh fish traffic. It will, of course, be more expensive than the method of subsidizing fish shipments hitherto in force, but the importance of the industry and the results that are bound to follow are sufficient justification for any increased expenditure for a limited period.

The second is, perhaps of more importance than the first, for this reason: that the export trade in cured fish brings money out of the pocket of the foreigner and puts it into that of the Canadian, whereas the home trade in fresh fish largely consists of a transference of money from the pocket of one Canadian into that of another Canadian. Like the first, the second can only be secured by improving the quality of the product. Especially is this so in view of the efforts of other countries to increase their output of cod and other salt fish to markets which are common to all fish-producing countries.

Efforts to persuade fishermen and curers by mere lectures or by written articles are not sufficient to bring the required improvement. That method is too slow. While waiting the results from such efforts we may wake some day soon to the fact that our competitors, by giving more attention to this quesiton of quality, have ousted us from the very markets we hitherto had looked upon as peculiarly ours. Such action as will be more quickly effective is therefore necessary. Here again the Government

should come to the rescue with financial assistance for a time.

A standard should be established for all cured fish, and after adequate inspection. If necessary the Government should appoint cullers in all the principal buying sections of the country and pay them so much per quintal for culling fish of different qualities. There should also be paid on each of the various units of quality which conform to the fixed standard a sum sufficient to encourage fishermen and curers to turn out standard products. After a few years of such encouragement, with rigid inspection, followed by instruction where necessary, our salt fish producers would undoubtedly find themselves in a position to meet all competition unaided.

With an increasing demand for fish at home and abroad would come a demand for increased production. To meet such a demand individual fishermen or groups of fishermen should be encouraged and assisted financially in securing such crafts as may be deemed most suitable. This is no more than the governments of other countries have been and are doing to advance their fisheries. To this end a fund should be created from which loans—not gifts—at low rates of interest could be made to approved persons or groups of persons to enable them to buy or build approved fishing crafts of all sizes.

While this suggestion is applicable in some measure to the Pacific coast, it applies mainly to the Atlantic where a much greater number of people are engaged and a much smaller sum is earned by their labour, which is performed under more severe conditions. The salmon fishery has been pretty well exploited and developed on the Pacific, and now that the salmon canning monopoly in the shape of protecting canners by limiting the number of cannery licenses has been ended recently, the provision of loans to white fishermen who are British subjects to enable them to secure boats for the halibut fishery—fully half the quantity of halibut landed at Prince Rupert is landed by American vessels—and the salmon fishery is perhaps the most effective way in which to help forward the Pacific fisheries. The increased production is bound to follow if the fishermen are encouraged to prosecute the industry. For the large fleet of trawlers which operate from Lunenburg county and proceed to the different banks where they fish from March to October, one or more hospital ships should be provided, so that fishermen will know that if they get sick they can be properly looked after.

Then to encourage men to engage in this industry, a scheme of state insurance, both life and accident, should be inaugurated. It would not cost a great deal of money to insure the fishermen during each season for an amount from $1,000 to $5,000, so that in case any of them lose their lives during the voyage their families would be looked after. If you will look into the statistics you will find that although their calling is a very hazardous one, yet the fatalities are a small percentage of the number of men engaged in the industry.

I also think that some state provision either of insurance or otherwise, should be made for men who get hurt and also for those who, after serving a certain number of years have to give up fishing, either on account of ill health or old age.

Bait freezers should be established at not only different parts of the Nova Scotia coast, say at Lunenburg, North Sydney and northern Cape Breton or Prince Edward Island, but also at three or four important places in Newfoundland, as during certain seasons of the year bait is scarce and our vessels have to lay sometimes from one to four weeks waiting for bait. If these freezers were established and bait put in them from the previous season the fishing fleet would not be delayed and consequently would catch a great deal more fish. Last year, notwithstanding the handicap under which the fishermen laboured, the fleet caught some 30,000,000 pounds of fish. Had they been able to get bait, and get it without waiting for it, they would have caught at least fifty per cent more than they did.

The fishermen should also be encouraged by having a lower tariff on all they eat and wear in their homes, and what they use either in the building or outfitting of small boats or large vessels should come into the country free of duty. They have to go into the open market to sell their product and take what they can get for it, and to properly encourage them they should be allowed to purchase anything they require without the barrier of a protective tariff.

The by-products of the fish should be taken care of. Plants should be erected to take care of the heads, guts, skins and other offal of the fishes. This would serve a two-fold purpose, as fertilizer for the farms could be made from the bones and offal, oil would be extracted from the livers of the fish, and glue made from the skins. The Government would therefore kill two birds with one stone.

We also need in this country a new fisheries organization. The present department

at Ottawa is ashamed to be known as the Fisheries Department, as a few years ago they changed the name of that department from "Marine and Fisheries" to "Marine and Naval Affairs." Why this was done passes all understanding, as the fisheries is of sufficient importance to be designated by the proper title. Looking over the Routine Proceedings and Orders of the Day, I notice a resolution under the name of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. This resolution states that it is necessary to amend a certain part of the Canada Shipping Act relating to the inspection of hulls, boilers and machinery of vessels. It is quite right that that resolution should be under the name of the Minister of Marine, but I cannot see what the Fisheries Department has to do with the inspection of boilers. Immediately below that resolution there is another standing in the name of the Minister of the Naval Service, and having to do with a proposed amendment to the Fish Inspection Act regarding pickled herring, ale-wives, and mackerel. Now, I do not know whether they are going to supply pickled herring, alewives and mackerel to the Canadian Navy, but it certainly seems ridiculous for a resolution of that kind to be in the name of the Minister of the Naval Service.

What we want is a new lock, stock and barrel in that department, with practical men in charge, and until we get this we cannot expect very much to be done to encourage or promote this great industry.

Some money should be spent to encourage the immigration of fishermen to this country. I think I am safe in saying that I could pick from the Lunenburg fishing fleet at least one thousand men who are capable of taking charge of fishing vessels, although at the present time they are fishing in dories from other vessels, but I feel quite confident that if the Government would encourage the immigration of capable fishermen to this country these men would be able to get vessels of their own, which would greatly enlarge the present fishing fleet. If the Government would provide the men, I feel quite confident that the people of Nova Scotia, especially the people of my own county, would see that vessels are built and the fleet enlarged.

I trust, Mr. Speaker, that my remarks will not fall upon barren ground, but that the Government will take steps to encourage the proper development of this great industry. The men who are prosecuting it at the present time are not only the salt of the earth, but they are the salts of the sea. Their calling is an arduous one; they risk their lives every hour of the day and every day of the year; they are brave and daring and are not daunted either by the winds or the waves or by storms or fogs. Such men as these who go down to the sea in ships and do business on the great waters should receive every consideration and every encouragement from the Government of this country.

Mr. C. W. PECK (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, While I do not agree with a great many of the conclusions of the member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) I think that we owe him a great deal for introducing this question into the House and that we must respect his great grasp of the fishery situation. When I have occasion again to speak on this subject, I purpose proving that the minister who is at the head of the Fisheries Department (Mr. Ballantyne) is doing a great deal, in our part of the country at least, to develop the very principles for which my hon. friend stands. My hon. friend speaks of the Atlantic fisheries; I speak of the Pacific fisheries, and I will say this, that of all the Ministers of Fisheries we have had there has been no other minister who has at all approached the Minister of Fisheries of this Government in regard to his policy in developing the fisheries of British Columbia. I came from a fishing country, namely, the province of New Brunswick, and I live in a fishing country, in northern British Columbia, one of the greatest fisheries in the world, and I certainly look on fish as one of the most delicious products. The whole question in regard to its production and also in regard to it from an appetising standpoint, is very interesting. At this hour of the night, however, I do not think that our hardworking members of Parliament who labour for the very large sum of $2,500 a year, should be delayed in order to discuss this subject.

Mr. McKENZIE: My hon. friend should move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. PECK: I am going to do that in two or three minutes. I hope this debate will be resumed at an early date. If it is not, I mean to take up the subject, which is very controversial and bitter in British Columbia, of the destruction of the cannery monopoly. I have taken a part in that question and I am deeply interested in it. I wish to prove, in my humble way, to the Parliament of this country that the minister has proved himself to be the strongest minister we have had in regard to that question and that he has not hesi-

tated to play the part of a strong and disinterested man in destroying the cannery monopoly. I see some of my hon. friends opposite smile, and, I presume, in derision, because they were the people who introduced this cannery monopoly which has been the cause of so much trouble in our province.

I want to speak of the question of the returned soldier. I have been an advocate of the policy that the Government should assist in establishing the returned soldier in the fishing business. I can say honestly that I think the minister and his officials are quite in sympathy with that policy, and I commend that to the consideration of the House. If you can re-establish men in farming, while I realize that you cannot re-establish them in every walk in life, there is one business in which you can re-establish them, and that is the fishing business. Therefore, I hope this debate will be resumed at an early date, and if it is not, I purpose taking up the whole question of the salmon fisheries of British Columbia in a most interesting and entertaining manner. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of Right Hon. Mr. Doherty the House adjourned at 11 p.m.

Tuesday, March 30, 1920.

The House met at Three o'clock.

TRUST COMPANIES ACT, 1914, AMENDMENT.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (Minister of Finance) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 38, to amend the Trust Companies Act, 1914.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Explain.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The object of the Bill is to provide for an inspection of these companies, there being none at present. There is a provision in the existing Act under which the Minister of Finance may, if he so desires, have an inspection made of any particular company. He is not in a position, however, to know what companies should or should not be inspected; and complaints are not made about companies until something is wrong with them, when inspection is generally too late. Trust and loan companies will both be made subject to inspection because I shall introduce in a moment another Bill dealing with the latter class. The new legislation will place both trust and loan companies in exactly the same position as insurance companies. An annual inspection is provided for because only by an annual inspection is it possible for any one to tell when special examinations ought to be made.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

LOAN COMPANIES, 1914, AMENDMENT ACT.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (Minister of Finance) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 39, to amend the Loan Companies Act, 1914.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT—STEAMBOAT INSPECTION.

Hon. C. C. BALLANTYNE (Minister of Marine) moved that to-morrow the House do resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider a proposed resolution to amend part VII of the Canada Shipping Act, chapter 113 of the Revised Statutes relating to steamboat inspection.

FISH INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE (Minister of Marine) gave notice that to-morrow he would move in Committee of the Whole a resolution to amend the Fish Inspection Act, chapter 45 of the statutes of 914, extending the provisions of the Act to pickled herring, ale-wives, mackerel, and salmon, other than mild cured salmon, and the containers in which such fish are packed and marketed, etc.

THE ARMENIAN PEOPLE AND THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. I. E. PEDLOW (South Renfrew): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Government a question of supreme importance at the present time. I noticed in a recent issue of the Toronto Globe a reference made to some correspondence that had passed between the Acting Premier of the Dominion and the Premier of Ontario regarding certain representations forwarded, on behalf of the Armenian people, by the Canadian Government to the Imperial authorities, and by the latter to the Supreme Council of the League of Nations. I would like to know the tenor and nature of the representations made and which, according to press reports, have been endorsed by the Premier of Ontario.

Rt. Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Acting Prime Minister): I may say to my hon. friend that the general tenor of the representations made to the Supreme Council of the League of Nations through the Imperial Government was along the lines of securing by the making and operation of the Treaties of Peace, immunity for Armenian communities from oppression and massacre and the elimination of Turkish authority as far as they are concerned.

Mr. McMASTER: Hear, hear.

CONDITION OF IRELAND.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. PEDLOW: I would also like to ask if it is the intention of the Dominion Government to make similar representations through the Imperial Government to the Supreme Council of the League of Nations with regard to the deplorable conditions which, according to press reports, obtain at the present time in Ireland, and if not, why not.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I may say that on the grounds stated by the hon. gentleman in his question, as to whether it is the intention of the Government to make similar representations to the same authority, that taking into consideration the essential difference between the two cases, both as to the conditions and jurisdiction, it is emphatically not the intention of the Government to make such similar representations.

ST. LAWRENCE SHIP CHANNEL—ICE CONDITIONS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly-Vercheres): I regret to have to again call the attention of the House to a most important and urgent question, I refer to the ice jam on the St. Lawrence river. On the 9th of March I drew the attention of the Minister of Marine to the condition in question; stating that I had been informed from reliable sources that there was imminent danger of floods. The minister then answered to the following effect:

> I am afraid that the information that has reached the hon. member is not accurate.* * * With no ice bridge formed at this point, there is no fear of disastrous floods occurring above. The channel is now clear of ice up to a point near Portneuf, 35 miles above Quebec, where the Lady Grey is working to-day, and is making good progress. * * * I do not anticipate any serious results from floods this spring—no one can accurately tell—but I am pleased to say that the Lady Grey is working so well and that the ice bridge is broken.
>
> [Mr. Pedlow.]

I have no doubt that the minister was sincere and in earnest in his statement but I believe he has been wrongly informed. In the Montreal Gazette of Friday, March 26 it is stated that at Three Rivers the ice barrage is still solid and trouble is feared as the water continues to rise gradually in the St. Lawrence. It is also reported that the ice barrage at Three Rivers is still solid clear across to the South shore, and that the Lady Grey will not be able to break through the ice that blocks the river for miles above this point.

In the reports of the Press yesterday—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member is bringing to the attention of the House a matter of undoubted public importance, but he is proceeding to make out a case which he ought not to do upon the Orders of the Day. The hon. member can summarize his question so as to get the answer he desires without going into the matter by way of argument.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I bow to your decision, Mr. Speaker. I was going to state that the report I read was dated Friday, and on Monday we had some further reports in the Montreal Gazette and the Montreal Star to the effect that the ice barrage was worse, that the water was rising, and that there was even—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: —and that even some of the Government shipbuilding plants were carried away by the flood. I would like to know if the minister, (Mr. Ballantyne) is informed of these conditions, and if he intends to do anything to relieve them.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE (Minister of Marine): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member for Chambly-Vercheres (Mr. Archambault) I cannot to-day give him information very much different from that which I furnished him a few days ago. I took occasion this morning to inquire of the officers who have charge of the ice-breaking operations how the ice-breaker Lady Grey was getting on, and I was informed that she is now up the river quite a distance this side of Portneuf, and that the river was quite clear of ice from Lothbiniere down to Quebec. Of course, I cannot state definitely that there will not be a flood, but forming my opinion on what has occurred in previous years, neither myself nor the officers connected with ice-breaking think there is any imminent danger of floods occurring this year.

The hon. member has referred to the height of the water at Three Rivers. As a matter of fact it is not very much higher than what it has been in former years. The particular shipyard that he refers to, that of the Tidewater Shipbuilding Company, is located at a spot which is always flooded in the spring. So far as I can prophesy, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that people along the South shore need be unduly alarmed as to the possibility of a great flood.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: If the hon. minister would permit me, the report also states that the Lady Grey has had to go back to Quebec for repairs.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The news I got about two hours ago was to the effect that the Lady Grey was at Portneuf.

CANADIANS IN THE IMPERIAL SERVICE—CAPT. JOHN A. BARRON.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. H. B. MORPHY (North Perth): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. POWER: Mr. Speaker, in view of the very interesting discussion in regard—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Perth has the floor.

Mr. MORPHY: I desire to bring to the notice of the Government, Mr. Speaker, a despatch appearing in the Citizen of Saturday morning last, entitled "Canadian in Berlin." It states:

> The continued disturbance in Germany, more particularly in Berlin, as a result of the revolutions and counter revolutions, have a decidedly local interest to Stratford, inasmuch as Captain John A. Barron, R.A.F., son of His Honour Judge Barron, is now and has been for some weeks at Berlin, the chief centre of the disturbances. As one of the entente officers selected by the allies to adjust certain claims upon the Germans, in relation to Zeppelins and airships, he was required to meet with German officers, and it is seen by the press that the reception by the latter was far from cordial, in fact at times it assumed the shape of aggressive force, and one at least of the French officers had died as the result of these attacks, and others have been injured. For some time Captain Barron has not been heard from by his friends in Ottawa.

I would like to ask the Government two questions: (1) Has the Government any system of keeping tab upon Canadians in the Imperial service? (2) Has the Government received any report in regard to the dangerous situation in which this Canadian is placed?

Rt. Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Acting Prime Minister): The first question, as I understand it, is as to whether there is any system by which the Canadian Government keeps track of Canadians in the Imperial service. That is looked after by the Imperial authorities themselves, and information can be got by application from Ottawa to the authorities in London with reference to any particular case. The second question I did not hear.

I am informed by the Minister of Militia (Mr. Guthrie) that a cable has been sent to the Imperial authorities for information, but that no reply has yet been received.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough): Mr. Speaker, some days ago I drew the attention of the leader of the Government to the fact that a mass of information moved for at the last session by members of the Opposition have not been furnished. I was asked to furnish particulars. I have looked over the records and I find forty-eight motions were made by members of the Opposition last year that have not yet been complied with. I handed the list to the leader of the Government and asked him to put the matter in the hands of the proper officer for action, as some of these returns are urgently needed by members of the Opposition.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I think I said to my hon. friend when he put the question before that if he would send me a list I would look into the matter. I have since had that list. I would beg hon. members to be a little merciful and patient considering the shower of orders for returns and questions for information that are being received. It is a hard tax on the resources of the departmental staffs, but the arrears are being overtaken as quickly as possible.

CLOSING OF DISTRICT PENSION OFFICES.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. NEWTON W. ROWELL (President of the Privy Council): The hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) inquired on Thursday last as to the accuracy of the rumour that the district Pension Office at Quebec and at certain other cities had been or were about to be closed, and I promised to secure information on the subject. I am now advised by the Chairman of the Board of Pension Commissioners that the board has decided to close the district Pension

Office at Quebec and some fourteen other district offices throughout Canada. The statement by the Chairman of the board is as follows:

District Offices were originally opened for the purpose of investigating applications for pensions made by dependent parents. There was no thought in the beginning of performing any medical work in connection with the District Offices. The medical work was all performed by military Medical Boards. After the armistice the cases of dependent parents for investigations immediately became very few in number but the medical work in connection with demobilization became very heavy. The medical work was, therefore, taken out of the hands of the military Medical Boards and doctors were sent from head office to each of the district offices to make medical re-examinations, etc. At the present time a district office exists mainly to re-examine disability cases from time to time.

About eight months ago it was realized that District Offices would eventually have to be closed and in order to make this possible a scheme of travelling Medical Boards was originated to re-examine pensioners in all centres where a number could be brought together at a particular time, that is to say in towns of a population of two thousand or more. This travelling medical board scheme is now in operation in the Eastern Provinces and is ready to be put into operation in the Western Provinces. The result is that pensioners attached to the Charlottetown and Sydney District Offices are being re-examined by travelling Medical Boards from Halifax; those attached to Quebec by travelling Medical Boards from Montreal; those attached to Kingston and North Bay by travelling Medical Boards from Toronto; those attached to Windsor by travelling Medical Boards from London and those attached to Port Arthur by travelling Medical Boards from Winnipeg. Travelling Medical Boards will also, in the near future, deal with pensioners attached to Regina, Saskatoon, Victoria, St. John and possibly Hamilton. As soon as these travelling Medical Boards have been in operation for a month or two the necessity for keeping offices open in all the smaller cities will no longer exist.

At the present time there are twenty-one District Offices which cost this commission an average of over one hundred thousand dollars a month, that is to say more than two-thirds the total cost of administration. Of course the smaller District Offices cost this commission proportionately less in accordance with their size but the closing of each of these offices will result in a saving of not less than five thousand dollars a year for the smallest District Office, namely Charlottetown, and not less than thirty thousand dollars a year for some of the medium-sized District Offices which it is proposed to close.

It is estimated that the closing of offices which can now be dispensed with will mean an annual saving of between $400,000 and $500,000 in the administration of the Pensions Board.

With reference particularly to the Quebec District Office, this office has, from the time it was opened, has been extraordinarily expensive when its size is considered. There are less than one thousand pensioners resident in the Quebec district which takes in the north shore of the St. Lawrence from Three Rivers and the south shore from Levis east. The office has been reorganized on two occasions but is still the most expensive of this commission when its size is considered. For the eleven months just past the expenditure in connection with this office has been about $23,000. By closing the office and doing the re-examinations of pensioners by the travelling Medical Board from Montreal it is thought that at least three-quarters of this expenditure can be saved and the service to the pensioner will be quite as good.

The same thing, although perhaps to not as great an extent, can be said with regard to the District Offices which it is proposed to close.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the statement of the Chairman of the Board of Pension Commissioners as to the action which the Board has taken and is about to take and the reasons therefor. The Board is convinced that by adopting this course efficient service can be given to the pensioners and at the same time the very large sum mentioned can be saved annually to the country. Members of the House know that the Board is constituted by statute and that its members are carrying out their duties under that statute.

ICE JAM IN THE ST. LAWRENCE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. C. G. POWER (Quebec South): In view of the discussion with regard to the ice jam on the St. Lawrence and the apparent impossibility of navigation about Portneuf, may I ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he intends to look into the request of the Quebec Board of Trade with reference to loading with Canadian grain and foodstuffs the four Government boats now lying in Quebec harbour?

Hon. C. C. BALLANTYNE (Minister of Marine): The operation of the Government boats is under the management not of the Department of Marine but of Canadian Government Merchant Marine, Limited. The Government in no way interferes with or exercises authority over the routes followed or the cargoes carried by these boats. I am sorry that I am not in a position to give the hon. member any information.

Mr. POWER: May my question be directed to the Minister of Railways?

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways): The same answer will apply.

HOUSE OF COMMONS OFFICIALS—ORGANIZATION.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. A. C. ETHIER (Laval-Two Mountains): I understand that Mr. Speaker is

to report to the House a plan of re-classification of the staff of the House, including the translators, who, I gather from the discussion which took place last week, are under the control of Mr. Speaker and the Debates Committee. May I ask whether you intend, Mr. Speaker, to submit that report some time this week?

Mr. SPEAKER: It was my purpose to have brought down the plan of organization during the latter portion of last week, but after a conference with the member for Wright (Mr. Devlin), it was thought better to defer it until Tuesday of this week. So far as I can give an assurance at the moment, it will be brought down to-morrow without fail.

Mr. ETHIER: Is it the intention to refer that plan or that report to a Special Committee of the House or to the Committee of the Whole?

Mr. SPEAKER: On two previous occasions the matter was dealt with through a motion placed upon the Order Paper by the Prime Minister. I do not know that any advantage can be gained by referring the matter to a special committee, but of course that is a question entirely for the House to decide.

Mr. ETHIER: I suggest, if I may be permitted, that a committee be appointed to report upon the matter to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: That can be dealt with when the organization scheme is before the House.

OVERFLOWING OF THE RIVER ST. PETER.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. D. A. LAFORTUNE (Jacques Cartier) (translation): Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to ask the Government whether they have been informed that the floods of the river St. Peter are a cause of serious loss to the inhabitants of that part of the constituency I represent. I have just learned from a large number of my constituents that the river is overflowing at the present time, flooding many a hundred dwellings. Two or three feet of water cover the ground to the great injury and discomfort of the dwellers. I understand that the river is under the care, supervision and jurisdiction of the Dominion Government. If that be true, I would suggest to the hon. minister in charge of that department the desirability of losing no time in safeguarding the interests of those constituents, landlords and tenants. Mr. Speaker, your humble servant would pray for an immediate answer, even if it be in English.

The right hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): I was surprised to hear the hon. member from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Lafortune) state that the river St. Peter is under the jurisdiction of the Dominion Government. I have no knowledge that the supervision of water courses was one of the many attributes of the Government. If I am correctly informed, what is known as St. Peter's river is rather a brook which at times overflows. I shall inquire whether the waters of that small stream are under the jurisdiction of the Government or not and if it is within our powers to prevent their overflowing. The hon. member may rest assured that I shall inquire immediately into the matter.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAY SYSTEM.

ANNUAL STATEMENT BY THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS.

On the motion for Committee of Supply Hon. J. D. Reid (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING: I do not desire to delay the House going into Supply, but I should like to point out to the Government that the explanatory details which are usually given in regard to civil government have not yet been brought down, and until they are, I think we should defer taking up that part of the Supply.

Hon. J. D. REID: When we are in Supply, I shall not ask the committee to take up Civil Government to-day, but I shall be pleased to take up some Estimates other than Civil Government.

Mr. Speaker, when the House resolves itself into Committee of Supply to-day, it is my intention to take up the Railways and Canals Estimates. It has been the custom to present an annual statement as to the operation of the Canadian Government railways. In presenting the Estimates of the Department of Railways and Canals for the forthcoming fiscal year, I desire to place before the House a statement dealing with the operation of the Canadian National Railways for the calendar year 1919. The Canadian Northern was merged with the Government railways in December, 1918, so that we are now in a position to review one completed year of operation under non-political and purely business auspices. The

National system, with which we are now dealing, comprises the following lines:—

	Miles.
Canadian Northern railway system	9,479
Intercolonial	1,592
Prince Edward Island	278
National Transcontinental	2,002
Branch lines	376
Total	13,727

It is unfortunate that abnormal economic conditions, the disturbing effects of which are world-wide and beyond the control of any railroad management, whether public or private, should have prevented a better showing for the first year of large scale national operation, but the result, when closely analysed, is not without hope for the future of Government ownership and operation.

More Revenue but Greater Operating Costs.

Briefly stated, the National system comprising

The Canadian Northern,
The Intercolonial, and
The Transcontinental,

earned $94,000,000 during the year, or almost $12,000,000 more than during 1918. But even with the $12,000,000 increased earnings, the operating loss is $14,000,000, made up as follows:

Canadian Northern	$6,500,000
Intercolonial and Transcontinental	7,500,000
	$14,000,000

The explanation of this is that during the year the operating expenses advanced from 84 to practically 108 millions, an adverse increase of nearly 24 millions. For the most part, this was due to advances in wages under the McAdoo award and supplements thereto, which were not offset by corresponding increases in rates. There was no rate increase during 1919. Given the same operating costs as 1918, the earnings for 1919 would have taken care of them and provided in addition the tidy sum of nine millions towards meeting fixed charges. These interest obligations in themselves amount to nineteen millions, and, singularly enough, a comparison of the payroll of the National system for the two years shows an increase of practically nineteen millions in wages alone during 1919.

The operating loss of fourteen millions, and the consequent failure to provide for fixed charges, is really a reflection of conditions which obtain all over the world as a result of the war. Comparisons are seldom conclusive, but sometimes they are illuminating, and in passing, I am reminded that in the United States, where economic conditions so closely approximate our own, the lines taken over by the Government for operation during the war are reported to have failed in two years by over seven hundred millions to earn the net revenue which the Government guaranteed them when taken over by the United States Railroad Administration.

More Passengers but Less Freight.

Although the freight earnings of the National system show an increase in excess of two and a half millions for the year, there was a falling off in freight handled amounting to three million tons. This was due in part to the stoppage of munition shipments on cessation of hostilities, and four-fifths of the decreased tonnage was on the old Canadian Government system, which formerly handled so much war business. There was a noticeable falling off also in westbound business, due to unsettled conditions in the period of transition from war to peace. That there was an increase in freight earnings at all is attributable to the increased rates put into effect during 1918, to which I shall refer more fully later on. Had the volume of freight handled during the preceding year been maintained, the increased freight earnings would have amounted to seven and a half millions instead of two and a half. Thus the return of the world to a peace basis may be said to have cost the National system five millions in freight revenue during the year 1919. But no one will say it was not worth while.

The National system carried eleven and a half million passengers during the year, an increase of about one and three quarter millions. Additional services and the return troop movement helped to swell these figures. Total passenger earnings increased from fourteen to a little less than twenty-two million dollars. About a million and a half of this increased revenue is attributable to the 10 per cent increase in passenger rates granted during 1918, and in effect for the first time for the full year. The coupling up of the Canadian Northern and the Canadian Government railways has, I may say, resulted in an increase in better paying long-haul business, and the management has every expectation that this business will be maintained, notwithstanding the completion of troop movements.

Operating Costs.

I shall try not to weary the House with an endless procession of figures, but as

briefly as possible call attention to their significance, and then append to this verbal statement detailed statistical information, which, with the permission of hon. members, could appear as appendices to these remarks, and thus receive the leisured scrutiny which their importance warrants. The tables to which I refer differentiate between Canadian National and former Canadian Government lines, and, as well, give the totals for the entire system, with which I have been dealing. They do not, however, include the Grand Trunk Pacific, which, pending the taking over of the Grand Trunk system, has been operated as a separate entity. As receiver for the Grand Trunk Pacific, I intend in due course to present a detailed report of the operation of that line for 1919, though I shall refer briefly to the results of that operation at a later stage of my present remarks.

The operating revenue of the National system as already stated, was more than ninety-three million dollars. The wage bill for the year exceeded seventy-three millions, having, owing largely to the McAdoo series of advances, jumped from fifty-four millions in 1918. In other words, out of every one dollar of revenue earned, seventy-eight cents passed directly, by way of wages, to the employees.

Labour Conditions.

The cessation of hostilities appreciably relieved the labour situation and enabled a start to be made on overtaking considerable maintenance of way and equipment work which had been deferred under war conditions. An extra large number of tie renewals were made, which, at the higher price and higher cost of labour, made a large item. Also relaying of rails which could not be gone on with during the war, added to operating expenses. Special locomotive, car, and work equipment repairs were undertaken with a view to keeping in service as much equipment as possible so as to avoid purchase of new units at the extraordinarily high prices to which I shall refer later.

It is to be remembered then, in dealing with the operating expenses for the year under review, that such deferred maintenance work as has been done, amounting to over five million dollars, is included in the year's operating expenses, and to that extent has increased the deficit. There is still a large amount of deferred work to do, which will add to the operating costs for the year nineteen-twenty, but it is satisfactory to know that all the work which is being done is increasing the physical value of the property, as well as making for higher efficiency and economic operation.

The position of the 55,000 employees of the National system was materially improved during the year. They worked on the average a shorter day, and capital expenditures for the year included large items for the improvement of their housing and working conditions. In 1914 the average wage per year of the railway employees of Canada was $700; in 1919 on the National system it was $1,447.

The relations between the management and the employees have been very satisfactory. Since Canadian Railway Board of Adjustment No. 1 was established in September, 1918, Canadian railways have been remarkably free from serious labour troubles, and although the National system then comprised 35 per cent of the mileage in Canada, the grievances arising therefrom amounted to only about 16 per cent of the cases before the board. It is hoped that this board, which is comprised of six representatives of the large railway labour brotherhoods and six railway officers, will be maintained so that differences of opinion may continue to be settled by round table conference rather than by more expensive uneconomic and inconvenient methods.

Betterments.

Important progress was made during the year in improving the transportation plant of the Government-owned lines. The aim of the management is to bring the lines up to the standard which existing traffic justifies, and to improve these standards as traffic increases, and finally to reach the position where the facilities will provide a slight margin over the immediate traffic requirements, so that when emergency traffic develops there will not be congestion. With respect to many sections of the main lines this margin of capacity now exists, but expenditures are required on various sections, and at terminal and other important points where limiting conditions now restrict the economic handling of traffic. To improve track conditions, 625 miles of new 85 pound rail were laid, and on 130 additional miles of track the existing rail was replaced with heavier section, this being largely good 80 or 70 pound rail released by the first item. The balance of the released rail was used up on the construction of 64 new passing tracks, and the extension of 35 others; also 44 transfer,

storage and other tracks, and 46 private and industrial tracks. This additional trackage will greatly facilitate the handling of trains and switching in yards.

About $1,200,000 was spent on ballasting. Over 100 trestles were replaced with permanent structures, and many other bridge improvements were made, a large item being $267,000 expended on the St. Charles river bridge. Good progress was made on the important work of providing a second track where in previous years serious congestion has occurred on the Intercolonial railway. The points where double tracking is being undertaken are between Ste. Rosalie and Charlotte, Truro and Belmont, between Springhill Junction and Maccan and also out of Moncton. Over a million dollars was expended on the work during 1919. The double track between Drumheller and Munson Junction, Alberta, has been completed, thus greatly facilitating the handling of coal from the Drumheller mines. In the case of the Drumheller work the grouping of 23 mines in one locality and the attendant mining conditions make the handling of the traffic practically a limiting factor in production; the movement, too, being crowded into a relatively short season, makes it imperative that good facilities for handling be provided. These expenditures to improve operating conditions produce in many cases a much greater return on the investment than equal expenditures on new lines, as not only are additional earnings secured, but operating expenses are reduced, greater use of equipment is obtained and better service to the public. In line with the management's policy of improving existing facilities, many new structures have been erected, among these being 16 water tanks, 11 coal handling plants, 2 coaling trestles, 26 stations, 12 station shelters, 13 freight sheds, 4 express buildings, 64 single section houses, 10 double section houses, 36 bunk houses, and 8 workmen's cottages. Such expenditures eliminate train delays, effect labour saving, add needed facilities, provide housing and tend to the welfare of employees.

Additions and improvements to round houses, machine shops and other mechanical facilities accounted for $125,000. General improvements included considerable ditching, widening banks, removing sags preparatory in some cases to ballasting. Some diversions to reduce grades, to give better alignment, or eliminate bridges were completed and others are under way.

The rebuilding of the Canadian Northern line between Cap Rouge and Portneuf, washed out by the tidal wave in 1918, was almost completed.

On Prince Edward Island, where the lines are narrow gauge, a third rail has been laid from Charlottetown to Summerside, and from Port Borden to Emerald—60 miles in all, which enables standard gauge rolling stock to be interchanged by car ferry, greatly facilitiating the handling of traffic to and from the Island.

New Construction in 1919.

In submitting the construction programme for 1919, the directors recommended that the work to be undertaken should be as closely as possible confined to completing branch lines which were under construction in Western Canada at the outbreak of the war. Following this policy, work was done on various lines, among the more important being the extension of the Hanna-Medicine Hat line to Red Cliff, and the St. Paul de Metis line in Alberta, and the Humboldt-Melfort connection and Duck Lake branch in Saskatchewan, and in British Columbia the Kamloops-Kelowna line. On Vancouver island, twenty-eight miles of track were laid on grade previously constructed, and forty miles of ballasting completed. The Vancouver passenger station was completed and opened for traffic.

Shortage of labour and disturbed industrial conditions during the summer prevented the expected completion of certain Western branches, but the work on these will be vigourously pushed this season.

At Toronto, the Leaside terminal yard was further developed. Most of the facilities at this point are now utilized and are proving of great value in handling the business on the lines in Southern Ontario.

Betterments Proposed for 1920.

The following general improvements are recommended by the directors as being among the most pressing requirements of the system:

Canadian Government Railways.

The relaying of about 200 miles of track with heavier steel, and the utilization of the released steel for additional passing tracks, spurs and sidings.

The completion of the 20 miles of double tracking already referred to and now well under way. Improvements to or replacing of over 200 bridges, trestles and culverts, including filling and other permanent work.

The construction of 25 stations and freight sheds, 7 coaling plants, 7 water

stations, nine buildings for the mechanical department such as engine houses, machine shops, etc., 58 buildings for housing employees such as section houses.

Provision will be made for the general improvement of track conditions, and at St. John an extension of the yard trackage is required to relieve the congestion at that point.

Canadian Northern Lines.

The construction of branch line mileage in Western Canada provides an opportunity to replace steel now on main lines with heavier section, the steel taken from the main lines being serviceable for branch line traffic. The additional traffic being provided by the branch lines is enabling heavier train movements to be made, and the present demand for all-steel passenger equipment requires the utilization of very heavy power, making it necessary to continually improve the standard of main line roadbed, track and structures.

The programme in respect to rail replacements covers the relaying of 350 miles of new steel on main lines; 331 bridges, trestles and culverts are to be replaced, filled or renewed, involving the replacing of many temporary structures by permanent work. The completion of additional mileage in the Prairie Provinces has necessitated the construction of many new buildings, a large item being 68 new stations and freight sheds. There were also built 22 coaling plants. The present price of labour necessitates the adoption of labour-saving devices of this kind. There are also listed 20 new water stations. The mechanical department's facilities will be improved by the construction of new engine houses, machine shops, etc., 19 in all. Some of these are required at the end of new branch lines. Additional lines also account for a number of the 134 section houses required.

A large appropriation is required for general road-bed and track improvements and increasing traffic warrants improvements and revision of the main line between Montreal and Quebec.

A greatly needed improvement is the stringing of an additional copper and steel wire between Montreal and Toronto and Winnipeg to provide through wires between these important points, the present wires being required for local business and train despatching. The new wires will also enable new through business to be handled by the G. N. W. through Canada, whereas the company's through business now goes via United States connections.

Construction Programme, 1920.

It is again proposed to confine new construction in Western Canada to the completion of branch lines on which work is well under way. The programme includes work on 16 branch lines in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia. The principal items of track-laying will be from Eston south-easterly 35 miles; Humboldt-Melfort line, 32 miles; Melfort north-easterly, 32 miles; Oliver north-easterly, 22 miles; Peace River line, 32½ miles; Swift Current line, 18½ miles, and Jackfish Lake branch, 27 miles. In British Columbia it is proposed to grade 40.4 miles to complete the Okanagan branch. In all, 349.6 miles of track is to be laid and 123.4 miles of line to be graded. The extension of other lines and the construction of additional branches is very strongly urged, and while certain of these projections are fully justified on traffic considerations, their construction has to be postponed on account of the financial situation, labour shortage and high cost of material and supplies.

In Eastern Canada there are several very important connections which can be regarded as essential to economic and unified operation with other lines of the National system, but which must also be postponed until the financial situation improves. Among these may be mentioned the Long Lake connection between the National Transcontinental and the Canadian Northern main lines which, when completed, will give the Canadian Northern railway the short route between Winnipeg, Montreal and Toronto.

Rolling Stock Situation.

During the year 1919 the following rolling stock was ordered for Canadian Government railway:

25 Pacific type locomotives,
25 Switching locomotives,
13 Compartment observation cars,
18 Standard sleeping cars,
9 Dining cars,
30 Baggage cars,
130 Colonist cars,
20 Tourist cars,
20 Mail cars,
550 General service or coal cars,
500 Flat cars,
750 Box cars,
250 Ballast cars,
800 Stock cars,
150 Refrigerator cars,
25 Cabooses.

This equipment has been delivered except seven of the standard sleepers, the

observation cars, diners, first-class coaches and mail cars, all of which it is expected will be in service at an early date.

Passenger earnings have shown such a good increase that 30 additional heavy passenger locomotives are required, and 50 additional passenger train cars.

On account of the very high unit prices of rolling stock, the requirements have been kept down to the lowest point consistent with traffic conditions. This is very necessary in view of the fact that locomotives suitable for our purpose which could be purchased for $24,000 in 1914 cost $62,000 now; first-class coaches have increased from $16,000 to $38,000; dining cars from $28,000 to $46,000. The increase in price of freight cars range from 144 per cent for refrigerators to 170 per cent for steel frame box cars.

The equipment to be ordered is as follows:

Locomotives.

20 Pacific type—medium weight.
10 Pacific type—heavy weight.
25 heavy freight locomotives.
20 switching locomotives.

Freight Cars.

3000 40-ton box cars.
500 refrigerator cars.
650 50-ton coal or general purpose cars.
350 50-ton ballast cars.
100 cabooses.
6 snow ploughs.
150 stock cars.

Passenger Cars.

20 baggage cars.
18 standard sleepers.
12 standard diners.

Mr. CHARLES MARCIL: Were all these cars purchased in Canada?

Mr. REID: All that could possibly be obtained in Canada were purchased in this country. I will give the details of the contracts when the House is in committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I must remind hon. gentlemen that the House is not now sitting as Committee of Supply and that these questions can be more properly asked when that stage is reached.

Mr. REID: I will be glad to give any information that is desired as soon as we are in Committee of Supply.

The Question of Rates.

The question of rates is one which will bear careful examination. No system can indefinitely stand the relationship at present existing between earnings and operating expenses of the National, but before proceeding to a consideration of future rates, it may be well to review what has taken place in recent years in that connection. Hon. members will recall the agitation, extending over a period of years, for a reduction of rates in Western Canada, by many urged because it was felt one railway at least could well afford a reduction. Just a few months before the outbreak of war this western rate case was finally decided. The judgment involved a comprehensive reduction in rates in territory west of the Great Lakes, and very seriously affected the newer lines. Then came the war and with it undreamed of problems of transportation, and the railways began to feel the effects of war conditions. In 1916 what is known as the Eastern rates case provided for a five per cent increase in tariffs of Eastern roads, both Canadian and American, but it did not apply to the West. In 1918 there were two rate increases, the March order, commonly called the 15 per cent increase, and the August increase of 25 per cent (so-called) which accompanied the first of the McAdoo series of wage increases. There was this difference, however, between the rate increases and the wage increases: the latter were retroactive the rates could not be retroactive; and, in addition, it was found that the rate increases, when finally applied, did not produce anything like the increase in revenue hoped for. The first mentioned (15 per cent) netted only seven per cent on the National Railway system's passenger revenue and ten per cent on the system's freight revenue, or nine per cent on the gross. The second increase was on freight only, and was less in the West than in the East, owing to the equalization of eastern and western rates involved. For instance, in Western Canada the 25 per cent increase wiped out the previous 15 per cent increment. Taken together, these two rate increases are estimated therefore to have approximately only 30 per cent instead of considerably more than 40 as they would have had they been imposed upon the other.

Now, there are only two ways by which a railway's revenues may be increased. One is by increased rates and the other is by increased business. The Canadian National railways, should—in view of the resumption of trade and immigration, in view of the strengthening of weak spots by the inclusion of Grand Trunk lines, and especially in view of the traffic possibilities of the sixty steamships, the freight of which will come to National railways,—commence to show a steady increase in business, but the

management has, in the course of public utterances, called attention to the necessity for increased rates if operating expenses are to be met out of earnings. There are and will be various opinions as to this, but it behooves us to give careful consideration to the viewpoint of the management. They point out that Canadian roads are closely bound up with American roads, in proof of which witness the application of the McAdoo awards to Canada. Not only do we pay the same wage schedules and apply the same working conditions, but, generally speaking, freight rates are the same on both sides of the line. In the United States the roads are being handed back to their owners in groups, and the legislation provides that they be allowed to earn 5½ per cent on their investments, with an additional half per cent construction betterments. During the war the American roads were guaranteed a certain return which was made up from the Public Treasury. Now that this guarantee no longer applies, either an increase in rates will be necessary or the American Government must continue to implement the earnings of the weaker roads. It is estimated that a rate increase of 26 per cent would be required to put the American roads on a paying basis. An increase to that extent, if applied to the earning of 1919 on the National system, would have produced a revenue of a little more than one hundred and ten millions, which would have left a surplus of net earnings of over two millions. That, of course, does not take the fixed charges into account. The management, therefore, feel that, both because we have the same expenditures to meet and must compete with each other all along the line, whatever freight increase is permitted in the United States ought also to be applied to Canadian roads. As Minister of Railways and having asked the management to operate on a business basis, I am bound to present the management's viewpoint for the consideration of Parliament.

I have, however, a larger responsibility as Minister of Railways, having, as such, to do with all Canadian roads, and answerable, in the final analysis, to the people, who at present find the cost of commodities sufficiently high. The railway situation in Canada has undergone a marked change, the entire mileage being now controlled in two great groups or systems, the Canadian National and the Canadian Pacific. In Canada the mileage of the latter road is 14,824, but there are 4,948 of owned or controlled lines in the United States, so that the system mileage aggregates 19,772. Including the Grand Trunk lines, the Canadian National system will comprise 22,356 miles, of which 2,093 miles are located in the States. These two great systems are, from the mileage standpoint, at any rate, fairly evenly balanced, and it is unnecessary to point out to honourable members that any increase in rates granted the Canadian National system would equally apply to Canadian Pacific lines. No doubt, honourable members read in the newspapers recently the annual statement of this immense corporation, which showed that, notwithstanding the disadvantage of increased operating costs and charges common to all roads, the Canadian Pacific railway had been able to pay a dividend of seven per cent on their railway operation and three per cent on their outside operations, or in all their usual 10 per cent dividend on last year's operation.

Now, the argument has been advanced that it would be possible to tax out of the Canadian Pacific Railway any increase in earnings which might be permitted them in common with the Canadian National system. I have my own opinion as to the fairness of such a proposition, but, in any event, I personally feel that such a proposal, even if fair from the standpoint of competition, would not be practicable, for the simple reason that you could not prevent the Canadian Pacific from spending their revenue legitimately on the improvement of their property, and if, at the end of the year, we found that the increased earnings had gone into betterments, how could we tax it out of them?

My own feeling is that the Canadian Pacific are entitled to a rate sufficient to earn 7 per cent on their railway investment, and this they appear to be able to do, notwithstanding present abnormal conditions. The question resolves itself, therefore, into the following proposition:

Shall Canadian freight rates be increased generally for the particular purpose of enabling the Canadian National system to meet its operating expenses and fixed charges, or would it be better to go on with the present rates, giving dealers no additional excuse for increasing the cost of living, and trusting to increase in business, the economies it should be possible to effect by co-ordination, and the return of normal conditions to gradually reduce these deficits until the day (which I personally feel is not far off) when the revenue will prove sufficient to pay for operation and, later, also to take care of fixed charges?

Should this latter suggestion prevail, it would require to be thoroughly understood that the Minister of Railways, no matter who he may be, must come down next year with a deficit, and the next year with a deficit, and so on for a few years until we shall have turned the corner.

The earnings of the Canadian Railways last year were 350 millions, made up as follows:

C.P.R.	177	millions
Canadian National	94	"
G.T.R.	68	"
G.T.P.	11	"

A 25 per cent increase on these earnings would approximate $88,000,000, the greater part of which would be earned in Canada. Whether we shall take 88 millions in increased freight fates out of the people of the country next year in order to show a surplus for the National system is a question as to which I myself am not prepared to take the responsibility of deciding either one way or the other at the present time. I leave it to the consideration of the House and of the people of Canada as a whole, and shall be glad to elicit representative public opinion in the matter, so that the Government may be in a position to give this important question the best possible consideration.

Bringing in the Grand Trunk.

The current year will witness the rounding out of the Canadian National Railway system by the acquisition of the Grand Trunk and its subsidiary lines. With these added, it is estimated that over 50 per cent of the domestic freight traffic of the Dominion will be found to originate along Government railways. The connecting up of the Grand Trunk lines will give direct access to eastern industrial centres, especially in Ontario. Western Canadian business originating on Grand Trunk lines will no longer require to be split into three but can go forward in one long haul over all-National lines, and, vice versa, the Grand Trunk will benefit from a large amount of additional business from our Western lines which it could not obtain except as a member of the National system.

Fear has been expressed that Halifax and St. John might suffer as a result of the Government taking over the Grand Trunk. The people of Eastern Canada need have no fear of this for the reason that these are the terminals of our immense railway systems and have been for many years. They have been greatly improved, and in the operation of our National system, more especially in view of the ocean tonnage we now control, these ports will become increasing, rather than diminishing, factors in the Canadian railroad situation.

The connecting up of the Grand Trunk lines will mean that 52 per cent of the entire railway mileage of Canada will have passed under Government control. This will permit of economies in operation where the two systems have been maintaining parallel lines and duplicate staffs, and, as already pointed out, there should be compensating advantages to the Canadian Northern, the Intercolonial and the Grand Trunk as well. I wish to point out, however, that, in speaking of advantages, I am referring to the Grand Trunk lines only, not the Grand Trunk Pacific or the Transcontinental Railway systems. These last named colonization roads, built as part and parcel of the Grand Trunk, are bound to be unprofitable for many years to come. The loss on operation of the Transcontinental last year was $2,735,000. This was included in the Canadian National figures already referred to. But there is also the Grand Trunk Pacific, which the Government found on its doorstep in March of last year, and as to the operation of which I shall have to make a separate report, as the figures form no part of the National system figures with which we have been dealing. But to make my present statement complete, I desire to point out that the Grand Trunk Pacific for the year ending December 31 last showed an operating loss of five and a half millions. To this must be added fixed charges of eight and a half millions, making a total deficit of fourteen millions, an increase of three and a half millions over 1918. The reasons for this increase was set out in a communication from the General Manager to myself as Receiver, and these will be dealt with at the proper time.

Personally, I do not think it will be possible for many years to make the expenses of operating these colonization roads, nor do I think it fair that they should be expected to make the showing we look for from the Canadian Northern, the Intercolonial or the Grand Trunk proper. Therefore, I think the annual loss on these railways should not be added to the net deficit of the Canadian National railways for purposes of comparison, and I have instructed the management that the operation of these systems must be shown separately at the close of each year, so that when comparisons are made between other systems and

our Government system, the comparison may be a reasonably fair one.

Hudson Bay Railway.

There is one more railway which was commenced and which has not been completed, which is known as the Hudson Bay railway. For the information of the hon. members, I may say that the Government has decided that no more work shall be done on that during the coming year. It is the intention to use every effort to extend branch lines into districts where settlers are much more in evidence and in much greater need of railway communication. The Hudson Bay Railway will therefore stand until financial conditions will permit of its resumption.

In conclusion let me say there was a time, not long ago, when the Government system was largely a local carrier getting the short end of business that goes with the short haul. The longest haul it could hope for was from Halifax or Sydney to Montreal, and vice versa. And in competing with the Grand Trunk for Montreal business offering to the seaboard, we could charge only the Portland rate, though the Intercolonial mileage to Halifax was 841 as against the Grand Trunk's 297 to Portland. Similarly, the Canadian Pacific railway had the advantage of its comparatively short haul of 481 miles to St. John, and for business originating at the Intercolonial chief terminal, Halifax, it had to compete with this same highly organized and stronger competitor, whose agents were always active abroad and whose ships were ever on the seas. But a change has come over the scene. Now the Government system itself bestrides the continent, with branches reaching for the first time into productive centres and with terminals upon both Eastern and Western oceans. The story of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine has been told by the proper minister, and at last we also have our ships upon the seas, and our agents abroad will actively compete for international trade. Keen competition, "adroit, persistent, aggressive and fair," is promised by the President of the Canadian Pacific, who expresses the hope that both their own systems and the National may in future work in common for the advancement of the country. He says there need no longer be controversy, but that there will always be keen competition. That is what the management of the National system expects and welcomes. I am told that the nationalization of the Canadian Northern has made no difference in the morale of the employees of that road, that they are as keenly alert as ever and "on their toes'" to make government ownership and operation a success. We expect the employees of the Grand Trunk systems will co-operate with equal loyalty, and the Government in turn will spare no effort to build up a great National railway system able to compete with and maintain the high standard of transportation efficiency reached by the Canadian Pacific. That road may well be the standard against which we may measure the success of government ownership and operation. I say "success" because I am not prepared for one moment to contemplate any other possibility. The National lines, with the Grand Trunk included, will comprise a system which will serve every province in Canada, which is identified with every progressive community, and must continue to perform the major part of the transportation service of the entire Dominion. We have taken steps to remove the Government's lines from political interference. Experienced railway men are in charge; they are being given money to improve the roadbed, to buy the best equipment to enable the greatest tonnage to be hauled in a single train. It is the greatest encouragement towards expansion to have this great National system ready and equipped to handle additional traffic as it develops—and it surely will develop. If we imagine Canada to have reached the maximum of development then we shall have planned foolishly, but I, for one, have the faith to feel and the vision to prophesy that this great transportation system is not being prepared to perform this splendid transportation service in vain.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to hand in these schedules to be inserted in Hansard so that hon. members may have before them all the details I have mentioned.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS.

Comparative summary of operating results—12 months ending December 31, 1918-19.

Operating Revenue.	1919.	1918.	Increase.	% Increase.
Canadian Northern	$53,562,177.57	$47,310,011.91	$ 6,252,165.66	13.22
Canadian Government ..	40,179,380.93	34,636,484.67	5,542,896.26	16.00
Canadian National	93,741,558.50	81,946,496.58	11,795,061.92	14.39

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—*Con.*

Comparative summary of operating results—12 months ending December 31, 1918-19—*Con.*

	1919.	1918.	Increase.	% Increase.
Distribution.				
Passenger	21,837,744.47	14,327,355.63	7,510,388.84	52.42
Freight	63,154,773.39	60,550,011.42	2,604,761.97	4.30
Other	8,749,040.64	7,069,129.53	1,679,911.11	23.76
Operating Expenses.				
Canadian Northern	60,034,023.92	44,062,949.94	15,971,073.98	36.25
Canadian Government	47,728,205.73	40,028,099.35	7,700,106.38	19.24
Canadian National	107,762,229.65	84,091,049.29	23,671,180.36	28.15
Distribution.				
Mtce. of Way and Str.	28,476,450.66	19,266,424.83	9,210,025.83	47.80
Mtce. of Equipment	19,950,409.17	15,792,342.10	4,158,067.07	26.33
Traffic	1,478,372.41	1,291,721.00	186,651.41	14.45
Transportation—rail	52,914,891.80	44,406,311.93	8,508,579.87	19.16
Transportation—water	782,316.69	319,857.23	462,459.46	144.58
Miscellaneous	1,877,168.08	1,162,311.69	714,856.39	61.50
General	2,282,620.84	1,852,080.51	430,540.33	23.25
Operating Ratio.				
Canadian Northern	112.08	93.14	18.94	20.33
Canadian Government	118.79	115.57	3.22	2.78
Canadian National	114.96	102.62	12.34	12.02
Operating Loss.				
Canadian Northern	* 6,471,846.35	3,247,061.97	* 9,718,908.32	*299.31
Canadian Government	* 7,548,824.80	* 5,391,614.68	* 2,157,210.12	* 40.01
Canadian National	*14,020,671.15	* 2,144,552.71	*11,876,118.44	*553.84
Mileage Operated.				
Steam	13,601.75	13,451.16	150.59	* 1.12
Electric	125.60	62.00	63.60	*102.58
Total	13,727.35	13,513.16	214.19	* 1.58
Revenue train miles	29,633,398	28,555,928	1,077,470	3.77
Earnings per R.T.M.	3.09†	2.82†	0.27	9.58
Expenses per R.T.M.	3.57†	2.91†	0.66	22.66
Loss per R.T.M.	0.48†	0.09†	0.39	433.33

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS.

	1919.	1918.	Increase.	% Increase.
Operating deficit	$14,020,671.15	$ 2,144,552.71	$11,876,118.44	553.84
Canadian Government rentals	697,384.22	692,400.00	4,984.22	7.20
Miscellaneous income	*961,665.21	*298,075.67	*1,259,740.88	*422.62
Def. St. John and Quebec	187,269.97	142,941.87	44,328.10	31.01
Net deficit excluding Can. Northern fixed charges and miscellaneous income balance	$13,943,660.13	$ 3,277,970.25	$10,665,689.88	325.38

Traffic—Passengers carried (exclusive of electric lines.)

	1919.	1918.	Increase.	% Increase.
Canadian Government	6,697,232	5,779,085	918,157	15.89
Canadian Northern	4,910,160	4,114,965	795,195	19.32
Canadian National	11,607,392	9,894,050	1,713,352	17.32

	1919.	1918.	Increase.	% Increase.
Canadian Gov't. Railways	11,108,391	13,476,755	2,368,364	17.57
Canadian Northern	12,822,444	13,699,345	876,901	6.41
Canadian National	23,930,835	27,176,100	3,245,265	11.93

Train mileage—Passenger.				
Canadian Government	4,744,179	3,946,703	797,476	20.21
Canadian Northern	5,829,184	5,043,098	786,086	15.58
Canadian National	10,573,363	8,989,801	1,583,562	17.62

*These figures denote decrease or deficit.

†Electric and water lines excluded.

Statement excludes income and equipment items and branch line rentals.

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

CANADAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—*Con.*

Mixed.				
Canadian Government	1,182,041	1,205,829	* 23,788	* 1.97
Canadian Northern	1,841,603	1,788,536	53,067	2.97
Canadian National	3,023,644	2,994,365	29,279	0.98
Freight.				
Canadian Government	6,199,775	6,986,399	* 786,624	*11.26
Canadian Northern	9,788,782	9,545,329	243,453	2.55
Canadian National	15,988,557	16,531,728	* 543,171	* 3.29
Work.				
Canadian Government	547,594	492,558	55,036	11.17
Canadian Northern	1,505,543	1,108,625	396,918	35.80
Canadian National	2,053,137	1,601,183	451,954	28.23
Total.				
Canadian Government	12,673,589	12,631,489	42,100	0.33
Canadian Northern	19,012,946	17,525,622	1,487,324	8.49
Canadian National	31,686,535	30,157,111	1,529,424	5.07

*Decrease.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS.

Comparison of pay-roll—12 months ended December 31.

	1919.	1918.	Increase.	Per cent.
Can. Government railways	$31,545,481.18	$24,980,155.59	$ 6,565,325.59	26.28
Canadian Northern railway	41,620,133.30	29,269,906.70	12,350,226.60	42.19
	$73,165.614.48	$54,250,062.29	$18,915,552.19	37.87

Explanation of Increase.

	Canadian Government.	Canadian Northern.	Total.	Per cent.
Increase due to G.O. 27	$2,499,353.28	$ 3,218,339.56	$ 5,717,692.84	30.23
Supplements	3,749,029.92	4,827,509.34	8,576,539.26	45.34
Deferred maintenance and increased service	316,942.39	3,456,199.97	3,773,142.36	19.14
Back time 1918	.....	84,177.73	84,177.73	.....
Total	6,565,325.59	12,350,226.60	18,915,552.19	100.00

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Does the House unanimously consent that the schedules mentioned be inserted in Hansard.

Consent unanimously given.

(The figures in the subjoined comparative statements are not final and are subject to slight modifications as complete returns become available):

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS.

REVISED ESTIMATE OF WAGES FOR 12 MONTHS AT PRESENT RATES.

Showing increase under McAdoo Award, Supplements and Collateral Increases down to and inclusive of 4c. increase to Shopmen. Based on number of hours on duty for all employees for year ended June 30, 1918.

Class of Employees.	Compensation prior to G.O. 27.	Increase under G.O. 27.		No.	Increase under Supplements.		Estimated Wages 12 months under existing rates.	Total increase over 1917.	
		Amount.	%		Amount.	%		Amount.	%
	$ cts.	$ cts.			$ cts.		$ cts.	$ cts.	
Maintenance of way	10,686,978 83	2,837,304 88	26·55	8	4,701,487 53	43·99	18,225,771 24	7,538,792 41	70·54
Maintenance of equipment	9,595,877 56	2,921,562 96	30·44	4	3,163,022 42	32·96	15,680,462 94	6,084,585 38	63·41
Enginemen	5,334,427 54	611,870 90	11·47	15	636,986 23	11·94	6,583,284 67	1,248,857 13	23·41
Trainmen	6,323,329 91	673,679 16	10·65	16	392,532 24	6·21	7,389,541 31	1,066,211 40	16·86
Agents and telegraphers	2,468,844 39	177,110 04	7·17	13	956,310 93	38·74	3,602,265 36	1,133,420 97	45·9
Clerical and other station forces	6,199,273 57	1,195,561 46	19·28	7	1,970,280 30	31·79	9,365,115 53	3,165,841 76	51 07
Various (not distributed)	1,381,846 26	261,059 04	18·89	Var.	830,981 46	60·14	2,473,886 76	1,092,040 50	79·03
Officers	1,275,303 73	.....	.....	Coll.	361,353 81	26·33	1,636,657 54	361,353 81	28·33
Grant total	43,265,881 79	8,678,148 44	20·06	.....	13,013,954 92	30·07	64,956,985 15	21,691,103 36	50·13

TORONTO, February 24th, 1920.

(Sgd.) E. P. MALLORY,
Statistician.

Mr. FRANK CAHILL (Pontiac): Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister's address will, I think, confirm the opinion generally held throughout the country that the Government have absolutely no railway policy. He has just stated to us, if I caught his figures correctly, that we made a loss on operation of $14,000,000 and a loss on interest charges of $19,000,000, or a total loss of $33,000,000, and that no provision whatever for maintenance is included in these figures. So that he comes down to us to-day with a statement showing that if we had maintained the road properly we would have sustained a loss this year of not less than $60,000,000; and he tells us also that this loss is to be continued for one year, perhaps for two or more years, perhaps for many years to come. He states in his usual way that he has no policy as to what is to be done about this deficit: Whether he is going to ask the people to continue to pay these heavy losses out of the treasury of the country or whether he is going to adjust his management so that the road will earn the revenues that it should earn. The minister did not say a word, so far as I heard, about the management. Apparently he is quite satisfied to let the Mackenzie and Mann crowd go on tapping the treasury of Canada indefinitely. He is not prepared to tax the people who are using the service; he is quite willing that the Mackenzie and Mann crowd should go on spending this $50,000,000 or $60,000,000 a year without giving any information whatever to this House or to the country. The amount that the minister mentions is only the deficit; no account is taken of expenditures necessary for maintenance or for betterments. During the past two or three years we have spent huge sums on this system, and all that we can get from the minister to-day is that we may expect to go on spending forty, fifty, sixty or more millions per annum until these railroad barons, these Canadian robbers, shall have exhausted the treasury of this country.

The minister stated that colonization roads were not paying. I am glad to see the leader of the Government (Sir George Foster) in his seat, because I wish to direct his attention to a matter with regard to colonization roads that is of prime importance to every Canadian. We have developed in the northern part of Quebec a railway system and we have settled in that country upwards of 15,000 of the best colonizers that can be found anywhere in the world; they are the only people who will ever colonize the northern part of our Canadian domain. They are not like the people who were being taken out of Kapuskasing during the last few months; they are doing successful work in the district in which they have settled. The only drawback is the lack of railway facilities. I wish to read an affidavit which I received from there a few days ago. It is signed by Frank Blais, and reads as follows:

I, the undersigned, Frank Blais, lumber merchant, of the village of Amos, make oath and say:

1. There is actually at the different sidings between La Reine and Nottaway—

That is a very short distance in that country.

—on the Transcontinental railway, more than 60,000 cords of pulp wood piled up ready to be shipped.

2. There is also in this same district 20,000,000 feet of sawn lumber ready to be forwarded which was left in the yards from 1919 on account of the shortage of cars, and there will be about 60,000,000 more manufactured during next season.

3. It would need about 6,500 cars to ship the lumber and pulp wood already piled up ready to be forwarded.

4. The authorities of the Transcontinental have only placed at the disposition of the owners of the pulp wood and lumber about 50 cars during the whole month of February, and about the same proportion during this month of March.

5. When the cars are loaded and moved from our sidings, they only reach their destination point after a delay of six or eight weeks, and often more.

6. The employees of the railroad will not take the trouble of placing the cars on the sidings in the proper way to be used conveniently by the shippers, and the engines used do not seem to be in the proper state to give satisfaction in moving the cars.

7. The whole Abitibi region is suffering heavy losses from the facts above mentioned.

And I have signed:

FRANK BLAIS.

Sworn before me at Amos this 22nd day of March, 1920.

C. A. LAFRANCE, N.P.,
Com. Supreme Court, District of Quebec.

Now, there is the condition of the road that the minister states lost traffic last year on account of the war being over. He says that the earnings were decreased because the railways did not have the traffic; yet here is traffic lying right at hand that has not been moved. I want to read the letter accompanying the affidavit, because it throws light on this subject, and there is a good deal of truth in it. It reads:

Again we have to apply for your protection and to ask you to take our interests in hand. I am writing in my own name, but I will send you declarations by other lumber merchants and pulp wood dealers, which shall prove to you that the same unfortunate situation exists all over the Abitibi region. We believe this

state of affairs could be improved with your help, by putting the case before the authorities of the Federal Government, which has full control over this situation.

You are perfectly aware of the fact that the pulpwood and lumber trades are the only sources of revenue for this part of the county. To take advantage of this industry we necessarily need cars for the transportation of the lumber and pulpwood, and we actually have no cars of no kind for that purpose. We are asking such cars through all the officers of the railway, with no result.

I have myself over 15,000 cords of pulpwood, at a cost of more than $120,000, and I can get no cars to forward the same. I have made a demand for 30 cars a day, and I received an average of one car per day. In two months from now all that wood we own will be exposed to burn in the bush fires, and we could not sustain such a loss. The money has been advanced by the banks, who are helping us to buy that pulpwood from the settlers, who have no other means to support their families. It would also be a total loss for the paper mills, that are already blamed on account of the high price charged for their paper. We have been compelled to stop buying any pulpwood, not being able to ship what we have on hand, and there is still a great quantity for sale by settlers, who are waiting on such sale to support their families.

There is in the Abitibi region about 55,000 cords of pulp wood to be shipped before the bush fires become a danger and it would need about 4,000 cars.

There was about 20,000,000 feet of lumber left from 1919 on account of the shortage of cars and there will be about 60,000,000 feet more during next season, which will need about 5,500 cars for expedition and we are wishing that you would ask the Federal authorities to prepare for such expedition of lumber and to provide for the actual need of cars for pulp wood.

You will probably have as an answer that there is no cars to be had, but I can assure you the contrary and as an example let me tell you that in February last, at Hearst, west of Cochrane, there were enough cars loaded there to force an embargo on the shipments of pulpwood from that place and there were more cars loaded than could be received; while in that same month of February my requisition was for 30 cars a day and all I had during the whole month was 6 cars.

I believe the officers of the railway in our region are doing their best to help us, but their instructions come from a higher source that does not seem to sympathize with our requirements.

Every year there are thousands of cords of pulpwood burned by the settlers who cannot sell such wood on account of the shortage of cars. This is a serious loss and we believe that the situation could be very much improved if the Federal authorities are willing to do so.

Mr. Speaker, the intimation in this letter is that the Federal Government are deliberately trying to kill settlement in the Abitibi district. It is well known that the members of the present Government who were in Opposition when the road was built opposed its construction, and it is well known that they have since taken every means of opposing the development of that country. I want to ask the leader of the Government—I am tired asking the Minister of Railways and the Department of Railways for help in that district—if it is the studied policy of the Government to choke that district off; if it is their determination to see that the settlers have no means of subsistence? Or will the Government see that these people get relief? The railways of the country cannot possibly succeed if this kind of management prevails throughout Canada. We are told by the minister that they do not succeed. Well, scarcely any person expected anything else. Having regard to the present system of no management for the railway and no railway policy on the part of the Government, how can we hope that the Canadian National railways will succeed?

I shall not take up any further time until I have had an opportunity of studying the minister's statement. But I do hope that before this discussion proceeds the minister will lay down some definite policy for the management of these railways.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE (Edmonton East): If the minister will answer definitely a question which I have put to him by correspondence and on the floor of this House, I will refrain from laying my grievances before the House on this occasion; otherwise I propose to make my speech. When will the Oliver-St. Paul de Metis railway be completed so that a service may be afforded to people who have been suffering from lack of railway facilities since 1909?

Hon. J. D. REID: I will have the particulars when we get into committee and will be able to give the information then.

Mr. W. H. WHITE (Victoria): I also would like to ask the minister a definite question.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member would not be in order in putting a question to the minister. The hon. minister has exhausted his right to speak and is, therefore, precluded from giving a reply.

Mr. W. H. WHITE: I do not wish to extend my remarks very much if the minister can give me the information I desire. I am interested particularly in one branch of railroad. As to other matters—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That information can be given to the hon. member in Committee of Supply, but it would be absolutely out of order for the minister to give it now.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If my hon. friend will allow me, he will receive an answer to his question almost immediately if he allows the House to go into Committee of Supply. These questions cannot be put and answered on the motion for Committee of Supply. We always like to get into Supply as soon as possible so as to give hon. members an opportunity of putting questions and having them answered.

Mr. W. H. WHITE: I thought perhaps if I mentioned what I was going to take up the minister would be able to say whether he was going to deal with that question or not; and if not, I was going to make a complaint on account of a promise made by the minister last year. I do not know whether I am in order or not. I wanted to make a statement as to what I wished to complain about. If the minister is going to deal with that question, I am quite willing to wait until the House goes into Commttee of Supply.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member is quite in order in making any statement upon the motion to go into Committee of Supply. It may relate to this or any other matter which has not been previously debated during the present session or which is not already inscribed upon the Order Paper.

Mr. W. H. WHITE: Last year before the Railway Committee the minister promised, at a time when the Canadian Pacific were applying for a charter for a line parallelling the line of the Canadian National railway, that if they would withdraw, and the committee, instead of supporting the charter of the Canadian Pacific for a line to parallel the line of the Canadian National railway, would give the department an opportunity, they would guarantee to build a road from Whitford to Bruderheim. The Canadian Pacific had arranged to extend their line from Cutknife to Whitford and wished to extend it to South Edmonton. I may say, in passing, that Whitford is an old thickly populated settlement, a settlement that has been in existence for some thirty-five years. Every odd or even section is under cultivation in the whole district, and a delegation came here, sent by the people from that district, they naturally being very anxious to have railway facilities. There were present that day in the railway committee Mr. D. C. Coleman, Vice-President of the Canadian Pacific, and Mr. McLeod of the Canadian Northern, and it was arranged amongst them that day that the Canadian Pacific would be allowed to extend their line through Lloydminster to Whitford and the Canadian Northern would extend on their old charter from Whitford to Bruderheim, thereby relieving the people in that section of the country. The minister at that time promised that the railroad would be built last year. I might say that at that time Mr. McLeod stated that the line of the railroad had been graded some four miles. I took the opportunity then to point out that the grading had been started, but that very part of the road that he claimed was under construction was now being farmed and under crop. The minister, however, promised that that extension would be constructed to relieve those people, but not a sod has been turned and nothing has been done along that line. That is why I rose to ask if any provision was made in the minister's programme that the construction of that road should go on this summer. That is what I wanted to bring before the House and the minister.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I quite understand that we have some latitude when we come into committee and deal with specific items. Nevertheless, the minister himself found it necessary to make his statement while you, Sir, occupied the Chair, and when we have a wider range of discussion, as he might possibly find any particular item too narrow for the statement which he found it necessary to make. In like manner, I presume that private members of the House will find it necessary, in order to deal in a general way, with the statement made by the minister and the matters of policy which that statement contains, to deal with this question perhaps a little more at length while the Speaker is in the Chair and the matter is before the House as such.

For the last number of years we have heard a great deal about railway policies, railway ownership, private ownership and public ownership. I have been following the different changes that have been taking place in this House and in the country with regard to railways for some twenty years past; and the Government of the day and the party behind it take much glory to themselves because they say that they are big Canadians in connection with railway policies, and that they have a big policy in connection with railway matters. Speaking for myself, I have always contended and I still contend that the proper way to do railway business or any other business that can be

left to a private concern, is to have it done in that way. I have always contended that, whatever the reason may be, it is impossible to get out of men and measures and policies in the hands of Governments the same satisfactory results as we get from private ownership and enterprise. This country of ours is the same from coast to coast, it is the same from the American boundary to the north for everbody that is in it; at least, we hope that that is the case; that there is no discrimination; that there is no favouritism. We hope that there are no shackles thrown around the neck or limbs of any person who is in business. We find in this same Canada a corporation, to which reference has been made to-day, doing splendid business, extending their lines, keeping their lines in first-class shape with everything going along well, and in the adverse conditions with which they have had to deal within the last year, they come down with a dividend of 10 per cent upon the operations of the year. That is private business, that is the management of some 22,000 miles of railway in the hands of private men, men who have grown up in the business, men who are trained, men who have nothing else in view but the business of the company, and the company is making money. That is one side of the matter; that is the side which I have always advocated, the side that I stand by. It was flung at us last year by hon. gentlemen opposite that we were the enemies of the country because we did not jump at this idea of Government-owned railways and Government management of railways in this country. If any evidence were required to show that Government management of and Government enterprise in railways in this country are a huge failure, we had that evidence in the most conclusive manner from the statement in its very best form that was given to the House to-day. The statement made by the Minister of Railways (Mr. J. D. Reid) to-day bears at every line, at every turn and at every page, the earmarks of the special pleader, the preparation, not of the minister, but of those who are under him, those who are trying to make the most of a bad bargain, and to make appear in the very best light the jumble of figures, the jumble of lines, the jumble of management which is foisted upon this country and which burden we have to shoulder. If I wanted to present the worst example of Government management of a railway or any other enterprise, I have it here. We are told that there is a deficit of something like $95,000,000 or $100,000,000, but that figure merely touches the fringe of the truth, as we should find if we had it. There is nothing said about what must be expended on these lines to put them in such shape that we can compete with our great competitor in this country. What can one say? What can one suggest? I would say to the Canadian people, if it were possible; get from under this burden as quickly as you can. Get it in business-like shape as soon as you can. Get it under proper management and try and make it work its way along; let one hand wash the other, so to speak. That is what any sane person with any sense of responsibility would say, if there were any means of bringing it about. I presume, however, that having been exploited for the last twenty or twenty-five years by private owners, who have kept running to their friends in this House and in this Government and have been getting all the money they required to make millions for themselves, the roads are in such a condition to-day that no private enterprise would take this monstrosity off our hands on anything like fair terms. We, therefore, have to make the most of the situation, and try and get the enterprise into business-like shape, putting all our energy behind it. It is now some two years since we were rushed here to pass an Act of Parliament for the purpose of creating some corporation that was to take hold of these roads. Politics were to be thrown to the winds, we were told. There was such a rush to get that legislation through Parliament that before the Bill was printed closure was applied in this House. You will hardly believe it, Mr. Speaker, but five pages of printed matter were added to the Bill after the closure had been on for twenty or thirty-six hours. The enterprise was so big, and the responsibility so great and pressing, that the Government could not wait one minute to put these roads into the hands of this corporation that was to be created. Well, the legislation passed. Summer came, then winter, then another summer and winter, and now I think we are getting near the close of the third year since that Bill was passed, and yet no action has been taken by the Government under that legislation. Nobody has been appointed, and things are pulling along just as they please. We are supposed to have a business Government, a business Minister of Railways, a business-like management all around. We are told we have these things, but what do we find when we look in the next? It is very nice, if a man is running a hennery, to have fine hens, but

you want to look in the nest to find if there are any eggs, to see what results these birds of beautiful plumage which you are feeding, and feeding highly are giving. When we look at the nest in connection with this railway we find it is like Mother Hubbard's Cupboard—always empty. We are feeding it highly, but the balance is always on the wrong side. We get no results. How long is this to continue? I appeal to my hon. friend the Minister of Railways whether he is satisfied with this condition of things. I do not think he is. I think he says to this management from year to year, before presenting his statement to Parliament: Prepare this monstrous nightmare yourself. It is bad enough for me to be obliged to read it, but I will go into the House, supported perhaps by a glass of whiskey or something, and I will read it.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Take it back.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (North Simcoe): This is a dry country.

Mr. McKENZIE: Perhaps it is. It was certainly a dry statement. There is nothing personal, however, to be said in connection with this undertaking. It is too crushing a load to be put on the back of any one person. I appeal to the people of this country and to the management of this system, if there is anybody responsible among them, to see if something cannot be done to take the enterprise along lines where there will be a show of daylight at some stage. The Minister of Railways tells us we are going to get around the corner. That is a wonderful sort of corner. It reminds me of the fool jackass that had a tuft of hay put on the end of a pole tied around its neck with a rope, so that the tuft of hay was always ten feet ahead of him. We seem to be getting further away from this corner all the time instead of approaching it, and we are spending millions upon millions of the people's money in the process, without any hope of ever getting it back. That is the position to-day. Without going into details just now, let me hope that there may be a prospect of reaching this corner, which seems to be so extremely difficult to get at. It took Moses forty years to get to the Promised Land, and it looks as if it was going to take us an equal number of years to put our hands on this corner which the minister is holding out to us, where better things will be in prospect for the people of this country.

We were told that the railways were to be taken clean out of politics, that politics was to have nothing whatever to do with them; but what was the statement made to-day? The minister says that the management have no policy, they cannot determine what should be done. We must do one of two things, he says. We must continue to plunge into the pockets of the Canadian people, or we must dig into their pockets in another way by increasing the freight rates. The management, he says, have not got a policy; they have not the punch or the backbone to decide for themsleves, and so they ask me to decide. But I will not decide. I do not know what is to be done, so I will bring the matter back to this old political court, and you can do as you please about it. Is that getting away from politics? Are we not getting the railways back into politics worse than ever before? We were told that it cost this country some millions of dollars every year while we were trying to get the roads away from politics, and that in future politics would have nothing whatever to do with the roads. I say, Mr. Speaker, as my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) told this House last year and the year before, it is impossible for any road or any property that is owned and managed by the people of this country to get away from political influences. Even if it were possible, I would not be a party to it. So long as the people of this country are putting their money into any enterprise or are being taxed for the maintenance of any undertaking in this country, they should have an opportunity through their representatives in this Parliament of having something to say about it. To suggest that we can spend hundreds of millions of dollars of the people's money every year without the people having anything to say about it, is a most absurd and unworkable proposition, and the sooner we get back to rock bottom, and understand that the people of this country have a right to know what is being done with their money, the better. If we appoint a management to look after a railway or any other enterprise, that management must be answerable to the people of this country. This Parliament should have something to say about their appointment, and the Government should be perfectly frank and open with us, so that we may at the earliest possible moment know precisely what may be expected to be done. We cannot go on in this way, Mr. Speaker. I am sure that on either side of the House the minister could find wisdom, experience and the faculty of direction that would materially help him if he would only seek for these qualities.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that at this stage it is perhaps in order for me to point out to the minister that the people in the part of the country from which I come think themselves entitled to at least fair consideration in matters of transportation. The section of the country which I have the honour to represent in this House is the oldest part of this great Canada of ours. In my county is the spot where Cabot is supposed to have landed some two hundred years ago, and it is a matter for surprise, and some indignation, on calm reflection, that the splendid people in that part of Canada are 110 miles from the nearest railroad. The people are adept fishermen and successful farmers, but they lack transportation facilities. In 1911 the sum of $100,000 or thereabouts was placed in the Estimates in order to provide a start in railroad building down there, but when this Government came into power they wiped that Estimate out. They declined to do anything in the matter, promising instead to consider the situation at a later date. In 1914, the minister being in the House, I introduced a resolution to the effect that the time had arrived when something should be done to furnish with proper facilities the good people in the Island of Cape Breton, in the county of Victoria. My good friend accepted the resolution in 1914; but, the war intervening, I deemed it proper, in the national interest and in view of the exigencies of the crisis which had suddenly burst upon us, not to press my resolution at that time or during the war. Last year, however, I moved another resolution in the House expressing the view that, in the opinion of the House, the time had come when my former resolution of 1914 should be implemented, and urging upon the Government the imperative necessity for action. That resolution was accepted by the minister and the Government, but I regret to say that nothing has been done, not even a survey having been undertaken. I find that my hon. friend is extending lines west, buying new lines, and doing sundry works in various parts of the country for the purpose of improving the railway facilities of Canada. I have no fault to find with this programme, but I do say that it is now away past the time when the Government should implement its promises and carry forward a policy that was intended by previous Governments to be fully prosecuted. It is not to the credit of this Government that part of the railway policy of the Laurier Government in 1911 was ignored to suit their purposes. Every Tory road that was in contemplation at that time was built; but because this little road of mine in the good old county of Victoria happened to be in the constituency of an Opposition man, nothing has been done there. I submit that the good peole of my county should not be punished and deprived of railway facilities simply because, of their free will and in the exercise of the franchise, they sent to the House of Commons a representative who does not happen to be sitting on the same side of the House as the Government. That should not be the policy of any Government; least of all should it be the policy of the Union Government. The policy of the Government should take cognizance of the best interests of every part of the country regardless of the political procliviities of any community. At a later stage, Mr. Speaker, I may have something further to say on this point.

I had the pleasure of meeting the minister in my own town of North Sydney some two years ago, when the hon. gentleman had an opportunity to see the congested condition of the chief terminus of the Intercolonial railway in Eastern Nova Scotia. He saw that the wharves were not large enough and that there was not enough space. There were more steamships in than there was space to accommodate them; and ten cars were ready to be pushed on the wharf where there was room for only one. Through that point goes out the immense traffic that Canada has built up with Newfoundland, and the minister was impressed with the great necessity that existed at that time, and that still exists, for attention to that terminus. Nothing has been done, however. As I heard the minister reciting the various improvements and extensions of facilities which are contemplated, I was astonished to hear nothing about this terminus at North Sydney. Probably it is not a matter of very great concern to us as to what are the requirements of the Dominion of Newfoundland, although we should have at heart the interests of every part of the Empire to which we belong. But at the same time the trade that has been built up between all parts of Canada —Winnipeg, Montreal, Toronto, Halifax, etc.—with Newfoundland is immense, and if we desire to maintain that trade and traffic we must have proper facilities at the terminus at North Sydney, so that people will not have to wait two or three months before getting freight through because of a lack of accommodation. It is not a matter of personal interest to me whether or not the trade goes through that

point, but it is in the interest of the whole of Canada that we should hold on to the enormous traffic which has already been built up. It is not always gratifying, although it sometimes affords a bit of satisfaction, to find one's prophecies and predictions fulfilled as time goes on. But I have always, in the face of opposition and of threats from hon. gentlemen opposite, maintained, as is apparent now, that the best way in which to deal with questions of a large character, such as the management of railways in this country, was by private enterprise if private enterprise were willing to take hold of the business. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me read a statement that was made by Lord Macaulay as far back as 1830, and which applies to this question of State ownership as compared with private enterprise. Lord Macaulay said:

> Our rulers will best promote the improvement of the nation by strictly confining themselves to their own legitimate duties, by leaving capital to find its most lucrative course, commodities their fair prices, industry and intelligence their natural reward, idleness and folly their natural punishment, by maintaining peace, by defending property, by diminishing the price of law, and by observing strict economy in every department of the State. Let the Government do this; the people will assuredly do the rest.

Although there were at that time few Government-owned railways, or indeed railways of any kind, there must have been other enterprises whose conduct led Lord Macaulay to make this wise statement, which is more or less prophetic in its application to present day conditions. I submit to the best judgment of the Government this advice which the great British statesman gave so far back as the year 1830, and hope that the Government will do one of two things: Either organize some concern that will take this business out of their hands; or, if they will not do this, see to it themselves that proper management is put in charge of affairs so that we may have an institution that will at least pay its way, although it could not pay any interest on the huge sums of money which the people of Canada have invested in the enterprise with which we are now dealing.

Mr. ROBERT H. BUTTS (South Cape Breton and Richmond): I wish merely to contribute one or two observations to this debate. Listening to the speech of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat I was struck with the remarks he made with respect to railroad matters chiefly, and particularly in regard to Mackenzie and Mann. I would like to remind my hon. friend that the eggs that hatched out Mackenzie and Mann were hatched out in a Liberal nest; that the eggs which hatched out the Transcontinental railway were hatched out in a Liberal nest; and that the two knighthoods that were bestowed on Mackenzie and Mann likewise emanated from a Liberal nest. My hon. friend's remarks might come with very good grace from almost any member on this side of the House, but it ill behooves any hon. gentleman opposite to make such comments and remarks as my hon. friend has indulged in. Let me say in this connection, there is an old proverb that it is a dirty bird that soils its own nest.

With respect to the question of the terminals at Sydney and the facilities for handling the Newfoundland trade my hon. friend is perhaps as well, if not better, acquainted with conditions there than any one in this House. He says that hardly a day goes by that he does not pass those terminals, hardly a day that he does not find there, to a greater or less extent, a congestion of trade. That is true, but that congestion of trade is owing to the fact that the Reids' have never performed their end of the undertaking. They have got a narrow-guage railway from Port aux Basques to St. John's and it takes their express train, if she runs on time, 28 hours to cover that distance. Now, you can imagine, gentlemen, if you were operating a line of boats that were able to carry away all the freight that goes to North Sydney how you would feel upon reaching Port aux Basques to discover there is not at that place room for its accommodation. I have been to Port aux Basques and seen the existing wharves and sufficient ships cannot be docked there to carry away the freight that is brought in the fall of the year, when the maximum amount of congestion occurs. Consequently the Reid people are obliged to put on extra boats. Those extra boats come directly from North Sydney where all the freight for Newfoundland is handled, but they do not go to Port aux Basques; they go to Placentia and St. John's directly, because the Reid railroad is not capable of handling all the freight that offers. Therefore before any complaint can be made against the railway and terminal facilities on Cabot Strait we should require the Reid-Newfoundland company to provide facilities for handling it on the other side. What is the use of taking freight down to Port aux Basques, when in the first place you can only dock your ship if the pier is vacated by the Reid-Newfoundland boats, and then only one at a time. And even if

you could dock your ships fast enough there is not sufficient storage room nor wharfage to take all the freight offering. Even if there was sufficient dock accommodation there is not a railway capable of carrying the freight from there to Placentia or St. John's. Such are the actual conditions at the present time. I have hinted at the desirability of improvements at different times to the Minister of Railways, and I hope he will take those hints into consideration, and that the day is near when instead of relying upon the Reids', the Canadian Government will take over the control of the facilities themselves, handle their own freight, and as far as possible their own passenger boats, running directly from Sydney harbour to Placentia or St. John's, and act independently of the Reid-Newfoundland company. Then gentlemen, we will have a solution of the problem which awaits settlement down there. Until some action of that kind is taken no remedy will be afforded. Imagine a railway running from St. John's, Newfoundland, to Port aux Basques, through a territory of 520 odd miles and taking 28 hours to cover that distance, having to traverse a narrow-guage road so exposed at certain points that freight cars were blown off the track in the month of November.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. BUTTS: It is not a thing to be laughed at, gentlemen, the incident which I have mentioned actually occurred. These are the conditions that the Government have to face, and if the terminals at Sydney harbour are not large enough the best thing to do would be to cease relying upon the Reid-Newfoundland company and let this Government handle the traffic running directly from Sydney harbour to Placentia or St. John's, Newfoundland.

Mr. P. F. CASGRAIN (Charlevoix-Montmorency): I am very pleased to have had the privilege of listening to the address of the Minister of Railways. It is always a pleasure for me to hear him, because he reminds me that whenever an advocate has a bad case if he speaks sufficiently loud and sufficiently long he can make that case appear somewhat presentable. The hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) has described that policy as a little nebulous and I am inclined to think that was an appropriate characterization. Under the terms of the previous legislation the Government has acquired most of the Canadian railways with the exception of the Canadian Pacific railway. In the statement which he has presented to-day the minister told us that he puts the Grand Trunk Pacific and Grand Trunk to one side because they do not show any profit on their operations. He says that this year and next year, and perhaps for two or three years, he will have to come to Parliament and ask for a vote of some millions from Parliament to cover probable deficits resulting from the operation of these railways and provide for the improvements which they may need. The minister, however, does not give us any indication as to these amounts which it will be necessary to provide from the Dominion Treasury. There is another point which impressed me very forcibly this afternoon, and that was when I heard the Minister of Marine reply to the hon. member for Quebec West, with respect to the loading of certain ships at the port of Quebec. The minister said: "We have nothing to do with this matter, it is in the hands of the Canadian Government Mercantile Marine Company." Practically the same reply was made by the Minister of Railways on the same subject. In view of this attitude on the part of members of the Government we have this situation: That although we are the shareholders, and are supposed to be the owners and stockholders of the Canadian National Railway System, members of the Government come here and declare that they know practically nothing about the operation of ships belonging to the Canadian people because the management of these vessels has been turned over to a limited corporation which alone is going to deal with the matter.

There is another point to which I desire to draw the attention of the House and it is this: Some days ago we heard that the president of the Canadian National Railways, Mr. D. B. Hanna, for whom I have a great respect, had stated in the course of an address at a certain meeting—I think it was reported in the press—that the Government should keep their hands off the Canadian National Railway and its administration. The Minister of Railways (Mr. Reid) has said the same thing, and hon. members on the other side of the House said the same thing when the Canadian National Railway Company was being incorporated. Whenever any of us have occasion to discuss any matter with the directorate we are told that the administration of the railway is in their hands, and that inasmuch as the people have placed them in control they—the directorate—are clothed with all the necessary powers in regard to operation and improvements. I object to this principle, Mr.

Speaker, as I objected last year when the Canadian Northern Railway Bill was before the House. We then protested against that policy, because it was equivalent to taking away from the people the right of being consulted as to the manner in which public money should be expended.

Although I may be called somewhat too parochial, Mr. Speaker, I hope that I may be allowed to discuss, while the policy of the Canadian National Railways is before the House, certain matters which particularly concern the constituency which I have the honour to represent in this House, the county of Charlevoix-Montmorency. Some years ago the Government passed legislation for the acquisition of the Quebec and Saguenay Railway from a certain point in the county of Montmorency to another point in the county of Charlevoix. Last year the completed portion of the railway was operated from the first of July until November. Murray Bay, or as it is called "La Malbaie," is one of the greatest summer resorts in Canada, and at once a large freight and passenger business was opened up, with profitable results to the railway. But for one reason or another, in the month of November all of a sudden I heard that the Government had decided to discontinue the daily train service and run only three trains a week. I inquired of the minister the reason for this change, and was told that it was in the best interests of the country as the service was sufficient for the locality. All the local public bodies as well as the big industrial companies settled in that part of the country protested against the change, and I hold in my hand petitions, letters and other documents of protest which were at that time lodged through me with the Minister of Railways and the president of the Canadian National Railways. I also wrote to these gentlemen, and in reply was told that the action complained of simply had to be taken.

Mr. Speaker, it is not very often that I congratulate the Gvoernment, but they are entitled to my congratulations on the service they maintained until the month of November, for the trains were well operated and were profitable to the Government. But from the first of November up to the present day only a restricted service has been continued, with the result that all the good effects which followed from the daily train service are not in evidence to-day. I bring up this point in the hope that the Minister of Railways (Mr. Reid) will evolve a new policy in regard to that train service from the first of May until at least next winter, by which time I trust the railway will be finished and completely equipped to run throughout the year.

In connection with the same railway, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say something further to my hon. friend the Minister of Railways. Last year a request was made,—not by myself but by a big industrial enterprise in the county, the American Titanic Ore Company, the owners of a big mine,—for a branch line to be built nine miles north from Baie St. Paul to St. Urbain at a cost of $50,000 or $60,000, which would be a good feeder to this new railway. At the time the minister told me that a survey would be made and men would be sent to inquire about the possibilities of such a venture; but nothing has been done.

Another project has been brought before the Legislature of the Province of Quebec, and it is being supported by the people of my county and of the county of Chicoutimi, having in view pushing the same railway northward from Murray Bay to Chicoutimi. May I be permitted to say to the hon. Minister of Railways that I have not looked into this matter, but engineers of his department —men whom I know he holds in the greatest esteem—have told me that if this extension were made it would certainly bring a lot of business to the Quebec and Saguenay Railway, and the profitable traffic would be quite sufficient to pay the interest on the capital expenditure. I may add, Sir, that the projected extension would reduce the distance from Chicoutimi to Quebec by about forty-five or fifty miles. This district contains great lumber industries as well as manufactories of different kinds, so that such a line would at once get a great deal of traffic and at the same time act as a stimulus to local industry.

When the management decided last fall to take away the daily train service, I was assured by the Minister of Railways that the Government would sooner or later take over the entire railway and operate it as part of the Canadian National system. Later on I was told that this policy was not carried out on account of a certain little accident that happened on the railway. I have inquired from many people in my county if such an accident ever took place, and they have told me that this was not the case, and they are most reliable people. While the engineers and contractors are still engaged in completing this railway I would urge upon the minister to come down and see that part of the country and meet the people, and I am sure that if he does so he will on his return take the necessary steps

to have these two branch lines immediately constructed.

The Minister of Railways towards the end of his speech pointed out that in a few years to come the Canadian National Railway system will in his opinion, be able to show a surplus. As the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) has well said this afternoon, there is freight in abundance everywhere in the province of Quebec, as well as in the other provinces, and the only thing the Government has to do is to go where the freight is available and so secure a good revenue. But, Mr. Speaker, I have one thing to object to in regard to the Canadian National Railway management—it is that men from the province of Ontario, such as Mackenzie and Mann, or, if they are not themselves in charge of affairs, their own agents and right bowers like Mr. D. D. Hanna and Mr. Mitchell, and others connected with them, are still in control of the system. I do not believe that people from other localities who are not at all conversant with the needs of a special district can themselves without personal inspection acquire a knowledge of its needs, and the president does not carry conviction by issuing orders from the province of Ontario or from the city of Ottwa and saying, "All goes well because I say so, and I am correct because I am paid a salary of $25,000 a year."

The minister has said that the rates charged by the Government railways were all right; that they might be increased a little later, but that they would be the same as those charged by other railways. I may be mistaken, but I have always thought that the rates charged by railway companies were fixed by the Railway Commission. Replying to a question which I put some time ago regarding the rates prevailing on the new railway in my county, the Minister of Railways informed me that these rates had been fixed by the officials of the Canadian National Railways. I am informed upon good authority that these rates are higher than the rates charged upon certain other railways for the carrying of goods over the same distances. For instance, $15.66 is charged for carrying fifty bags of cement which, carried over the same distance on other railways, would cost 10 cents per bag. Ten cents per 100 pounds was charged for one carload of hay shipped from Montreal to Quebec, a distance of 180 miles, whereas 14 cents per 100 pounds was charged for the same load from Quebec to Baie St. Paul, a distance of 60 miles. The charge for carrying a barrel of apples from Quebec to Baie St. Paul is $1.70; I believe that is too high.

Last fall I took up with the Minister of Railways the matter of remedying the conditions existing through the lack of adequate railway facilities between Quebec and Murray Bay, and also the Railway Commission. I was informed by the Railway Commission at that time that they had no control over the railway operating between these points because the Government had not taken official charge of it. On the other hand, I was told by the minister a few days ago that the officials of the Canadian National Railways had themselves fixed the rates charged on this railway. I would like to know what is the position in regard to this railway. One day we are told that the Government owns it, and then when we try to avail ourselves of that very fact and endeavour to have certain conditions remedied through their being brought before the proper board, we are told that the board has no jurisdiction.

The Minister of Railways spoke also about certain improvements made at Quebec and at certain other places. He said, for instance, that a huge sum of money had been spent at Quebec and on the St. Charles river. I was at the city of Quebec some time ago, and I do not believe that the Government have done all that they should have done at that place. As another hon. member dealt with this matter a few days ago I shall not go into it on this occasion, except to point out that this district seems to have been entirely neglected. Last autumn I was at Levis, right opposite Quebec, and I found that no station had been built there or even commenced. During the last five or six years the people of that place have only a kind of shack to serve as accommodation while waiting the arrival and departure of trains. I am told that there is a great need of repair on that part of the Canadian National Railways which is known as the Intercolonial. I travelled a good deal last year on the railway between Riviere Ouelle and Montreal; never in my life have I known the trains on that line to be on time.

I do not believe that the Government Railways can compete with the Canadian Pacific. The servants of the Government will always be the servants of the Government; we shall never be able to get from them the same service that is rendered by the employees of private concerns.

I wish to call attention also to the fact that there is no decent, safe and adequate station accommodation for those who use

the Canadian National Railways at the city of Quebec. I put a question on the Order Paper the other day inquiring of the minister whether the Government had considered the advisability of taking over the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix railway and linking it up with the Canadian National Railways, the old Canadian Northern, and with the Quebec and Saguenay. He told me that this was still the intention of the Government; I hope that it will be done as soon as possible. I was told that negotiations had been carried on for the acquisition of this railway, but for one reason and another it has not been acquired. It is not for me to dictate the policy of the Government, but here we have a condition where the Government operates a railway out of Quebec a certain distance, and from Quebec to St. Joachim, a distance of thirty miles on that line, they are not the owners of railway serving that district. So far the acquirement of part of this line Quebec and Saguenay was a good step, but the Government should do better and acquire the rest of the line in order that they may have a direct line from Quebec to Murray Bay.

I directed the attention of the Government to the need for the building of stations along the line between Quebec and Murray Bay, and they said that they would inquire into it. As is always the case when that reply is given, we heard no more about the matter. We are always told that the Board of Management of the Canadian National Railways will give attentive consideration to any representations made to it from different parts of the country. But I have found that it sometimes takes three or four months to get an answer to letters which I have sent to them concerning railway matters. I do not know how the system is run; whether there is a head office in Toronto, in Ottawa or in Quebec. But I do know that in Montreal there is a gentleman named Mr. Brady who represents the department and very often when I send him a communication I receive a reply to the effect that he will communicate with Ottawa or with Toronto; and I hear no more about it—that is the end of it.

I will not detain the House much longer; but in connection with the present policy of Government ownership of railways, I do not believe it is feasible or possible at present to bring under decent control and management all the different railways which the Government has acquired, unless absolutely right away, immediately, all the people from near and far who had anything to do with the Canadian Northern railway before, are done away with. We heard that Mr. D. B. Hanna is the greatest railway man and exponent of railway problems. I believe what the Government may say; but if up to date, Mr. Hanna had been so big and great as that, he certainly would have been retained by other big railways in the United States, as was the case with Mr. Gutelius who was manager and chief engineer of the Canadian Government railways previously. I do not really believe that the employees and the men who are at the head of this famous Canadian National Railway Company to-day are up to much, and we should immediately pay the best salaries possible, without looking at the amount, in order to get the most efficient men and the most efficient management.

Motion agreed to, and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY—RAILWAY ESTIMATES.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY—RAILWAY ESTIMATES.

Railways and Canals, chargeable to collection of revenue—Canadian Government railways, toward deficit of working expenditure for nine months ending December 31, 1920, the management of the railways being hereby authorized to apply the receipts and revenues toward payment of the working expenditure, $5,000,000.

Mr. ROBB: Before we take up this Estimate, I should like to ask a question of the minister. There is a statement made that on the 1st February, the number of Canadian freight cars in the United States was forty thousand odd and on the same date the number of United States freight cars in Canada was 24,000 odd, leaving a surplus of Canadian cars in the United States of 16,109. On the 1st March, the number of Canadian freight cars in the United States was 59,000 odd and the number of United States cars in Canada was 40,000 odd, leaving a surplus of Canadian freight cars in United States of 19,084. I understand that while the United States Government is giving back to the railways the control of their roads—the United States Car Service Commission continues to administer the service of freight cars until the 1st May. If that be true, it seems to me that the Canadian Government should be able to represent to the United States Government that we should have a fair reciprocity in freight cars. I am sure the minister will agree with me that it is

very necessary at this time that we should have cars to move Canadan products.

Mr. J. D. REID: Everything that I personally or the Government or the railway companies could do to try to get our cars back, has been done. Through the British ambassador at Washington, we have urged the United States Government to give us back our cars; the Canadian Railway Association at Montreal have done everything that they could possibly do, and the heads of the different railways have been pressing the United States to return their cars. We have, however, so much to ship out that as fast as the United States railways return the cars, those cars are moved back into the United States and are retained there. There is a great shortage of cars in the United States at the present time, the railways in that country being short from 100,000 to 150,000 cars, and they will not let us have their cars. Nothing more could be done than has been done by the Government through the ambassador and by the railways acting through their organizations.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I want to ask the minister a question in reference to a clause in the Grand Trunk Bill which was before the House last session and a clause which appears in the agreement between the Grand Trunk and the Government. At the last session of Parliament when the Bill was before the House, the following clause was in the Bill and was subsequently stricken out when the Bill was in committee:

> The Government may lend to the said Committee of Management, upon the notes or other obligations of the Grand Trunk, such sums as the Government may from time to time deem necessary to the carrying on or operation of the Grand Trunk system.

Exception was taken to that clause on this side of the House, and the minister consented to its withdrawal. In the agreement there is a clause which is not in exactly the same words, but which seems to have very much the same purport, and it reads as follows:

> The Managing Committee may, with the consent of the Governor in Council, borrow from the Government on Grand Trunk notes, or other obligations or securities approved of by the Governor in Council, for the carrying on of the operation or improvement of the Grand Trunk system.

In the opinion of the minister, is there any difference between these two clauses, and if so, what is the nature and extent of the difference?

Mr. J. D. REID: I am hardly in a position to give the hon. member an answer, because that is more of a financial question, and the Minister of Finance, if he were in his seat, could probably give a better answer than I could. As I understand the matter from reading this clause, that was intended to assist in financing the Grand Trunk railway, but the assistance is to be given only after the money is voted by Parliament. As I understand it, no money has been voted by Parliament for that purpose, and, therefore, no action has been taken up to the present time as regards giving any money to the Grand Trunk railway under that clause.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Do I understand from the minister that under this clause in the agreement between the Government and the Grand Trunk, no money will be advanced to the Grand Trunk unless an appropriation is first made by Parliament for that purpose?

Mr. J. D. REID: That is the way I understand the matter. Of course, I am speaking subject to correction pending discussion of the matter with the Minister of Finance.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I suppose we may refer to the matter again when the Minister of Finance is in the House.

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes.

Mr. DEVLIN: I want to call the minister's attention to the statement which he made when the hon. member for Chateauguay-Huntingdon (Mr. Robb) raised the question about Canadian cars being held in the United States. If I understood the minister aright, he stated that the Canadian authorities had done everything possible to get those cars back, but that they had not succeeded. If a person, having got property legitimately at first, holds it against the owner's consent illegally and without the intention of returning it, he is subject to being accused of theft.

Mr. J. D. REID: But he is not holding it illegally. There is an international agreement that where a car is on a foreign road, that road pays a per diem allowance for that car until it is returned to the original road that owned the car.

The American railways are not holding those cars illegally, but it pays them to pay that per diem allowance rather than return our cars. The British Ambassador and Mr. Mahoney, who is connected with the Board of Commerce at Washington, are

making the strongest possible recommendations to get the cars back.

Mr. DEVLIN: Is there any understanding between the British Ambassador of Washington and the American companies as to a limit within which these cars shall be returned?

Mr. J. D. REID: No.

Mr. DEVLIN: Would the minister be willing to place on the Table all the correspondence that has taken place between the British Ambassador and the other parties relative to the steps that have been taken to get back Canadian cars?

Mr. J. D. REID: I have no objection. The American Government has been urging the railways to return the cars, but the companies keep passing them from one road to another. No one road keeps the cars for a great length of time, but altogether they remain over there a long time. When they get the cars there they keep them. The trend is more from Canada to the United States.

Mr. DEVLIN: People want cars in this country, and the minister has to furnish them. If the minister could get back the Canadian cars on the other side, would that save any part of this item of $5,000,000?

Mr. J. D. REID: No. We have another item providing for the purchase of new cars. If we got 14,000 cars back we would not require to order so many new ones. But the products of Canada must be got out. The hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) was complaining because he could not get cars to take pulp-wood from the Transcontinental to the other side. If we allowed these cars to go over there, we would not get them back.

Mr. DEVLIN: If the minister could get back these 14,000 cars it would effect a great saving to the Canadian people. Is there anything in the form of an agreement by which the Canadian people will be compensated for the holding of these cars on the other side?

Mr. J. D. REID: All we get is a per diem allowance, just as we have to pay a per diem allowance on American cars, but our railways get more revenue from this source on account of the adverse balance.

Mr. ROBB: The minister has just told the hon. member for Wright that the reason why the people of the Abitibi district are not supplied with cars to move their freight is because it is the deliberate policy of this Government not to supply cars that would go to the United States, because they would not get them back. Is that the policy of this Government in connection with all business in Canada, as regards grain, for instance? Let us follow the minister's statement to a conclusion. The hon. member for Pontiac this afternoon made the statement, supported by affidavit, that there were up in the Abitibi country 6,500 carloads of freight ready for the railway. The minister himself has told us that there are two ways of getting increased revenue for the railways; either by increased rates, or increased business. In this case the business is there. According to this statement, supported by affidavit, there are approximately 200 trainloads of freight waiting for transportation. The same condition exists all over the country. In Western Canada the grain is ready to be moved. Is it the deliberate policy of this Government not to supply cars for carrying wheat, oats, lumber, hay and other products of this country to the United States?

Mr. J. D. REID: No. Our policy is to serve Canada first; in other words, to look after interprovincial traffic. We require a certain number of cars for our own needs in Canada, and if there is any surplus we use them for international traffic. What we have been urging the United States Government and the United States railways to do is to let their cars come over here and get this traffic. The hon. member will see that it is absolutely necessary to have a certain number of cars in Canada for our own business. If we were to act on his suggestion we would not have any cars in Canada at all.

Mr. ROBB: Why?

Mr. J. D. REID: If you send these two hundred trainloads—

Mr. ROBB: Does the minister claim that all this traffic in the Abitibi district is intended for the United States?

Mr. J. D. REID: If it is not, there is no trouble about cars. If we were to look after international trade, we would not have sufficient cars to take pulpwood, for instance, from some part in Canada to the mills where it is manufactured; we would not be able to take paper from Chicoutimi to Montreal. We have to protect first our own people in Canada, and use whatever surplus cars we have for international traffic.

Mr. W. H. WHITE: The minister claims there is no trouble within Canada. Let me

tell him that cars shipped with wheat last November were not reported in Winnipeg on the main line of the Canadian Northern when I came down here on the 26th of February. In the period between November 1 and February 26 the cars had not arrived at Winnipeg, and that is the condition everywhere in the West. I pointed out to the minister the other day that of the few cars we had available in the Peace River country, 76 were standing on a side-track, of the Canadian National railways, for some three months and have never been moved in that time. I know that for a fact. Owing to the lack of cars we were unable to get out our grain. Some of us were lucky enough to secure cars last fall, but we were not able to get the grain transported even to the nearest point of inspection at Winnipeg. I know several cases of that kind. Furthermore, in the Edmonton district I have been unable to sell one bushel of grain since last fall for the simple reason that the elevators were filled at threshing time, and they were unable to get cars to relieve the congestion. The elevators were still full at the time I left. I do not think that bears out altogether the statement of the minister that there is no trouble at all if the cars are not going to the United States. The trouble is on the main line, and the minister can very easily obtain information on the matter. We have had no markets along the line of the Canadian Northern in Alberta because the elevators have been filled and cars have not been available to relieve the congestion.

Mr. J. D. REID: This is the first complaint I have heard this winter with reference to the operation of this railway. There may be other complaints, but they have not reached me.

Mr. W. H. WHITE: The primary cause of the trouble was that the elevators were filled at threshing time and transports could not be obtained to relieve the congestion.

Mr. J. D. REID: The hon. member will see that the congestion begins at the seaports—Halifax, St. John, Portland or New York—and keeps backing up, with the result that the elevators are filled. It must be obvious that we could not supply cars to be used for storage purposes.

Mr. W. H. WHITE: I was answering the point made by the minister that there was no trouble except one of an international character.

Mr. J. D. REID: The point I wish to emphasize is that there is a great quantity of produce that has to be moved backwards and forwards between the provinces, and we try to protect that traffic first by having sufficient cars to move it.

Mr. W. H. WHITE: Probably the reason why the minister has not received more complaints is the statement of the railway authorities that they could not give cars to relieve the congestion owing to the feed shortage in the South, which called for the use of cars for transporting feed thither from the North. We accepted that statement, considering that, in view of the seriousness of the situation, it was perhaps only right that the live stock should be saved.

Mr. ROBB: Before six o'clock I want to put a question on record. What is the per diem rental charge on cars between different routes? How long is the contract made for, and when does it expire? Further, is the rental based on an estimate sufficiently high to cover reasonable interest on investment?

Mr. J. D. REID: Ninety cents a day is charged on each side forty-eight hours after the car has arrived, and that is unlimited. We cannot force a car back.

Mr. ROBB: Is this arrangement from year to year?

Mr. J. D. REID: The rates are revised from time to time.

At six o'clock the Committee took recess.

After Recess.

The Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN: When the Committee rose at six o'clock we were considering item No. 335, a vote of $5,000,000 for the Canadian Government railways. Shall the item carry?

Mr. CAHILL: The minister stated before six o'clock that the Government had done everything in their power to get cars returned from the United States. About a year ago I brought this question up in the House, and the Government then promised that they would undertake to make some arrangement whereby these Canadian cars would be brought back from the other side of the line. During the past year the United States Government had control of all the railways in that country, and I would like to know if there has been any attempt on the part of this Govern-

ment to arrive at an understanding with them—an understanding between the two Governments rather than between individual railway companies—as to an exchange of these cars, and whether the Canadian Government will take the responsibility of seeing to it that Canadian cars shall be returned to this country.

Mr. J. D. REID: Perhaps the hon. gentleman was not in the Chamber before six o'clock when I made a statement on this matter. The Canadian Government communicated with the British Ambassador at Washington with a view to his taking the matter up, and he is doing all that he possibly could. In addition to that we have a representative of the Board of Commerce in Washington who has been endeavouring to arrange the matter with the railway organization at the United States capital. Likewise, our railway association at Montreal, together with President Beatty of the Canadian Pacific railway, and President Hanna of the Canadian National Railway system, have been using every effort to bring about an improvement of the existing conditions, to say nothing of messages which the Minister of Railways and other departments have been forwarding. I promised to get all the correspondence and lay it on the Table. The Deputy Minister of Railways has already received instructions to obtain all the information available in order to show what efforts have been made to get the cars owned by Canadian railway companies back into Canada.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: Seeing that we have 4,000 cars in the United States, is it not possible to have the per diem allowance increased, and have it not only doubled, but trebled? The cost of cars has increased three or four times over what it was a few years ago, and surely there ought to be some way of making the allowance for these cars three or four times more than it is to-day. The nominal sum that is at present charged is a snap for the United States companies that are using our cars; but if the allowance were increased three or four times it would in all probability produce better results.

Mr. J. D. REID: The per diem charge was formerly sixty cents and it was increased to ninety cents.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: That is of no avail.

Mr. J. D. REID: Suppose we were to say that we would charge $5 a day?

[Mr. Cahill.]

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: I would suggest $2 or $3 a day.

Mr. J. D. REID: In that case how would you collect the amount from the companies over there? They have the cars and we cannot get them back until they are prepared to return them. For our railway companies to start quarrelling with a company on the other side would, I am afraid, result in complications that would not be to our advantage in the long run. I think I am quite safe in saying that the Canadian Pacific, the National railways, and the Grand Trunk, are all just as anxious as they can be to get the cars back, and they are making every exertion to do so. The fact of the matter is that the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian National railways are compelled to buy more cars because of the shortage in Canada caused by Canadian cars being in the United States. The Government and the Canadian railway companies are doing all they can, and I do not think that any further effort can be made beyond what is being resorted to up to the present time.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: This matter has been going on for several years. The sum of sixty, or even ninety cents, per diem, is such a small amount in comparison with the capital invested in a car that the authorities on the other side of the international boundary line should not be annoyed if they are charged $2 or $3 per diem in respect of cars that are not returned. With such an allowance as that Canadian railway companies would be in a position to possibly pay the interest on the cost of building cars in this country.

Mr. J. D. REID: In that case the United States railways might say: We will not exchange cars; if you are going to charge that rate we will not tranship your cars on our road. Suppose a dozen cars arrived at Niagara Falls, New York, and we said to the American company: The per diem charge for those cars is $3 or $4 a day; they would simply say: If you do not want to comply with the rules in the United States we will not take your cars. In that case what could we do?

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: Is the minister taking up with the American authorities the question of increasing the allowance to $2 or $3?

Mr. REID: The railway companies themselves have taken it up and we have discussed every phase of the matter with them in the hope of getting the cars back. It is

the interest of the railways and the public that guides us as to what is best to do.

Mr. BELAND: This is a very serious question indeed. The trade figures show that Canada has imported in the past year about $300,000,000 worth more than it exported. That would in itself indicate that there should be many more cars in Canada from the United States than there are Canadian cars in the adjoining republic. May I ask the minister whether it has not been the policy of the Canadian railway companies, or of the Government National railways, to hold in Canada as many cars coming from the United States as possible in view of the fact that United States companies were retaining Canadian cars on the other side? In view of the trade figures I cannot understand why we should have fewer American cars on this side than they have of Canadian cars in the country to the South.

Mr. J. D. REID: The hon. gentleman will realize that it takes more cars to carry Canadian products such as pulp, and lumber, which are bulky in their character, to the other side.

Mr. BELAND: But we import coal; we imported $40,000,000 worth. Then there are automobiles.

Mr. J. D. REID: We are not holding any more cars to-day than are required for our own trade. However, this is a very important question and if hon. gentlemen agree I would like to have a day set apart for its discussion by the Railway Committee. If satisfactory to hon. gentlemen, I will arrange to have the railway representatives there to explain the situation and also present such information as can be got from the Railway Department. I can only repeat that the Government and the railway companies are making every possible effort to get our cars back, and we cannot put forth any more exertions than we are already doing to bring about that result.

Mr. BELAND: I do not wish to controvert the minister's statement. I think the Canadian National railways, the Canadian Pacific and the Grand Trunk have tried all they can to get their cars back to Canada. However, can we not say of the Canadian National railways that they have been more lenient than American companies in that they have allowed American cars to go back to the United Statets whilst their own Canadian cars were retained in that country?

Mr. J. D. REID: What the hon. gentleman means is that we should hold more American cars in this country?

Mr. BELAND: Certainly.

Mr. J. D. REID: How are we going to ship pulp-wood to the United States if that is done? The hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) has complained about pulp-wood along the Transcontinental railway remaining unshipped. We must send the cars back to the United States.

Mr. BELAND: You must reverse the situation. How can the Americans ship large quantities of goods to Canada unless they have the cars? Because the minister must remember, they export to this country $300,000,000 more than we export to them. And these goods are not in the shape of diamonds or gold rings, which require but a small amount of car space. For instance, besides coal we import $40,000,000 of automobiles and $30,000,000 of machinery, traction engines, etc. This freight requires spacious cars.

Mr. W. H. WHITE: I would like to know if the minister is prepared to answer the question that I put this afternoon but which was ruled out of order at that time; that is, with respect to the extension of the Canadian Northern from Bruderheim to Whitford, Alberta.

Mr. J. D. REID: My deputy tells me that we have no item in the Estimates for that work so far this year. However, the matter does not arise under this item, and before the item passes I will obtain more information. I have a memorandum before me and we will ascertain from the management of the Canadian National railways in Toronto if any further information is available. The hon. gentleman stated this afternoon that I made a promise at the meeting of the Railway Committee. It is hard to keep all these matters in recollection. but whatever promise I made would be on the strength of information given by the officials of the Railway Department at that particular time. I shall draw their attention to the statement now made by the hon. gentleman and before the item passes will endeavour to obtain whatever supplementary information is necessary.

Mr. W. H. WHITE: My reason for pressing the question at this time is in view of the promise which was made. A delegation from the district was here at the time and the matter was fully discussed in the Rail-

way Committee. The people of the district have been looking forward to the department making good that promise that was made, and I was asked to bring the question up and remind the minister of it. The people of that part of Alberta expect to get some definite information as to whether they may expect to get the railway extended into that section this year. The minister says there is no item. Am I to conclude from his statement that nothing is going to be done with the road this year?

Mr. J. D. REID: Before giving a positive answer I would like to have an opportunity of further consultation with the management to see if I have overlooked it in their statement. I will give my hon. friend an answer later on.

Mr. CAHILL: Before we get away from the question of car exchange I want to ask the Government if they have any policy in regard to the exchange of cars between the United States and Canada. A few years ago we sent a deputation to Washington to negotiate a treaty, not through the British Ambassador, but directly on behalf of Canada. Is it not possible to negotiate another treaty with regard to the exchange of cars? There is no question that this car shortage is going to continue, for we must export goods to the United States until at least we have balanced the trade situation. If the Government is not in a position to negotiate with the American Government, we must expect a continuance of the same confusion. The people I spoke of this afternoon, in the Abitibi district, will get no relief until this situation is cleaned up, and if they are not going to obtain relief they might as well know it and get out of the country.

There can be no question about the United States Government legislating so that arrangements may be made to get these cars back, and, of course, the Dominion Government has the same power to legislate for the return of American cars from this side. The minister points out that if you make the per diem charges $4 or $5 the American roads will not accept the cars. But there is no necessity to make that charge apply at once; it can be arranged to become effective after a certain lapse of time. But there must be some arrangement whereby Canadian and American roads will exchange cars on a more satisfactory basis than obtains to-day. It is not for the Railway Committee to negotiate between several hundred lines in the United States and in Canada; it is a question to be settled between the two Governments. I pointed that out last year, but apparently the old condition of affairs still exists. The minister says: Let this question be settled by the Railway Committee. It is not a question for the Railway Committee to settle; it is a question for the Government of this country to negotiate with the Government of the United States to see if they cannot come to some arrangement whereby a settlement can be reached.

Mr. BUREAU: I see that the item is:

Canadian Government Railways, toward deficit of working expenditure for nine months ending December 31, 1920.

That is next year. May I ask the minister what that working expenditure is based upon? I understand that this year we are having a deficit of $30,000,000, and from the newspapers I find glowing accounts of the progress our railway system is making, and the hopes entertained that our railway revenues will lift the entire burden of taxation from the shoulders of our taxpayers. Of course, I quite appreciate that the minister cannot answer every question of detail which may be put to him, but on the other hand these are supposed to be Government railways, and still more are they supposed to be Parliament railways. The Government do not hear as much about bad operation of any of their railways as the individual member of Parliament through whose riding the railway runs, and the only case where the member can put his grievance before the authorities is here. Therefore I think that a field day in the Railway Committee will not amount to much, because we will merely get very glowing accounts from Mr. Hanna and the other officials—I do not blame them—to assure the people that their railways are being operated efficiently and to encourage their patronage. First of all, I want to know what to-day constitutes the Canadian Government Railways.

Mr. J. D. REID: The Canadian Northern system, the Intercolonial railway and the Transcontinental railway. Answering the other question, how I arrived at that $5,000,000, the loss for the past fiscal year ending March 31, was $7,500,000. Now we are bringing the Transcontinental and the Intercolonial fiscal year to an end on December 31 the same as the fiscal year of the Canadian Northern and all other railways. So we estimate $5,000,000 as being the deficit for the year.

Mr. BUREAU: While I am on my feet, Mr. Chairman. The other day I put some questions to the Minister of Railways—very simple questions that could have been answered yes or no, or very shortly. The

minister, as was his right, moved for a return. I got the return to-day. I am not going to deal with it in detail, but I will merely state the questions I put. They were:

Has an Order in Council been passed entrusting the said company—I was talking about the Canadian National Railway Company—with the management and operation of the Grand Trunk Pacific and Intercolonial railways?

The answer is no. The second question I put was:

If so, what is the date of the Order in Council?

Naturally, there is no date. No Order in Council was passed. Then I put this other question:

If an Order in Council was not passed, why was such an Order in Council not passed?

There is no answer. I have this to complain of, Mr. Chairman. You can sue the Canadian Northern railway before the courts of your province and bring the case to trial; but if you try to sue the Transcontinental you find that it will take you a year to get a fiat—and I am speaking from experience. I understand the situation perfectly well. The Secretary of State sends the petition to the Minister of Justice; the Minister of Justice cannot pass on the facts unless he has them before him; therefore he sends the petition back to the Minister of Railways; the Minister of Railways sends it to Toronto, and those in authority in Toronto sends it down to Leduc or to some other headquarters of the Transcontinental, where they ask a man who knows something about lumber to cruise certain territory which has been burnt by the railway and make a report; the man makes his report, sometimes it is unsatisfactory, and a second report is called for; the report goes to Toronto, from Toronto it is sent to the Minister of Railways, and he sends it to the Department of Justice. In two instances, I do not know whether the reports were lost or what happened, but the cases did not go any further. I know of a case where the petition of right was served in July and the report was made in the following February. The cruisers went through the bush in February where the fire took place the preceding June. I admit the winter season is a better time for tramping through the bush on snowshoes and traversing the frozen lakes and rivers, but in my experience up the St. Maurice river I never heard of a cruiser going out during the winter, especially when the snow is high, to see what damage had been done by fire.

I want to find out why the Transcontinental railway is not put in the same position as the Canadian Northern Railway system so that a man who suffers damage from negligence or any other cause whatever can go before a tribunal in the locality where the damage was caused and where all the witnesses live and have his case tried the same as if he was bringing an action against the Canadian Northern railway which is also a government railway. The Government has no more interest in the one railway than in the other, and I do not see what reason they can have for putting a litigant to all the trouble of waiting five, six or seven months before getting a fiat to bring his case before the Exchequer Court.

Mr. J. D. REID: The reason is that the Canadian Northern railway is an incorporated private company, of which we are the stockholders. The hon. member will remember that we passed a Bill in a previous session whereby we are going to transfer them all——

Mr. BUREAU: Yes, I well remember you passed it by the use of the closure.

Mr. J. D. REID: That is the reason it was such a good Bill.

The intention is to transfer all these railways to the Canadian National Railway Company, and then, of course, if there should be considered cause for action against the Transcontinental, such action could be brought just as can now be done in the case of the Canadian Northern. The hon. member is right in saying that every facility should be afforded to those who have just cause for action against the Government railway. Possibly there may have been delay in the case referred to; if the matter had been brought to my attention we would have facilitated the proceedings in every possible way. The delay in connection with the Grand Trunk acquisition has prevented us from taking the necessary steps to bring these lines under the Canadian National Railway Company, but ultimately the Canadian Northern, the Transcontinental and the Intercolonial will all be subject to the one law so far as the bringing of action against them is concerned.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not think that the minister expects me to take that as an answer or as a reason for the course that has been followed. The object of the incorporation of the Canadian National Railway Company was to put under one system of

operation and make subject to one law all the railways operated by the Canadian Government. Now, here is an anomaly; an Act is passed for the special purpose of bringing under one management the Transcontinental and the Intercolonial; yet neither of them is brought under that management. To say that you are waiting for the Grand Trunk is no excuse; you might as well say that you are waiting for the Chaudiere Falls Railway or for the St. Maurice Valley Railway. I do not want to be understood as criticizing the department, because I understand the difficulty that is encountered when reports pertaining to such matters as this have to go from the Secretary of State to the Minister of Justice, from the Minister of Justice to the Minister of Railways, from the Minister of Railways to the Toronto office, or to Moncton in the case of the Intercolonial, and so on. I simply want to point out how unfair it is to the man who suffers damages alleged to have been caused by a Government railway when he has to deal with two Government railways, one operated by the Canadian National Railway Company and the other not so operated, although it should naturally form part of the Canadian National system. It is true that the letters "C.N.R." still appear on the sides of the cars forming part of the equipment of the Canadian National Railway System; but let that pass. If we are going to have operation of Government railways by an incorporated company, let us have it for the whole system, including the Intercolonial and the Transcontinental. Great damage was caused in the St. Maurice region last year through the alleged negligence—as to that the courts will decide—of the Transcontinental; millions of feet of timber were burned because of that negligence. While on this question of operation let me refer to a condition which exists on the Canadian Northern line between Montreal and Quebec at a place called Glenada, where there is no agent. The next station is Grand'Mere; at that point there is an agent. As I came upon the train to-day it was directed to my attention that an unsatisfactory state of affairs prevails at this point. Ste. Flore, with a population of 3,000 people, is at the door of Grand'Mere, and the nearest point from which they can ship their freight is Glenada, but as there is no agent at Glenada, they have to ship to and from Grand 'Mere. But the Canadian Pacific station at Grand'Mere is on the level, and the Canadian Northern station is at the foot of the hill. If a man has to order a car of freight, instead of having it shipped on the Canadian Northern he gets it by Canadian Pacific in order to avoid the haul up the hill. If we had an agent at Glenada, we would get all that traffic and prevent it from being diverted to the Canadian Pacific. These things ought to be inquired into. I was told to-day that carload after carload of freight was being lost to the Canadian Government Railways because of our having no agent at Glenada.

[Mr. Bureau.]

Mr. J. D. REID: I shall see that the attention of the management is drawn to my hon. friend's statement.

Mr. PARDEE: The minister told us this afternoon that the loss on operating expenses is $14,000,000 and interest charges $19,000,000, making a total deficit of $33,000,000. What have these roads cost the country by way of deficits during 1919? By deficits, I mean outgo less income. What I want to get at is this: The Government had adopted the policy of Government ownership of railways. Having regard to the fact that in past years we have put up large sums of money for the Canadian Northern, the Grand Trunk Pacific, and so on, will the minister say whether the present state of affairs is less costly to the people than the system previously followed?

Mr. J. D. REID: Does my hon. friend want the gross earnings?

Mr. PARDEE: I want to know how the loss on Government operations compares with the result from private operations prior to 1919.

Mr. J. D. REID: My hon. friend has the figures correctly. The loss on operating expenses was $14,000,000; the fixed charges on the Canadian Northern about $19,000,000. I mentioned also in my statement this afternoon that the loss on the Grand Trunk Pacific, which is not a part of the Canadian National railway system, was $5,000,000, to which should be added $8,800,000 for fixed charges, making a total of $14,000,000 on the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. PARDEE: That is, $14,000,000 must be added to the $33,000,000?

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes; that includes the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Transcontinetal, the Intercolonial and the Canadian Northern. I gave all the figures this afternoon.

Mr. PARDEE: What was the total cost to the people of Canada?

Mr. J. D. REID: The loss was $47,000,000 during the past year.

Mr. PARDEE: Does that include maintenance?

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes, and includes also some $8,800,000 of fixed charges on the Grand Trunk Pacific and $19,000,000 of fixed charges on the Canadian Northern.

Mr. PARDEE: So that the people of Canada paid out during 1919 on account of the public ownership of railways, maintenance included, $47,000,000. Am I right in that?

Mr. J. D. REID: No, that is hardly a fair way to put it. Of course, during 1919—

Mr. BUREAU: Put it, "for the luxury of operating railways."

Mr. J. D. REID: During 1919 the cost of operation of the Government Railways was increased by $19,000,000 for wages alone, and there were no increases given. Therefore, it is not fair to compare 1919 with the previous year, because in 1918 some increases in rates were granted. But if we take the situation as the hon. member has stated it, he is correct; those railways lost $47,000,000 last year.

Mr. DEVLIN: Is that the total loss?

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I do not think the minister is putting the case strongly enough, because we are face to face with another rise in freight rates. It is not more than a year or two ago since the first increase in freight rates was made. I think there was an increase of five per cent in 1916, a second increase of fifteen per cent, and later on a further increase of twenty-five per cent. My recollection is that the rates have increased forty-five per cent already, and it looks as if we shall have another increase in order to meet the deficit. Therefore, public ownership is going to give us a deficit of $47,000,000 which the ratepayers of this country will have to shoulder, and in addition to that we are face to face with an increase in rates which will also be a burden on the people of Canada. I would advise the minister to increase the rates so that those people who are shouting for public ownership will understand what it really means, because they will have to pay for it. I do not see why the ordinary taxpayers of this country should be called upon to pay deficits incurred in the running of our railroads. The people who use the railways should pay for the railways. Why should a man who lives twenty, thirty, forty or sixty miles from a railway, as is the case with many people in my constituency, have to pay for accommodation received by people in the larger places? It is not fair that this large deficit should be levied upon the general taxpayers of the country. The railways should bear their own burden, the rates should be put up in order that the bills may be paid. And after a while people will find out what public ownership is. Public ownership has been a failure in the United States; it has been a failure in Great Britain; it is a failure in Canada; and the sooner we come to learn the lesson, the better.

There is another matter which I want to bring to the attention of the minister and it is this. I listened carefully to his statement this afternoon, but I have no clear idea as to how we stand on this railway question. I suppose the minister has; but it will be necessary for him to prepare a statement such as is prepared by a joint stock company at the end of the year, showing his assets and liabilities, and his profit and loss account, and give it to the members of this House, so that we may know where we stand. The minister says that he has a deficit of $47,000,000, but that does not give us any information. We want to know where that money has gone; we want to know what assets we have, and the only way in which that can be put before us is by a regular statement like that prepared by a joint stock company. If the president of a joint stock company were to come before his shareholders with a story like the one the minister told us to-day and say that he had operated the business for a year and had a deficit of some $47,000,000, why, he would not be elected again, I am quite sure of that.

An hon. MEMBER: Neither will Union Government.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: The minister must give a summary, of course; but when he gives us a regular bookkeeping statement, showing his assets and liabilities and his profit and loss account, we shall be able to judge for ourselves. As the matter stands to-day we are not able to understand him.

Mr. J. D. REID: The hon. member will probably find all that he has asked for in the statements that I did not read out to-day, but that will appear in Hansard. If he does not, I shall be glad to furnish any further information that may be required. With reference to public ownership, the Intercolonial railway, which is publicly owned, lost $7,500,000 last year in operation. Does the hon. member want to suggest that that road should be handed over

to a private corporation on account of its losing $7,500,000? The Canadian Northern lost only some $6,000,000 in the operation of its whole system, whereas the Intercolonial lost $7,500,000 in addition to the interest on a capital of $125,000,000. What private corporation could we hand the Intercolonial over to now? The Grand Trunk Pacific was handed over to us; we could not help taking it over; what could we do with it? We could not close it down; no private corporation would take it off our hands, and we are compelled to operate it. When it was built we were responsible for it; we guaranteed the bonds. Therefore, it is impossible to hand back the roads that are really losing the most. No private corporation wants the Grand Trunk Pacific, and I do not think the people in the Lower Provinces would agree to handing over the Intercolonial to a private corporation even though it has lost $7,500,000 plus the interest on the capital. For myself, I would not want to hand it over; it was built to connect the Eastern Provinces with the Western Provinces, and I want it kept in the name of the people of Canada.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: The minister need not try to frighten me with the Intercolonial because I have no doubt that if the Intercolonial were put into the hands of a private company, it would do better than it is doing to-day. The Intercolonial was one of the bargains entered into at Confederation; it was one of the terms on which the Maritime Provinces came into this union. If the Maritime Provinces desire to keep the Intercolonial as a government owned road and to compel the Dominion of Canada to live up to its bargain, I will not object to that; but no enterprise of this kind pays and it is impossible to make it pay under Government ownership, because it is inherent in the management of railways that men have to act quickly; they have some times to take chances; they have to conduct business in a way that it is not suitable for a Government to do. The Intercolonial has not always paid in the past; but I know a few occasions when it did pay under good management, and it should have paid better during later years than it has done. I do not know that I can point out the reasons why it has not paid, but the minister ought to know why it has not paid better than it has.

Mr. J. D. REID: The reason last year was on account of the increase in wages, which added a large amount to the deficit; and during the war the increased cost of operation was on account of the increase in wages and rates were not advanced in a corresponding ratio.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I understand that the rates in Eastern Canada are higher than those in Western Canada. If I remember aright, when the rates were raised in 1916, the increase applied only to districts east of Port Arthur; the rates in Western Canada remaining the same. If it be true that the eastern section of the railway is on a higher scale than the western section, that is a reason why the minister ought to have made the eastern section pay better than it has paid. I have no doubt whatever that the money has been wasted. The minister has not told us that a profit and loss account would appear in Hansard. If it does, we shall be able to examine it to-morrow morning; but if there is not a straight bookkeeping account for us to examine, the minister should not ask us to pass this item until he submits a statement of that kind.

Mr. J. D. REID: I think my hon. friend will find the information on Hansard. If not, of course, I will give him any information he wishes. The hon. member, I think, stated that the Canadian Pacific Railway gave a statement of their earnings weekly. The Canadian National Railways have been doing the same thing. Their earnings are published in the trade papers. The Canadian Pacific, I believe, send a card showing their earnings to all their shareholders.

Mr. CAHILL: What amount was paid out of earnings on account of maintenance and upkeep?

Mr. J. D. REID: According to the statement I submitted, the operating expenses were $60,034,018.

Mr. CAHILL: That is not what I want. According to the minister's statement, the deficit on account of interest charges and operating expenses amounted to $47,000,000. Now if there is a deficit in operation you could not, of course, take any money out of earnings and put it into maintenance of way or upkeep.

Mr. J. D. REID: If the hon. member wants the items under the heading of Maintenance alone, I cannot give him those figures this evening.

Mr. CAHILL: Let me put my question in another way. There is such a thing as the maintenance of way of railways. The roadbed has to be kept up to a certain

standard; new ties, new rails and fittings have to be put in. In the statement of the Canadian Pacific, for instance, I find that for the year 1918 they paid on account of maintenance of way, new structures, and so on, $28,000,000, and on maintenance and equipment $22,000,000, making a total of $50,000,000 spent out of earnings. After deducting this amount from their net receipts, there is a surplus of $24,000,000. The receipts are not considered as earned until they have maintained the road in an efficient condition. The minister stated this afternoon that 78 per cent, I think, of the receipts on the Government railways was paid out in wages. The railways must also consume coal, for instance, and if 78 per cent of the receipts was paid out in wages there would be very little left for maintenance of way. What I want is a bookkeeping account, to show where this money that was received went to.

Mr. J. D. REID: I would ask my hon. friend to let his question stand, and I will get the details a little more fully.

Mr. CAHILL: I am quite willing to do that provided the minister will report progress.

Mr. BUREAU: The minister ought to know under what heading maintenance expenses are charged. Are they charged to capital or to operation? Such items as maintaining the roadbed, for instance?

Mr. J. D. REID: Any expenses in connection with renewing or repairing the old roadbed would be charged to operation, not to capital.

Mr. BUREAU: Were such expenses charged to operation in 1919?

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes. Those expenses are charged to operation before we get the net receipts.

Mr. DENIS: Referring to the question of maintenance, I should like to supplement the statement made by the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) a short time ago. He stated that on the Canadian National between Montreal and Quebec there were stations without agents.

Mr. BUREAU: And agents without stations.

Mr. DENIS: More than that, there are stopping places, which should be stations, where absolutely no shelter for freight or passengers is provided. In the county of Joliette, for instance, there is a stopping place called St. Pierre, which is situated in a very densely populated section. There is no shelter of any kind there, and up to last fall there was no road provided by the Government to the place where the train stops. I have been corresponding with Mr. Hanna in regard to this particular place for about a year, but have had no success whatever. I would ask the minister to see that some shelter is provided for the public in places so thickly populated as the county of Joliette and at such stopping places as St. Pierre, which is about nine miles from the city of Joliette. How can human beings be expected to stand out in a field, in the open, at all seasons of the year, and especially in the winter months when the temperature is sometimes thirty below zero, waiting for the Government train—and unfortunately these trains are very often late? We are all aware that the trains of the Canadian National between Montreal and Quebec are running late most of the time, especially in winter, and you can easily imagine the plight of these people standing out there in an exposed place without shelter. I hope this will strike the minister as being a proper and a reasonable representation to make, and I should like him to give me the assurance now that something will be done to remedy the situation.

Mr. J. D. REID: I shall bring this matter to the attention of the management. Of course, I have not the power to order the erection of shelters wherever they are asked for, I can only lay the matter before the management. I am sure, however, they will consider cases of this kind favourably provided financial conditions warrant the expenditure. I think from what I have learnt from hon. members and the public generally that there has been a great improvement during the past year along the whole system. The management are doing all they can to remedy as quickly as possible conditions such as my hon. friend has mentioned.

Mr. BUREAU: So are we.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: This afternoon the minister commented rather favourably on the widening of the gauge of the Prince Edward Island Railway between Charlottetown and Summerside. I should like to ask if it is the intention to proceed with the widening of the gauge over the entire system.

Mr. J. D. REID: We shall not proceed with that work during the present year. By standardizing the gauge between Char-

lottetown and Summerside we can take care of about 75 per cent of the trade of Prince Edward Island. As soon as financial conditions will permit standardizing the gauge of the rest of the railway on Prince Edward Island that work will be proceeded with, but not this year.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is an expense that is inevitable, and there would seem to be very little ground for not proceeding with it now. At present 25 per cent of the Island is without the accommodation it should have. That means a double shipment of all freight carried over the narrow gauge. I would strongly urge the minister to reconsider the matter and see if it not possible to proceed with the widening of the gauge over the entire system.

Mr. J. D. REID: I am afraid we cannot consider this proposal this year. The other parts of the island have the narrow gauge system, and the only inconvenience is involved where there is trans-shipment. This, however, is not so serious because it is done by the railway officials at Charlottetown and Summerside. The widening that has been so far done is of great advantage, and I quite appreciate the necessity for completing the work over the whole system as soon as possible. But financial conditions, we felt, would not justify our doing it during the present year. Now, Mr. Chairman, as I have an important appointment which I should like to keep, and as the Minister of Naval Service (Mr. Ballantyne) is prepared to go on with his Estimates, I should be glad if the Committee would pass this item.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. BUREAU: We can report progress, and the minister may leave.

Mr. J. D. REID: I move that further consideration of the item be postponed.

Item stands.

GOVERNMENT SHIPBUILDING PROGRAMME.

Amount required for the construction of vessels in accordance with Government programme, $20,000,000.

Mr. POWER: May I ask the Minister of Railways (Mr. J. D. Reid) to remain during the discussion. We found him so useful to us on the last occasion that we would appreciate his advice again.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I should like to refer again to the law of the country and the way in which these contracts have been awarded, but I desire to do so in the presence of the Acting Prime Minister (Sir George Foster), because I think the matter is important enough to call for a statement from the leader of the Government himself.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I think I can satisfy the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King), as well as other hon. members in this matter. I fully explained the other evening the reasons why we let the contracts in the way in which we did; and with particular reference to the legal phase of the question, I showed that where an emergency exists the Government are justified in placing contracts in the way they did in connection with our shipbuilding programme. I am sure hon. members will agree that there was a two-fold emergency. In the first place, the war was on and the Government were anxious to get the ships; secondly, we were exceedingly desirous to keep men employed in the various yards from Halifax to Prince Rupert. I announced the other night that the Government shipbuilding programme was at an end, and in connection with any further contracts that may be let we shall follow the law and call for public tenders, as no emergency now exists. I am quite sure that this explanation will satisfy my hon. friend.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: This item involves a sum of $20,000,000 which is a very large sum, and I would ask the minister if it is not possible, in connection with any portion of this amount, to call for tenders for the work that is to be done. Twenty million dollars is a big proportion of the total estimates for public works, and I might point out to my hon. friend that the total expenditure on this single matter is something like $70,000,000, an amount equal to the total expenditure of Canada only a few years ago. That all of this work should be done without tenders being called for in connection with a single contract, when the statute expressly provides that no contract exceeding $5,000 in amount shall be awarded unless public tenders are called for, seems to be a serious violation of the law of the land and one which even the minister himself will find it difficult to justify.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I was under the impression that I had fully covered the ground the other night, but I shall be glad to do so again. As I said a moment or two ago, the war was in progress and Canada wanted ships badly, and to have called for public tenders at that time would have meant

that two or three yards might perhaps have quoted at a lower rate than the other yards throughout the country; and if the Government had placed an order with, say, three yards that had only six berths, there would have been a serious delay in getting the ships. Furthermore, there was the labour situation to be considered. After all, however, the paramount question is this: Has the public interest been as fully safeguarded by the system which the Government adopted during the war and the reconstruction period as if public tenders had been called for? I take it that this is the question which the leader of the Opposition has in mind. I assume that he desires to be assured, and to have the public assured, that these ships were ordered at as low prices as if public tenders had been called for. Well, let me assure the hon. gentleman as well as other members of the House that no lower prices could have been obtained had public tenders been called for in the usual way. Indeed, I will go further, and say that these ships were ordered at lower prices than if tenders had been called for. Hon. members who come from cities where shipbuilding yards are located know full well that I did not accept the first price that was quoted me by any of the shipyards. I had prices checked up as to cost, and exercised all the business ability of which I am possessed, whatever it may be worth, as well as the ability of the technical officers who were associated with me, in order that we might reduce the prices to as low a point as possible. I made as close a bargain for the people as I possibly could, and I am thoroughly satisfied as a responsible minister that these ships have been orderd at lower prices than if public tenders had been called for. I have fully explained the reason for the deviation from the law. The emergency existed; it was imperative that the ships should be turned out; we were in a hurry for them; and if I had followed the advice which has been proferred by the leader of the Opposition the Government would not have to-day thirty ships in commission. By following the system which we adopted we got the ships in half the time that would have otherwise been required. Furthermore, the yards employed 25,000 men, and we wanted to distribute the contracts evenly amongst all the yards throughout the country. I am sure that hon. members will agree that the emergency, and the war conditions that existed at the time, as well as the desirability of giving employment to all of these 25,000 men, most of whom are returned soldiers, justified the Government in seeing to it that the shipbuilding programme was evenly apportioned. I have no regrets as to the manner in which the contracts were placed. I think they were placed properly in the public interest. Our programme, as I stated the other night is now finished. Any further orders that the Government may have to give will certainly be awarded in accordance with the law, and after public tender. I am quite satisfied to do that, I wish to follow no other policy. The law is there, and if there is no emergency I must follow the law. The Government must also observe that course. I am thoroughly satisfied that if we were ordering more ships and do so by public contract, the people of this country would pay more for those ships than was the case under the system of ordering which the Government adopted.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I realize that no good purpose can be served in a discussion of what was done during the period of the war. The war is made to cover a multitude of sins, and so far as the Government's violation of the law of the land in awarding these contracts is concerned, I am quite prepared to allow the minister to use the war as an excuse as regards any emergency that may have existed at that time. But the war has now been over for sixteen months, and I am not sure from the minister's statement that contracts have not been awarded since that time. The point I am particularly anxious to make at the moment is, that we are asked now to vote another $20,000,000 not for any expenditure to be incurred as the result of an emergency, but for expenditures to be incurred during the coming year. I would therefore like to know from the minister if it is not possible, with respect to any part of this $20,000,000, to follow the law as regards the inviting of tenders for the work to be done under that expenditure?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: In answer to the leader of the Opposition I might frankly state that all contracts have been placed subject to Parliament voting this amount of money. The urgency existed to keep our returned soldiers employed, and the Government are anxious to get the ships just as quickly as they possibly can; so all the contracts have been placed. I mentioned the figures involved the other night and perhaps I had better state them again. The total payments up to April, 1919, amounted to $19,510,322.35. The total payments from April, 1919, to March 1, 1920,

amounted to $24,194,639.78. The total payments on account of the Government's shipbuilding programme amount to $43,704,962.13. The balance available on March 1 from the vote for the current year amounts to $15,505,361.22. In addition to this balance that is available, the Government are now asking for another vote of $20,000,000, part of which is a re-vote from last year.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have noticed a reference that my hon. friend has made to the conditions under which these contracts have been awarded, that they are subject to Parliament voting the amount. That is what we are doing at the present moment. What I would like to ask the minister, while we are voting this amount, is, can we not in some way incorporate the condition that the amount shall be voted and expended in accordance with the provisions of the law of the land? Let me read from the statutes of 1906, part 2, chapter 39, the section which governs this matter:

> Whenever any works are to be executed under the direction of any department of the Government, the minister having charge of such department shall invite tenders by public advertisement for the execution of such works, except in cases:
>
> (a) of pressing emergency in which delay would be injurious to the public interest; or,
>
> (b) in which from the nature of the work it can be more expeditiously and economically executed by the officers and servants of the department; or
>
> (c) where the estimated cost of the work is less than five thousand dollars and it appears to the minister, in view of the nature of the work, that it is not advisable to invite tenders.

Now the amount in this case is not less than $5,000, it is $20,000,000. That being so, I am asking the minister: Is it not possible—if not in regard to the whole of the $20,000,000, at least in regard to some part of it—to invite tenders in accordance with the provisions of the statute which I have quoted?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I can only answer to the leader of the Opposition that these contracts were placed quite some months ago, with the exception of one or two on the Pacific coast which latter that we were holding up because the department over which I preside and the ship-builders out there could not agree on the cost of changing from coal-burning to oil-burning. Aside from that, however, the contracts were placed some months ago, and there are no further contracts now to be awarded.

Mr. DENIS: Are we to understand that the contracts were awarded before the money was voted by Parliament?

[Mr. Ballantyne.]

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The hon. member probably heard my statement a few moments' ago that there was still a balance available on March 1 of $15,505,361.22, which has not yet been expended. In addition to that we are now asking for a vote of $20,000,000, part of which is a re-vote from last year. The hon. member will therefore see that the money has not, as yet, been expended.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: How many contracts have been awarded since the Armistice and what is the total amount involved?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Eighteen contracts have been let since the Armistice was signed. If any hon. member wishes to refer to these contracts or any of the correspondence, I will be very glad to Table the documents. There is nothing that I wish to hide, or the Government either.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: That question is very important because while there might be some justification for violating the well-known law of the land prior to the Armistice, there was none whatever after the Armistice had been signed. The law should be respected and the minister has not given any fair explanation as to why that law was not observed. It is very distinctly and clearly laid down in the statute that where the amount involved is over $5,000 tenders must be invited. The reasons that the minister gave for not observing that course are not sufficient to my mind. He said there might be too many contracts in one place. But the minister was not bound to accept the tenders; he could find out by calling for tenders the lowest price at which the work could be done and could then give an opportunity to everybody in the vicinity to bid. In that way he would be able, in all probability, to bring down the price. Notwithstanding what the minister has said about the favourable price obtained for the building of these ships I am not inclined to agree with him. I think that these ships could have been built for a less price than the minister paid. The minister, if I remember aright, told us last year when he was asking for this estimate that the average price for the building of ships was $195 a ton in the case of the contracts that had been let prior to that session of Parliament. I understand that he has since made contracts in some cases at $167 and in others at $180. But these are all very large and abnormal prices. Steamships of that description could be built for $50 and $60 a ton prior to the war and were built for those prices.

My friend the deputy minister has studied this question, and I have a great deal of confidence in his judgment. I read a speech that he delivered before a club in the city of Ottawa a few weeks ago, in the course of which he stated that ships of this class could be built in Europe for £33 10s a ton. In the same paper in which this speech appeared, the Montreal Gazette, the exchange for a pound sterling was placed at $3.63—and if my friend were buying a ship built in Europe he would have to take the rate of exchange into consideration. According to the figure given by the deputy minister, and taking the rate of exchange at the time, he could have saved $70 a ton, by my calculation, by purchasing ships on the other side of the Atlantic instead of building them himself.

I find in a financial paper called "The Boston News Bureau," one of the best authorities on the subject on this continent, the following paragraph, under date of January 31, 1920:

> The British shipyards are now asking prices considerably below their American competitors. They are now asking £30 a ton, which at the rate of exchange on this side is $105 a ton.

So my hon. friend will see that he could have purchased the ships for a very much lower price. I quite understand that he wants to build ships in Canada—and we all want to do so if it can be done without paying a profiteering price.

My hon. friend calls this a shipbuilding policy. To my mind it is not a policy, it is simply building ships at a profiteering price, and nothing more. Anybody can do that. If you give the chief messenger of this House leave to go out and pay $195 a ton for ships, he will get you the ships just as readily as will the Department of Marine and he will make a millionaire of himself in the bargain. This is not a policy, because apparently the minister has not given any attention to the question of inducing our capitalists to put their money into the shipbuilding business; that would be what I would call a shipbuilding policy; if you can accomplish that you will be doing something towards establishing shipbuilding in this country. But buying or building ships at a very high price is simply discouraging the private investor and driving him out of the business.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Might I ask the hon. member a question? Do I understand him to say that to-day in England, Ireland or Scotland ships of the same type as the Government has built can be bought at $105 per ton?

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I understand that the British Government is selling ships at the present time at less than $100 a ton.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: That is not an answer to my question. Did I understand my hon. friend to say that ships of a type similar to those that are being built in our Canadian yards can be built in any yards of the United Kingdom at $105 a ton or at any lower price than what the Canadian Government is paying?

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I have given my hon. friend an extract from a well-known financial paper to the effect that at the present time ships are being built in the yards of Great Britain for £30 a ton, and considering the rate of exchange when this paper was issued that figure comes to only about $105 a ton. That is one authority. The hon. minister will not deny that the British government are to-day selling ships for less than $100 a ton to private individuals. The American government, I believe, are doing the same thing, arrangements having been entered into with certain owners for them to take over ships built for the United States government during the war, at a figure of about $100 a ton. Whereas my hon. friend is going on building ships at a much higher price than that, expecting them to compete successfully with these lower priced ships.

I said that this was not a policy, and I want to press that home on the mind of my hon. friend, because I think he honestly believes that it is. If Sir John Macdonald at the time he introduced the National Policy had started to lay the foundation of cotton factories and steel works at the expense of the people he and his policy would have been the laughing stock of Canada within five years' time. That was not his policy. His idea was to devise a policy that would induce our people to embark in the manufacturing industry. My hon. friend is not doing that. He is driving our private investors out of the industry and building ships at an enormous price with the public funds, and expecting them to compete with ships that are built and bought at a much lower price. A ship doing the business that my hon. friend expects to do has to compete with the whole world. A cargo of lumber or of wheat is put on the board in the shipping exchange in London or in New York, and the man who will carry that cargo for the lowest rate will get the business.

My hon. friend has got that competition before him; all the ships on the sea are competing for that one cargo. And my hon. friend has told the House over and over again that he is charging the market rate. Now, I want to know what benefit it is to the farmer of Canada if his wheat or his cattle is carried to the Liverpool market at exactly the same rate in a Gavernment ship as in a private ship? And what can be the benefit to the taxpayer if he has to pay the deficit that my hon. friend is bound to have to make good when he enters into competition with those ships that were built at a lower price? It is a very simple calculation. I have stated that a large number of ships with which my hon. friend is competing are ships that were built before the war at a price of from $50 to $60 a ton. Great Britain, at the time the war broke out, had some twenty million tons of shipping on the seas, and a large part of that tonnage was built at those low rates.

Very many of those ships are still on the seas, and my hon. friend when the times get hard—and they are getting harder now for shipping owners, ships are idle to-day in the harbours of New York and Boston because they cannot find business—will have to meet close competition. Let us make a comparison between the conditions pertaining to the building of a ship, say, at Halifax and those prevailing in connection with the building of a similar ship in the Old Country. My hon. friend, I understand, is having two ships built at Halifax at the rate of $195 a ton. At this rate, one 10,000 ton ship will cost him $1,950,000. The insurance on that ship cannot be less than three per cent of the value of the hull; the cost of insurance, therefore, when he starts the ship in business will be $58,500. He must allow five per cent for depreciation if he expects to continue in the business and get his capital back; that will be $97,500. He tells us that he is making five per cent interest on his money; that is another $97,500. The total amount of fixed charges, therefore, on the ship is $253,500. Now, let us take a ship built on the Clyde prior to the war at $60 a ton—a 10,000 ton ship of exactly the same type, with which my hon. friend has to compete. The cost of the ship in the first place would be $600,000. The insurance on the hull at three per cent would be $18,000; depreciation at five per cent, $30,000; interest at five per cent, $30,000; in all $78,000. These two ships are competing for the same business; one has a fixed charge of $253,500; the other a fixed charge of $78,000, so that the handicap against my hon. friend's ship to begin with is $175,000. That is to say, he has to earn with his ship $175,000 more than the other man earns before he can begin to pay a profit. When times are hard and freights are low, it will be impossible for him to do that, and the business must end up with a very heavy loss to the people of this country.

I drew the attention of the Minister of Railways (Mr. J. D. Reid) this evening to the fact that he had not given a bookkeeping statement with regard to this business of running the railways. I want to make the same remark to the Minister of Marine. He has not given a statement—

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It is here.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: You can read his speech very carefully without finding any statement showing assets and liabilities. My hon. friend is a business man; he knows what I want. If he was giving the financial statement of a joint stock company in Montreal of which he was director or president, he would show all his assets and all his liabilities; he would show also his profit and loss account; and he would place it in such shape that a business man could take up that piece of paper and see whether the shareholders were making or losing money. He has not given us any such statement. He told the committee the other night that he had somewhere a million and a half dollars in cash and in Victory bonds. Well, I quite believe he has, but in the other pocket he may have bills amounting to a million and a half that are not paid. I do not know what his liabilities are; nobody knows; nobody can tell from the statement that he has given. If we are going into the business of running ships; if we are going into the business of running railways, we must be business men and treat the people of this country as the president of a company treats his shareholders,—that is, give them a fair statement showing just how we stand. Does any one in this country know whether or not my hon. friend is making money in this business? I am quite willing to take his word for it, but he would not need to make a speech to convince me if he gave a proper statement from which I could see for myself. I was unfortunately absent when he made his speech the other day, but I read it over very carefully and it looked to me as if he was making an apology for what he was doing. I have a suspicion that he himself has not very much faith in this scheme and that he already sees the end

of it. He does not say that he is going to continue it.

The Minister of Railways came to the rescue of my hon. friend the other night by saying that we must have ships in order to carry on the business of the country; we must have them in order to compete with the Canadian Pacific. The Canadian Pacific, he argued, has ships; therefore the Government of Canada, if it is to prosecute the business of running a railway, must also have ships to carry the traffic from Canadian ports and route it through to its destination. Now, that might be true if the Government were establishing a line of ships on the Atlantic to carry passengers and freight across to Liverpool or other ports. That would be business. But that is not what the Government are doing; they are sending their ships all over the world. And I challenge my hon. friend to show where he is going to get his return cargo. Suppose he sends a ship from St. John down to the river Plate with a load of lumber. When he gets there, there is no return cargo to bring to Canada. What will he do? Will he buy coal at an enormous rate at the river Plate, where it costs three or four times as much as it costs up here, and will he fill his ship with that coal and steam all the way back to St. John with nothing in the hold? He will not do it if he is a business man; so that if he is going to continue the operation of his tramp vessel he must send it somewhere else. Well, the chances are that he will find a cargo of cattle or of wheat for Liverpool; nothing else will pay him. What will he be doing then? He will be developing the trade of the Argentine and competing in the Liverpool market with the Canadian farmer. That is the kind of liner he is going to run; he cannot avoid it if he continues to do business as he is doing it now. He is not bulding liners; he is not establishing any line of ships. The Minister of Railways need not worry over making terms with outside steamships to carry his traffic across the Atlantic. Dozens of steamships which cross the Atlantic from Montreal, Halifax, St. John and various points in Canada will be glad to connect up with the Canadian National railways and carry their traffic to the other side on easy terms. My hon. friend would have no trouble in making a good bargain, because there are many of these ships and they would all be competing for the business. It is idle to say that you cannot carry on a railway business without having ships to carry your produce across the ocean. Very few railway companies in the world have their own ships. England and Scotland send out as much produce as any other country in the world, but the railway companies of these countries do not, as a rule have their own ships. Very few of the United States railway companies have ships; it is very easy for them to make arrangements for the routing of their traffic through to destination. That argument, therefore, does not hold, though it was the chief argument advanced by the Minister of Railways the other night in defence of my hon. friend's policy.

I do not wish the Minister of Marine to think that I am opposed to Canadian shipbuilding, for I am not. No man is more anxious than I am to see the Canadian flag on the Seven Seas, and anything that can be done in that direction I shall support. But my hon. friend will never see that until he reduces his tariff. No protective country has ever been able to build up a great mercantile marine. For many years past no country would have been better able to do it than the United States. But it was a reproach to the United States, and they felt the reproach, that their passengers and their freight were carried in British ships across the ocean; that only some 12 per cent of their trade was carried in their own ships. It was a reproach to the people of the United States, and they would have overcome it if they could, but they could not overcome it and at the same time maintain their high tariff. Similarly, we cannot build up a mercantile marine and at the same time maintain our high tariff. If hon. members will look at the tariff schedules, they will find scores of articles that enter into the construction of ships that are made more expensive by the tariff. The only other way of assisting the shipbuilding industry will be by a bounty, and personally, I am not in favour of a bounty; I think the only effective step is a reduction in the tariff if the minister expects the Canadian people to continue in the shipbuilding industry. We have a good example in the province from which I come. Many years ago, Nova Scotia was one of the greatest shipbuilding countries in the world, for its population. That is a big statement to make, but I make it advisedly. Fifty years ago, more or less, no other country in the world had as many tons of shipping on the sea as Nova Scotia had in proportion to its population; it had a ton of shipping for every inhabitant, for every man, woman and child in the province, and that figure has not, I believe, been reached by any other country. Great Britain has

a very large fleet of ships, as hon. members know; the minister told us that when war broke out she had over twenty million tons of shipping; but Great Britain at that time had a population of over 40,000,000 people, and she was the only country that could compete with Nova Scotia in tonnage. Nevertheless, in proportion to population, Nova Scotia had double the tonnage that Great Britain had. How did we get that large tonnage? We got it under what was practically a free trade policy. We had a 10 to 12 per cent tariff in Nova Scotia at that date. The ships were wooden ships. They were built from the wood of Nova Scotia; work was done by the people of Nova Scotia, the hulls were built of wood and also the fastenings, and when a hull was finished some merchant in Glasgow or Liverpool advanced the builder the rigging, sails and other material, and that was admitted into the province free. That was practically free trade, and that was the way in which Nova Scotia made such great progress in wooden shipbuilding. I quite understand hon. members will say that when iron replaced wood we could not carry on the industry; but I can assure my hon. friend that we did carry it on under a low tariff, and we carried it on successfully. I may also make the statement to him that no country in the history of the world that maintained a high tariff ever had a great mercantile fleet. Therefore, to my mind, there is just one solution and only one. I am distinctly opposed to Government ownership. It is not the part of this Government to play the game; the Government should referee the game and let the people play it. Let my hon. friend produce some kind of a policy by which the people of this country can embark in the shipbuilding industry and he will have my hearty support.

Mr. M. CLARK: Before the minister concludes, I should like to be permitted to say a few words on this vote. I think the House and the country are indebted to the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) for having held the vote over. We are getting a little more daylight on this question than we did the last time it was debated in this House.

An hon. MEMBER: Louder.

Mr. M. CLARK: Does my hon. friend mean that? It may be his hearing and not my voice that is wrong. I am, however, very glad to accommodate him. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. J. H. Sinclair) has just delivered a speech of very great political wisdom and importance, and I am personally gratified to have support from him for views which I modestly put before the House last week when this subject was under discussion. His voice on this question is a weighty voice, because no other hon. gentleman in this House knows about the shipping question better than the hon. member for Guysborough. I can only hope his reward will be better than mine was for having given sound views on political economy. When I tried to preach the same doctrines, my genial and eccentric friend the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Butts) was put on his feet to ask me if I ever heard of Christopher Columbus. I am glad to see my hon. friend in his place and to relieve his anxiety about my historical knowledge; I have heard of the gentleman, but I have not quite the opinion that my hon. friend appears to have of him as a discoverer. I came to America much later than Christopher Columbus, and I found things here that Christopher Columbus never dreamed of—my hon. friend, for example.

I find nothing that reflects on myself in the first part of the speech of the hon. member for Guysborough. He uses stronger language than I care to use—I am well known to be a man of moderate views and studiously and carefully guarded language. Therefore, when the minister came with his shipping projects before the House about twelve months ago, I expressed fear that he had entered into what was an unprofitable contract. The hon. member for Guysborough changes the words slightly, and he boldly charges my hon. friend with a profiteering contract. I judge my meaning was the same, but I always like to be careful in the use of language. With regard to that, I must repeat that I think these contracts have not been profitable. I must say, when I raised this question first, I did not get the support I expected from the official Opposition of the day. The occasion was a somewhat famous one, and my hon. friend, the then leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) made it the occasion of a declaration, which I believe was a very serious declaration for himself. On that occasion he stated, with that honesty and courage which are characteristic of him, that he was a protectionist, and I am afraid that that declaration cost him the leadership of the party. I always hate to see any hon. gentleman suffer for his honesty. Sitting where he does, it is all right for one to entertain protectionist

views, but it is very wrong to avow them. But my advice will be of no use to my hon. friend now. I say that I did not get the support I expected on that occasion from the official Opposition. I am all the more glad to see my old and honoured friend, the member for Guysborough, strike out from the shoulder in the way he did to-night. I am deeply grateful to him for enforcing my views on political economy as I expressed them last week.

I did not rise to delay this vote, but I understand that we have the assurance of the minister that this is to carry out contracts which have already been entered into, and that after that he and the Government are retiring from the shipbuilding business. I understand that is the position at which we have arrived on this question. If I am not right, no doubt the minister will put me right when he rises to reply presently.

While I am on my feet, I wish to make reference to another matter which arose in this debate last week, and I do so for the purpose of making the position of this party in this House and in the country very clear upon a subject which, I understood from the minister, the Government have under their consideration, and that is the subject of possible subsidies to ships. I understand that the minister will finish these contracts and go out of what, according to my hon. friend from Guysborough, has been a profiteering business. I do not know that we should be surprised that it is such a business. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine comes from Montreal, and his deputy comes from Nova Scotia. Well, coming from the West as I do, I, a priori, have arrived at the conclusion that this is not a very good combination with regard to shipbuilding for the rest of Canada,—my hon. friend from Guysborough is an exception, of course, to certain tendencies in Nova Scotia, he still retains the free trade instincts of his family, but I am afraid there are very strong protectionists among the Liberals of Nova Scotia besides my hon. friend the late leader of the Opposition. However, the profiteering business is to be stopped, and the Government are considering the question of subsidies. Now I do not know whether my hon. friend from South Cape Breton was speaking in favour of subsidies or not; I am not at all sure that he knew himself. He said some things, nevertheless. He is always interesting to listen to, and thoroughly good-natured as a rule. I do not know that he was so very good-natured when he disavowed his Irishism and proclaimed himself a Canadian. I presume he meant by birth. I think I knew the meaning of his strong expression as well as of the enthusiastic cheers which accompanied that avowal of his nationality. All I have got to say upon that is this, that in opposing subsidies to British companies if they are going to make profiteering contracts or plunder the taxpayers of Canada I am a better Canadian and am less of an Englishman than my hon. friend if he supports the subsidies. It is only a poor type of Canadian in this House who does not feel it his duty to look after the cash of the people whom he is sent here to represent, rather than to allow those people to be rooked by companies, let those companies be from England or wherever you like.

I did not last week get the unanimous support I should have liked from the Opposition on the question of subsidies. Indeed, the two official sides have a very strong resemblance to one another on all these questions. There are hon. members opposite who come from the farming districts of Ontario who have very little use for subsidies, just as there are in the official Opposition hon. gentlemen who come from agricultural areas, who have very little use for subsidies. On the other hand, just as my hon. friend from Toronto spoke strongly in favour of subsidies, so my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) seemed rather in a receptive mood, and he said, that if such things were going round and there was money to provide them, he would be there with his hand out—so I understood him. I do not know that my hon. friend from Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) if he were present, would deny that he himself would look for a subsidy for shipping if such things were going. The hon. member for Cape Breton too I think would have an appetite in that direction. So we see, Mr. Chairman, that in regard to the two official sides of this House there is not very much difference between the two parties, any more than there was a year ago, in regard to this profiteering contract, between the then leader of the Opposition and the Minister of Marine.

But I want to say that there is a party in this House, which is much larger in the country, and behind which there is a swelling tide, which is absolutely at one both on profiteering contracts and on subsidies. We here, to a man, are opposed to subsidies and bounties on principle. We say they are unjust, they are bad political economy, they are wrong, and we oppose them, we care not what riding wants them. We are looking after the interests, the broad

interests of the whole Canadian people. When you pay a bounty to Dominion Steel, or a subsidy to shipbuilders, to placate the electors of a certain constituency, where do you get the money? Some one addressed that question to the minister the other day, and in the innocence of his heart he said, "I think we will get it from the bank." When you get money from a bank, the bank is not acting like the Good Samaritan—the money has to be paid back. Where does the money come from for all these doles? It comes from the brawn and sinew of the labourer, from the twelve hours' day of the farmer, from the worker in the factories. It comes out of the blood and bone and muscle of the people. We say it is a wrong thing to spend in bounties and subsidies money that has been got in that way. So we are opposed to subsidies on principle, and we are so opposed to a man.

I want to make one more point in this connection before I sit down. We are especially opposed to subsidies at this time because of the financial conditions of the country. I am trying to give the Government some grounds on which to come to a wise decision on policy, which we have been told by the minister is to be communicated to us when the financial statement for the year is brought down. The Government has no money to throw away in subsidies at the present time. The Government are living on borrowed money. They have just taken $700,000,000 from the people of this country, and the Lord only knows in His dwelling place when they will be able to pay it back unless we change our fiscal policy. They have neither moral right nor financial status to give subsidies of this kind. What the people of this country want is honest housekeeping. They want their money taken care of, and it is only by taking care of it and by arranging taxation on a proper basis that we shall alter the exchange against us in the United States, reduce the cost of living, and make Canada a fit country for heroes to dwell in.

I have one more ground supplied to me by my kind and genial friend from South Cape Breton. He told us in his address last week that they got the cheapest ore from Newfoundland that is to be found on the face of the earth. I do not think I misrepresent my hon. friend—the cheapest iron ore in the world.

Mr. BUTTS: What I did say was that we were capable of producing on the shores of Sydney harbour the cheapest pig iron in the world.

Mr. M. CLARK: From the splendid ores of Newfoundland they are capable of producing on the shores of Sydney harbour the cheapest pig iron in the world. Capable? Then capable men do not want subsidies. That is the argument. If you have the cheapest ore, and you are capable men, then take the advice of my hon. friend from Guysborough: Go to it and build ships in competition with the world.

Mr. BUTTS: I might tell my hon. friend from Red Deer, as he comes from a farming country, that we do not build ships out of pig iron.

Mr. M. CLARK: I might tell my hon. friend, though I come from a farming country, that he cannot build them without pig iron. Does my hon. friend wish another exchange? Mr. Chairman, I am a Canadian, and I wish to induce Canadianism, but not of the puny kind that comes to this House seeking subsidies. I want to produce Canadians who can stand four square to all the winds that blow, as their forefathers did in the Islands of the North sea, and as their brothers did in the trenches in Flanders. I want Canadians who in the trade and manufacturing world can stand four square to all the winds that blow, and say to competition, let it come from where it will: We are capable men; we have the material and we can produce the goods. That is the kind of Canadianism I believe in.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am greatly surprised that the member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) and the member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) should charge this Government in face of the information I have placed before the House, with having placed profiteering contracts. I take issue squarely with both hon. gentlemen and aver emphatically that not one profiteering contract has been placed. It is all very fine for hon. members, possibly for political reasons, to level such a serious charge against me as a responsible minister, and against the Government. But before this House and the public of Canada will accept the allegation that profiteering contracts have been placed by this Government, these hon. gentlemen must adduce more substantial proof than merely making the charge and letting it go at that. The hon. member for Guysborough did me the honour to confess that he had carefully read every word of my speech, and then alleged that profiteering contracts had been placed, stating that ships could be built in the United Kingdom at lower prices than those at which the Can-

adian Government had placed their contracts. I am sorry to take up the time of the House, but in view of the first charge of dishonesty that has ever been levelled at this Government or any member of the Government, I wish to quote again the figures I quoted the other day.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I rise to a point of order. Nothing I stated could be construed into a charge of dishonesty against the minister. When I talked of unprofitable contracts I meant the profits which the Government should have saved for the country went to those who sold steel plates at a dearer rate than that at which they should have been sold. That is not a charge of dishonesty against the minister. I had no such thought in my mind, and no word of my language will bear that interpretation.

Mr. CASGRAIN: It is bad business.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am glad to hear the statement of the hon. member for Red Deer. I certainly understood him to say that profiteering contracts had been placed for ships, but if I am wrong I accept with very good grace the hon. gentleman's assurance that he did not intend to convey the impression that profiteering contracts had been placed by this Government.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: My hon. friend must not misunderstand me. I endorse the position taken by the hon. member for Guysborough, but a distinction must be made between profiteering by contractors with whom the minister does business, and profiteering by the minister himself, which would be the only thing that could justify a charge of dishonesty.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: The minister evidently misunderstood me. I did not allege that he had made a personal profit out of the ships, for nothing was further from my mind than such a thought; and probably the word "improvident" would have been the better adjective by which to describe the conratcts. I am convinced, however, that some one made a big profit out of the contracts, and the question which the minister will have to settle with the country is, why he let the contracts at such high prices without calling for public tenders.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The hon. member for Guysborough has only confirmed what he said a moment ago. I have the facts to disprove his assertions. No profiteering or improvident contracts have been placed by this Government. I have stated before on the floor of this House, and I state again, that ships of a similar type have been built, and are being built, in the Canadian shipyards throughout the country at as low a price as can be obtained in England, Ireland or Scotland. The other day I stated that we had figured out the sterling price at $162.50 per ton. The hon. member for Guysborough goes back to pre-war days, but I am not dealing with conditions as they existed before the war. I affirm that since the Government let the contract for the first ship there has not been a time when ships of a similar type could be built in any of the yards in the United Kingdom at lower prices than those at which the Canadian Government placed their contracts. A week ago to-night, when speaking on this subject, I stated that notwithstanding the very large emergency fleet contracts placed by our neighbours to the south of us, they paid $25 per ton more than was paid by the Canadian Government. I also informed the House that not so long ago there was ordered in the United Kingdom a cargo ship of eleven knots, oil fuel, to be engaged in trans-atlantic business, at a price of $220.35 per ton, and that the Imperial Munitions Board were placing contracts for ships. I find no fault with the Imperial Munitions Board, and do not want it to appear that I am criticising them, because I think they placed their contracts well. But during the war they ordered forty-four steel ships to be built in Canadian yards at £39 10s. per ton, the net price per deadweight ton being $190. I also informed the House when speaking a week ago that sixteen wooden ships were built for England at a cost of $204 per ton; that England had ordered thirteen steel ships in the United States at a cost of $200 per ton; nineteen steel ships in Japan at $214 per ton; and three steel ships in China at $199 per ton.

Mr. JACOBS: During the war?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: During the war. Most of our contracts had been placed during the war, and since the Armistice was signed the Canadian Government ordered ships at $167.50 per ton; and I say from my place in this House that for a similar type of ship placed at the same time no one could have obtained in England, Ireland or Scotland a lower rate than $167.50.

Mr. MURPHY: Has the minister any figures to substantiate that statement?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Certainly. The figures I quoted just now are the official figures of the Committee on National Expenditure of the British Government. That is my authority.

Mr. MURPHY: Were these contracts placed during the war?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I presume the orders for these ships were placed during the war.

Mr. MURPHY: If the hon. gentleman will permit me. Earlier in the evening he mentioned that contracts for eighteen of these ships had been awarded since the signing of the armistice. Has the hon. gentleman any figures to show the price per ton of other ships, the contracts for which were given about the same time?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I will be very glad to give the information to the hon. gentleman. Since the signing of the armistice we placed contracts at $167.50 per ton. The British sterling price was £33 10s. per ton. The English sterling price would be close to our figure of $167.50.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. McMASTER: What was the rate of exchange?

Mr. DUFF :At what date?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: May of last year.

Mr. MURPHY: Can the hon. gentleman tell the committee the price per ton in the case of any contract for ships placed by well known private corporations, for instance such as the Canadian Pacific Railway, about the same time as he placed these orders for ships?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I will not give the name of the firm that ordered the ships because I do not think I would be right in doing so. I can say this, however, that Norway has placed orders for ships with one of our yards in this country within the last three months, at $170 per ton, and France has also placed an order at $170 per ton. I can say further that the Canadian Government have been offered not only the price that we are paying for our ships but more if we choose to sell them.

Mr. MURPHY: Then the hon. gentleman has no figures with respect to orders given by Canadian firms upon which to base a comparison?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No, I do not know anything about the orders given by any Canadian firm, but the very fact of Norway and France placing orders in Canada within the last three months at prices higher than the Canadian Government are paying, is, I think, conclusive evidence that ours are not profiteering contracts.

[Mr. Ballantyne.]

Mr. POWER: Is the $167 per ton the lowest price, or the average price, of the 18 ships referred to?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The lowest price.

Mr. POWER: What was the highest price?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: For what period?

Mr. POWER: I would like to know the highest price at which contracts were let for any of the 18 ships since the signing of the armistice.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Shortly after the signing of the armistice a contract was placed at $170 per ton and that is the highest price that has been paid for that type of ship—that is the largest type, of 8,400 tons deadweight. Most of these orders were placed at $167.50 per ton. I also stated last week that the firm of Skinner and Eddie, of Seattle, are constructing standard vessels of 8,800 tons. Mr. Skinner, when giving testimony before the United States Senate last month, declared that these vessels were being constructed at the present time at a price of $185 per ton. Now, I think, Sir, that I have proved my case, that no profiteering contracts have been let. I have also proved that the United States, their programme being much larger than ours, have paid $25 per ton and upwards more than we have paid. I have shown the price that the Imperial Munitions Board have paid for steel ships, and for wooden ships, and I have shown the price that Great Britain has paid for steel ships during the war. I have stated what the price is to-day for similar ships built in the United Kingdom and built here. I have given all these figures, which are absolutely accurate and official, and neither the Canadian Government nor this Parliament should be ashamed of the prices at which we have placed our contracts. Let me repeat again, there is no justification for the charge that has been made as to placing profiteering contracts.

The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) stated that he has some doubts as to the net profit of $1,406,000 that I stated a week ago resulted from the operation of the 19 ships that were in commission last year, some of which had only made one trip. The hon. gentleman states that as a business man, before making such a statement to the House, I should be prepared to lay before it the usual business statement showing assets and liabilities. I am glad to tell the hon. gentleman that I have

that very statement here. The current assets are as follows:

Cash in banks	$432,576 13
Victory bonds	504,583 33
Accounts receivable	492,247 75
Outstanding freight	71,411 05
Material and supplies	1,668 87
Total	$1,502,487 13

The total assets of the company are $2,024,537.40. The liabilities are as follows:

Accounts payable	$627,701 52
Open voyages account	340,068 50

The profit account is $1,056,767.38, and the total net profit, as I stated before, $1,406,000. If the hon. member for Guysborough doubts that statement, I would like, with the unanimous consent of the committee, to place on Hansard a statement of the gross and net profit of each one of these ships for each voyage.

Mr. DUFF: Hear, hear.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: These profits, as I have already stated, were arrived at in the same way that any business house would arrive at profits. After providing for organization, overhead expenses, depreciation, interest on the ships and insurance, the net profit has been arrived at, the amount being as stated.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. J. H. Sinclair) takes a more gloomy and pessimistic view of the Government ownership of ships than I do. I am a thorough believer in the Government ownership and operation of ships. Where would Canada have been during the past year if it had not been for the Government ships that brought a vast amount of tonnage of raw sugar from the West Indies to the sugar refineries of Canada at Halifax, St. John and Montreal? There would have been an actual sugar shortage in this country. Where would the people of British Columbia have been with respect to the large amount of lumber that they had in that province if it had not been for the Government ships which carried that lumber to England, to Australia and to New Zealand?

It has been stated by the hon. gentleman that ships operated by private ownership are going empty either one way or the other. I am happy to tell the hon. gentleman that the Government ships have full cargoes both going and coming on the various routes on which they are operating. I do not wish to unnecessarily occupy the time of the House, but let me cite the case of the Canadian Pioneer that runs to Buenos Ayres. The gross earnings of that vessel on the outward voyage were $174,961.17. On the return voyage the gross earnings were $292,000.

Mr. DUFF: What cargo did she bring back?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Hides and other goods. I cannot give you the precise details of the composition of her cargo.

Mr. DUFF: Did she bring that cargo to Canada?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Some of it here and some of it to New York. But that does not make any difference. What I am trying to refute is the statement of the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) to the effect that these vessels did not have return cargoes.

Mr. DUFF: He did not say that. He said they did not bring return cargoes to Canada.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Most of these ships did bring return cargoes to Canada, but part of this particular ship's cargo was destined for the port of New York.

Mr. DUFF: What did she bring to Canada?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: If the hon. member will wait until I get through I will be glad to give him any information he wants. The total gross earnings of the "Canadian Pioneer" for that one voyage from Montreal to Buenos Aires were $466,961.17, and the net earnings were $214,828.27. As I stated, I have in my hand the gross earnings and the net earnings for the open voyages and for the closed voyages, and I will be very glad to hand it to the hon. member for Guysborough, or if the House prefers I will place the statement on the pages of Hansard.

Mr. DUFF: Has the minister got a statement there of the steamer "McKee"?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: That is not a ship that was built under the Government's shipbuilding programme, she was bought several years ago and operated by the Railway Department. I have none of these old ships in my statement, only the new ships that have been built and operated under the Government's shipbuilding programme.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Was she not bought with money voted by this Government for the purchase of ships two or three years ago?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I can only say that such purchase has not been out of any

votes that have been put through the House for the Government shipbuilding programme since I have had the honour of being Minister of Marine. Before I resume my seat I want to say that with our large transcontinental railway system of 22,000 miles this House would be ill-advised, in my humble opinion, if it did not endorse the Government ownership and operation of these ships in order to compete with the Canadian Pacific railway. Not only do these ships make the profit that I have stated, but co-operating with them our railway system makes a profit also on the long haul.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I will put it in another way that probably will better please hon. members opposite. I want to say that the deficits on railway operation would have been even greater than what the hon. Minister of Railways has stated to-day did we not have these ships working in co-operation with our railway system.

Mr. DUFF: Absolutely not.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Well, I differ from my hon. friend there. I am quite willing to adopt the policy of the Canadian Pacific Railway. There is no better managed corporation than the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and if the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have seen fit to operate a large fleet of cargo and passenger ships in conjunction with their railway system, and to keep their marine accounts separate from their railway accounts in order to be able to tell what profit each branch is making, the Government of Canada cannot be wrong in following that policy. It has come to my notice since I have been minister, and I knew it before, that all transatlantic steamers are controlled by pooled rates. As a result Canada has been discriminated against time and again. How can we expand our export trade to South Africa, the West Indies and to other countries unless we own our own ships? Even if Canada did not make a cent on her ships, —I will go further than that and say, even if she made a loss,—the Government would be fully justified in carrying out their programme of owning and operating these ships. From what I have seen of the advantages of these ships in extending Canada's export trade, and also of the benefit accruing to our railway system from their operation, I am convinced that when the days of keener competition come, if those engaged in farming, mining, lumbering and manufacturing, either directly or as middlemen, find they cannot compete with other countries on account of our freight rates being a little high, I for one would think the Canadian Government Merchant Marine would be fully justified in lowering those rates in order that the products of our farms, mines, forests and factories could be delivered in any foreign countries on a basis that would enable our exporters to compete with the rest of the world. Therefore I will say as I take my seat that not only do I believe enthusiastically in the Government shipbuilding programme, but, without wishing to assume the role of a prophet, I also believe that if we are spared to meet here a year hence we shall be able to show a very much larger profit statement than the one I have already submitted to the House.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I differ from my hon. friend in his statement that we cannot build up an export trade without owning a merchant marine. He has made that statement constantly, and, in my judgment, it is without foundation. It is low freight rates that give a country a chance to build up an export trade, and you do not get low freight rates under government management. At the time the ships came under government management in Great Britain, the freight rates went up something like 58 per cent, and in some cases as high as 85 per cent, and when the same ships went back into private ownership the freight rates dropped again. That is what happened in England. Low rates will give you a chance to export; high rates will cripple you. Surely the Government of Great Britain is just as anxious to build up export trade as is the Government of Canada at the present moment, yet what is the Government of Great Britain doing? It is selling every ton of shipping it owns and putting the ships back into private hands, and it is selling them at a price a little more than one-half of what my hon. friend is paying now for the ships he is building to compete with those very ships for the export trade. The Government of the United States is just as anxious to build up an export trade as my hon. friend can be, but what is that Government doing? It is making arrangements to transfer all the ships it holds into private hands, and the price is mentioned at about $100 a ton. When my hon. friend says that export trade cannot be built up by a country without the Government owning the merchant marine, I want to tell him that it has been done. No country in the world has built up such an export trade as Great Britain, it has beaten

the world in exports, and imports as well, and while doing that it did not own one ton of shipping. My hon. friend will have to revise his information on that question before he is very much older.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I just want to confirm in two words what my hon. friend (Mr. Sinclair) has said about Great Britain. I daresay many hon. members read the very informing article in last nights' papers from an American correspondent in London pointing out that Great Britain since it parted with its government ships and sent them back to private ownership has exported more goods in the month of February just past than it had exported in any given month since the beginning of the war, that is, since the year 1914, and that those exports were going up every day. That is the condition of affairs under private ownership in Great Britain, which country, after all, does know something about shipping and cuts quite a figure in the shipping world.

But my main purpose in rising was to deal with a much more important statement of my hon. friend. A week ago he stated that the money we are voting now was to end existing contracts, and that on their completion the Government was going out of the business.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: That is right.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Then I need say no more. I hope my hon. friend does not misunderstand me.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: If the hon. member will allow me, I made the statement before, and I make it now, that the Government has finished its shipbuilding programme. I presume that is what my hon. friend refers to.

Mr. M. CLARK: I am very glad to hear that assurance; it simplifies the proceeding of getting this vote through so far as I am concerned. But in his speech to-night I certainly understood my hon. friend to express a very enthusiastic opinion in the direction of the Government's continuing this business, and I thought that statement not consistent with the interpretation, which it appears was correct, which I had put upon his statement when this matter was previously before us.

Mr. DUFF: I understood the minister to say last week that as the result of the operation of these nineteen steamers he had $1,500,000 cash in bank and Victory bonds. He told us also that there was a net profit of $1,400,000. To-night he tells us that he has only $432,000 in the bank and $504,000 in Victory bonds, a total of $936,000. There is a discrepancy which I should like the minister to explain.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Accounts receivable are also considered as cash; these amount to $492,247.75. Outstanding freight is also included.

Mr. DUFF: I admit that I am not much of a business man, but I never heard tell of accounts receivable being put in the bank as cash. If that is the way the Minister of Marine does business, the quicker he sells his ships the better. Accounts receivable are not cash, therefore the Minister of Marine deliberately misled this committee when he told us that he had $1,500,000 by way of cash in the bank and Victory bonds.

The CHAIRMAN: I must ask the hon. member to withdraw the words "deliberately misled."

Mr. DUFF: Well, unintentionally misled the committee. There is no question that there is not $1,500,000 in the bank. The minister also told us that there were liabilities of $627,000 and outstanding accounts payable amounting to $340,000, a total of $967,000. According to these figures, instead of having $1,400,000 to his credit, the minister has only $500,000. Then, he does not allow for depreciation. If he can offer an explanation of that I shall be glad to hear it.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I have said on more than one occasion that the net profits were arrived at after providing for operating expenses, overhead, depreciation, interest on cost of ships, and insurance. If the hon. member wishes me to read the figures again I will do so, but they are as I gave them a moment ago.

Mr. DUFF: I would like to have the thing explained so that the committee will understand it.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Very well. The current assets of the company are as follows: Cash in banks, $432,576.13; Victory bonds, which are the same as cash, $504,583.33; accounts receivable—I said, not that they were cash, but that they were equal to cash—$492,247.75; outstanding freight, $71,411.05; material and supplies, $1,668.87; a total of $1,502,487.13. Equipment, $8,502.03. Deferred charges: insurance, $505,284.27; advance wages, etc., $8,263.97; grand total of assets, $2,024,537.40.

Mr. DUFF: What does equipment, $8,502.03, mean?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I assume that it would mean office furniture, and so on.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Has the minister a list of the contracts that have been awarded since November 11, 1918, and their amounts?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: My deputy will get the information and I will give it to my hon. friend when it is ready.

Mr. MANION: Frequent reference is made in the House to the wonderful advances of British foreign trade, as if the British people were the only people who carried on any foreign trade. Nobody disputes that Britain has made wonderful advances in foreign trade but it is a fact that in the period of twenty-three years between 1890 and 1913 the foreign trade of the United Kingdom jumped, in round figures, from £748,000,000 to £1,403,000,000, an advance of 87 per cent, while in the same period the foreign trade of the United States jumped from $1,647,000,000 to $4,278,000,000, an advance of 160 per cent, nearly twice as great as the percentage of increase of British foreign trade during that period. The foreign trade of Germany between the years mentioned increased from £419,000,000 to £1,070,000,000, an increase of 155 per cent. The increase of the foreign trade of Germany and the United States was, therefore, twice as rapid as that of Great Britain. United States and Germany have subsidized their steamships; at any rate, they have been protected countries and have subsidized nearly everything.

Mr. DUFF: Did the United States have a government-owned mercantile marine?

Mr. MANION: I am not discussing the subsidies to vessels; I am referring to the suggestion which is frequently made that Great Britain has passed all other countries in the matter of foreign trade and pointing out that according to these figures, which are absolutely reliable, the United States and Germany have surpassed Great Britain in percentage of increase of foreign trade.

Mr. DUFF: Without any government mercantile marine?

Mr. MANION: I was not arguing my point regarding that, but they subsidize nearly everything. I think Germany subsidized her mercantile marine. I will give another set of statistics that might be of interest to the committee along the same line. In the thirty year period from 1875 to 1905, the foreign trade of the United Kingdom increased from £655,000,000 to £972,000,000, or an advance of 48 per cent, whereas during the same thirty year period the foreign trade of the United States, that highly protected country that is so often abused because it is protected, jumped from $1,046,000,000 to $2,636,000,000, or an advance of 151 per cent, or proportionately over three times the advance made by British foreign trade. I thought that perhaps, in view of the fact that here and elsewhere Free Trade Great Britain is so often quoted as being the only country that has made any advance, it would be interesting to the committee to know what some other countries that are protected have done.

Mr. McMASTER: Referring for a moment to the interesting figures placed before the House by the hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion), I wish first to say that he is using the very unsound percentage comparisons which were the fundamental unsoundness of the abortive campaign for protection which Mr. Joseph Chamberlain carried on in England some fifteen or eighteen years ago. Of course, the percentage of progress made by people who come into a race later than their competitors who have been in the race for years, is bound to be much greater than the percentage of progress made by the latter. For instance, let us imagine that Nova Scotia had a fleet of 1,000 vessels and that Prince Edward Island had a fleet of four vessels, and that in one year the fleet of Nova Scotia increased to 1,500 vessels, which would be an increase of 50 per cent, while the Prince Edward Island fleet increased to eight vessels, or an increase of 100 per cent. According to the arguments of my hon. friend across the way, the progress of Prince Edward Island would have been twice as great as that of Nova Scotia. That is precisely the basis of his interesting figures placed before the committee.

To return to the subject matter of the debate of to-night, I am going to make a last appeal to the minister to get out of this business when he can do so with a profit. The minister is in a peculiar position to-night. He has told us, with one breath: I believe in government ownership and operation of vessels, and again in reply to a question asked by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark) he has, if I mistake not, said that after these ships are built, the Government is at the end of its shipbuilding programme, and—I presume he will correct me if I am wrong—its ship-operating programme.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: If the hon. member will allow me, I did not make any statement about the operation of the ships other than that they were operated and managed by the Canadian Government Merchant Marine. The reason the Government have ceased placing contracts for freight ships is because we consider that with 63 steamships with a net tonnage of 380,000 tons, we have ample tonnage to take care of whatever export trade the ships might be called upon to carry or whatever other service they might be called upon to perform in conjunction with the government railways.

Mr. McMASTER: First, as to the statement that it is the Canadian Merchant Marine Limited that carries on the business, that is merely a naval uniform for the Government. The Government will be and will remain, in the eyes of the people responsible, and I should like to know—the minister, I am sure, will tell me—whether it is the intention of the Government, once they have finished their shipbuilding programme, to go on with a ship-operating programme under the guise of this company.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Mr. McMASTER: That places the matter before us fairly and squarely. I think the Government, in this policy, is making a grave error which, in the long run, will cost the taxpayers of this country large sums of money. The first reason for my belief is this: The ships have been built at very high prices. Before I touch on the question of price, I wish to revert for a moment to this situation, that 18 contracts which were let for the building of 18 ships, were let illegally and improperly. I want that fact to sink into the consciousness of the Canadian people. What has the minister said in defence of this irregularity? He has said: I was very careful in letting those contracts, and I saw to it that the price was a fair one; I drove a hard bargain with people on the other side. With all respect, I wish to tell the minister that that is no answer. It is not for the Minister of Marine, nor for anyone in charge of a Government department to say: I am above the law; the law, it is true, lays down certain rules for my guidance; but I thought that I could, for the benefit of the country, depart from those rules so laid down. That was improper conduct on the part of the minister, and I trust the people of Canada will take note of it.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Will the hon. member allow me a question? I think the hon. member heard his leader read the law?

Mr. McMASTER: Not only did I hear my leader read the law, but I read the law myself to the House.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: If my hon. friend will allow me, when the armistice was signed, a great emergency existed in this country—

Mr. McMASTER: We are getting at cross purposes. I am not complaining as to the building of these ships before the armistice; I am complaining about the building of ships after the armistice. In my opinion, no such pressing emergency existed once the armistice was signed as warranted the minister in departing from the law.

The next point I wish to make is this. The minister has said: I know that I did not let the contracts at too high a price, because during the war contracts were let at a very much higher price. That is not an answer. The minister might have said: Since the armistice has been signed, Great Britain, in her shipyards, has built on government account ships at so much per ton; the United States since the armistice has been signed, has built in her shipyards on Government account ships at so much per ton. The minister has not done that; he has, in order to justify his action, compared post-war prices which he granted after the armistice with prices which were granted while the war was on, and that is not a fair comparison. The point which I wish to make is how unsafe and unsound it is for any minister to depart from what I regard as the plain letter of the law.

What is the present situation? We are asked to vote money to build ships at about $195 per ton, when ships with which these ships have to compete are being built or at least are being sold—and it makes very little difference whether they are being built or sold in Great Britain and in the Untied States at roughly half that price. In an article taken from an English paper I read the other day that there are as many ships in the world to-day as there were at the outbreak of the war. Now, if that statement is correct, and I believe it is, the minister will very shortly have to compete with ships as numerous as those before the war, and a great number of these ships will be pre-war ships which were built at $55 or $60 a ton. The reason why high rates are still being earned is that many of the harbours of the world are overcrowded, and ships have therefore to wait for cargoes, and we have not the free circulation which we otherwise would have. But freights are dropping every day, the practical mariner from Lunenburg (Mr.

Duff) assures me. I am glad the minister has made money for the Canadian people so far, if he has made it—other experts say he has not—but, anyway, so far he has got along without a severe loss, and I am glad of it because the Canadian people need every red cent we can lay our hands on. But the point I want to make is this—I have made it before, and I do not wish to labour it—the operation of tramp steamers is not a proper function for a Government department. All we do require is the initiative and the liberty which private ownership will give.

The minister has called to his aid the Canadian Pacific. He tells us that the Canadian Pacific own ships on the sea. Yes, they own the big transatlantic and transpacific liners for the purpose of rounding out their transcontinental system. But that is not the sort of boats the minister is building or proposes to build. If he was proposing to build 14,000-ton or 15,000-ton liners there would be something in that argument, but as he is building only tramp steamers of 8,000, 6,000, 4,000 and down to 2,200 deadweight tonnage, his argument falls to the ground. We have had an example both in the United States and Great Britain of government ownership of steamers. These two great nations have seen fit to return to private ownership. Is their example worth nothing to the minister? I venture to assert that there is hardly a shipping man in Montreal who agrees with the proposal of the minister and with the policy he has adopted.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Hear, hear. Not one.

Mr. McMASTER: I suppose the minister will say that is merely selfishness on their part. The minister has already said his line is subsidized, that if it does not pay for itself the deficit will be made up out of taxes. I wish to take emphatic issue with the minister there. A public service, whether it is publicly or privately owned, should pay for itself and stand on its own feet. The proposal that you should take certain activities of the Canadian people and socialize them, and then ask the whole Canadian people to make up the loss in operation is, I think, unjust. I believe it will not work. I believe experience has taught us that it has not worked in the past, and I believe it will not work in the future. We are dealing with vast sums of money in this matter. I presume that the minister will be able to get his vote through, in view of the large majority of members of this House who sit behind him, but I wish to raise my voice in protest against a grave mistake and a deep wrong to the Canadian people, and I only hope and wish the minister will heed my words.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) has pleaded eloquently and well for the agents of private steamship companies in the city of Montreal, from which city we both come, but that does not alter my opinion nor the opinion of the Government. Although my hon. friend heard the law quoted by his leader, he still says that contracts for 18 ships were illegally let. I repeat again, a great emergency existed. After the signing of the armistice we were bringing back hundreds of thousands of our returned soldiers.

Mr. McMASTER: How many returned soldiers were brought back in Government ships?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: None, but that does not alter my argument. The leader of the Opposition has cited the law, and within the confines of that law the Government ordered these eighteen ships. There was an emergency at that time. The whole country was upset. Thousands and thousands of men were out of work after the signing of the armistice. Hundreds of thousands of our brave men were returning from the front, and aside from the need for ships, which I claim the Government needed badly, a responsibility rested on the Government of providing work for the thousands of men who were out of work in this country at that time and for the large number of soldiers who were returning from day to day.

Mr. JACOBS: How long would it have taken to call for tenders in the ordinary way, assuming there was an emergency?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I have already gone over that ground several times, and I do not think it is necessary for me to go over it again. However, I do not want to be discourteous, and I will explain in a few words. With seventeen yards calling for public tenders and six out of the seventeen quoting lower than the balance of the yards, how could we have kept the whole seventeen yards employed to relieve the unemployment situation? I say that the Government kept within the law in placing these eighteen contracts since the armistice was signed.

Mr. DUFF: Was there an emergency in January and February of this year, when I believe some contracts were let?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes, I will come to that later. The hon. member for Brome apparently did not hear what I stated. He says that I only quoted pre-war prices.

Mr. McMASTER: I do not want the minister to take me up wrongly. I said that the minister compared the prices of vessels ordered since the armistice with the prices of vessels built during the war, not before the war.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I still state that the hon. member for Brome could not have listened to what I stated. Let me compare the prices paid by the Canadian Government for ships since the armistice with the prices paid by other countries. I have already given this information, but I have no objection to repeating it. A well-known steamship company in the old land that has a line of steamers running to Montreal paid, when the rate of exchange was at $4.80, the price of $216 per ton as compared with Canada's price of $167.50. France paid $170 per ton since the signing of the armistice, Norway paid $170 per ton, and the United States paid $185 per ton.

Mr. DUFF: Will the minister inform us in what way the idle situation constituted an emergency that could justify the placing of the contracts without tenders being called for?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am sure that the hon. member (Mr. Duff), who lives by the sea where there are not so many unemployed men as there are in other parts of the country, must be aware that the idle situation was one of the most serious problems with which the Government had to deal after the signing of the armistice. It was a matter of providing help for unemployed men, particularly returned soldiers, and under the law cited by the leader of the Opposition, a real emergency existed when such a large number of men were out of employment, apart altogether from the pressing need of getting the ships.

Mr. POWER: Is it not a fact that the Government voted for out-of-work soldiers a sum of $40,000,000 of which only $4,000,000 or $5,000,000 was expended. I can hardly see where there could have been such an emergency, if among the class which might have been expected to be unemployed, we did not find it necessary to spend more than one-tenth of the amount voted for the purpose of meeting unemployment.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Does the hon. gentleman argue that there were not thousands and thousands of men out of work in all the large cities and towns throughout Canada after the signing of the armistice?

Mr. POWER: I am speaking of the months of January and February this year.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Well, does my hon. friend say that in January and February of this year there were not thousands of men out of work in all the large centres?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. POWER: Apparently, from the Government returns there were not. If I remember rightly, during the month of January there were very few men out of work, at least if we accept the Government returns as given by the press. In any event, there was not sufficient unemployment to constitute such an emergency as would make it imperative that contracts should be given without tenders being called for.

Mr. JACOBS: Can the minister give us a statement as to the number of returned men employed in these shipyards?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I cannot give the hon. member the exact figures. There were twenty-five thousand men employed in the shipyards in Canada, and an equal number were employed in the allied trades, such as the manufacture of marine engines, boilers, winches, chains, etc. I do not know, of course, exactly what percentage were returned soldiers, but I think I can safely say that the returned soldiers comprised a very large percentage.

Mr. JACOBS: Is the information available?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The only way in which we could obtain that information would be by writing to each of the shipyards.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The minister promised to give us a list of contracts.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes. There were forty-five contracts placed before the signing of the armistice, and the contracts that have been let since then are as follows: Canadian Vickers, 4; Tidewater Shipbuilders Ltd., 2; Port Arthur Shipbuilding Co., 5; Harbour Marine, Victoria, 2; Kingston, 2; Coughlan and Son, 6; Halifax Shipbuilders, 2; Nova Scotia Steel Co., 3; Prince Rupert Co., 2; British American Co., 2; Collingwood Shipbuilding Co., 3; Midland Shipbuilding Co., 1; Wallace Shipyards, 2; Dominion Shipbuilding Co., 2.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: These contracts were for the construction of ships. Do

they include the entire equipment and furnishings of the ships as well?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The whole thing is awarded in one contract; there is no separate contract for furnishings?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No. The Government lets the contract at so much per ton, and its designs and specifications have to be followed. The shipbuilding company who get the contract have to place orders for the engines, boilers, and all the equipment that goes into the ship.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Is there any specification requiring the boilers, etc., to be purchased in Canada?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Are copies of the contracts available?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Certainly.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I understand that a ship called The Recruit was lost in the St. Lawrence. Has the minister received the insurance on that ship?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The Canadian Government Merchant Marine, who operate the ships, insured this vessel, the cargo of which was also insured. She is lying at the mouth of the Saguenay river, and will be salvaged without difficulty. For the information of the hon. member I may say that the Canadian Government Merchant Marine places the insurance on vessels and looks after all matters of that nature.

Mr. McMASTER: She is abandoned to the underwriters?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Mr. DUFF: The Government is not interested in the cargo?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Has no money been received yet on account of the insurance? In the statement which the minister has given us has he taken this wreck into account? Is it a loss, or how does it stand in the statement?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The Canadian Recruit, which was wrecked by heavy ice, does not enter into the statement I have presented to the House. I inquired of Mr. Hanna whether the ship and cargo were fully insured, and he informed me that they were. The ship has been abandoned to the underwriters, but whether or not they have paid any money to the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, I cannot say.

Mr. DUFF: What interest has the Government or Mr. Hanna in the cargo of the ship? I may be wrong, but I understood the minister to say that the cargo was insured by the Canadian Government Merchant Marine. What interest can the Government have in the cargo?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The shippers insure the cargo.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: A few days ago I made certain inquiries regarding a ship called the A. J. McKee, and the minister informed the House that at 31st December last there a balance against that ship of $269,254. Has that been charged against the profits of the operation of the ships during the year?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The statement I have given to the House does not include the steamship A. J. McKee, which was an old ship purchased by the Department of Railways and Canals before this Government was elected; and the answer to which the hon. member now refers was not given by me but by the Minister of Railways (Mr. J. D. Reid).

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: That ship, while it was purchased prior to the election, was acquired for the purpose of carrying freight, and was a part of the Government's policy. The fact that the ship was purchased in April, 1917, which I understand is the date, cannot affect the result. The minister, I think, should have charged that loss against the account, and should have given us a full and fair statement as to how the account stands. It occurs to me that it is not fair for the minister to give a statement leaving out the ship which made a large loss and putting in the vessel which made a profit.

Mr. ROBB: Before the item carries I want to get some information from the minister which may be of interest to the shippers of this country. I met only to-day the representative of the largest firm of cattle shippers in Canada who told me that during the winter they were compelled to ship cattle via New York because there were no ships calling at Canadian ports that were equipped to properly store cattle for shipment across the Atlantic. I want to know from the minister if he proposes to so equip the Canadian Government vessels that they can take care of the Canadian livestock trade. Another matter upon which I want to get some information is this: He

made the statement that heretofore Canada had been discriminated against in the matter of ocean transportation. It has been a complaint of the manufacturing interests of Canada that ocean freights discriminate in favour of the raw material and against the manufactured product; that is, that raw material oftentimes is carried at a cheaper rate than the equivalent of that material when manufactured. I would like to know from the minister what will be the policy of the Government in future in the matter of rates as between the manufactured product and the raw material. For instance, will wheat be carried cheaper than its equivalent number of bushels if put into flour? I think it would be only fair for the minister to make a statement on these matters at the present time.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: In answer to the hon. member I beg to say that the gentleman to whom he refers in speaking of shipments of cattle called upon me to-day. I told him that I knew of no reason why the Canadian ships should not be fitted up so as to carry cattle, and no later than this morning I referred this gentleman's letter to the manager of the Canadian Government Mercantile Marine at Montreal. I hope that the manager will take steps to see that the ships are so fitted as to enable them to carry Canadian cattle. The other questions to which the hon. member referred—

Mr. ROBB: Before the minister gets away from that point, is the statement correct that Canadian cattle had to be shipped all the winter from New York because of the lack of shipping facilities from Canada?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am sorry that I cannot definitely answer that question until I hear from the management of the Canadian Government Mercantile Marine. The other question the hon. member has put to me is rather a difficult one. I know of course the broad policy of the management of the Canadian Government Mercantile Marine. There is so much freight offering now that they are charging the same rates as any other company for similar freight. What they may do, however, when competition becomes keener, I do not know. Still, I can say this: That while not interfering with the company in any way at all, I suggested that when they found they could help Canadian shippers, no matter what the product shipped might be, by quoting a lower rate, I thought they would be justified in doing so.

Mr. McKENZIE: I see around me a great number of hon. members who come from the West and from the important province of Ontario where a campaign is in progress having for its object retrenchment and the exercise of care in the expenditure of every dollar of public money. When the minister is putting through this large item of $20,000,000 I observed that the representatives of the West, all along the line, were lustily cheering him and saying in effect: Well done, good and faithful servant, you have thrown the law to the wind, you have constituted yourself the high priest of patronage and you have during the last few years acted regardless of the requirements of the law. I wonder what the careful people and the careful farmers of Ontario and the West who want to know what becomes of their money—and they are right in being cautious and careful in such matters—would say to their representatives here who are almost jumping over their desks in their anxiety to pass this item of $20,000,000 without the slightest attempt to see that we are getting market value for that money. What an enormous amount of eloquence, ingenuity, and physical strength the minister would have conserved if he had simply complied with the law in this matter. When we are endowed with a great deal of ingenuity, eloquence and a capacity to get around things we perhaps depend too much upon such qualities. The minister is particularly talented in that direction and I am sorry that he has been put almost to the breaking point and compelled to use to the utmost the ingenuity and talent that he possesses when the very simple process of complying with the law would have avoided the whole of it. In the matter of building the ships there were, I take it, sixty-three separate and distinct contracts; perhaps there were, perhaps there were not; at all events there were sixty-three separate and distinct entities, drawing the long bow or going beyond the bounds of ordinary imagination for me to suppose that there were sixty-three different contracts. These contracts, I presume, were ratified by the Government by sixty-three separate Orders in Council. Now although the Minister of Marine has raised this controversy by asking for this appropriation from Parliament he is no more responsible for the passage and the ratification of these contracts than my good friend the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) who presided over the deliberations of the Cabinet when the Orders in Council

referred to were presented. The President of the Privy Council is a lawyer but the Minister of Marine is not, and the latter in the innocence of his heart perhaps never heard of the provisions of the law which have been quoted to-night until they were brought squarely to his notice by hon. gentlemen on this side. But the President of the Privy Council cannot plead ignorance of the law because he is in the happy position of being a member of the bar.

Mr. DUFF: What bar?

Mr. McMASTER: The bar of Ontario, of course.

Mr. McKENZIE: The President of the Privy Council must have read this law several times and therefore cannot plead ignorance of it. Now, if the Minister of Marine wants to be open and above board with the committee he will table these Orders in Council and show the reasons advanced in those documents upon which the contracts in question were ratified. In doing as he did he was getting away from the law and he must have had to advance sufficient reasons to justify a departure from the statute. Therefore, if the Minister of Marine in respect to the sixty-three contracts which were presented to the learned presiding genius of the Privy Council satisfied his colleagues that his reasons were good, he is no more to blame than the rest of the Cabinet who made a mistake in that connection.

I think my hon. friend the minister (Mr. Ballantyne) could have avoided all these difficulties by having all those Orders in Council brought down and saying: Here are the reasons I gave the Government; those reasons were good enough for the Government, and I am no more responsible for the policy adopted than are my colleagues. But I rather fear there are no such reasons, and that no business course was followed by him. I am inclined to believe that he had with him an aggregation of gentlemen just as willing to partake of the advantages of this patronage as he was himself—not personally, of course, but we know what are the advantages to a Government of such fat patronage as the millions that have been spent in this connection. I would advise the minister that in future it will be easier for him and for his successors to follow the law and let us have competition in every line of business, rather than constitute himself the dispenser of patronage among a few chosen concerns. It is not business, and I venture to say that he met but very few returned soldiers in the emergencies and necessities he imagined.

The hon. minister has not been in this House as long as some of us. During 1910, 1911 and 1912 we were told by his leader—not the acting leader but the Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden—that it would take us fifty years to have anything like a decent knowledge of shipbuilding, that we had no men here who could build ships, and that there was not a particle of God's green earth in this country strong enough to hold up a ship. But now we have this changed condition of things, that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries can take sixty ships in his hands, throw them around, and call upon returned soldiers just as they land, and, without the slightest training along these lines, place them in shipyards, and away they go as first-class shipbuilders! What a wonderful transition has taken place, and what a magic wand my hon. friend wields when he can shake it over those fellows and immediately they are transformed into first-class designers, shipbuilders, and riveters,—taken right from the trenches with the mud still on their boots—men who can do anything from the keel to the masthead! These are wonderful days! Let me say again to the minister that he made a great blunder in trying to get away from the law even at the advantage of giving work to the returned soldiers—and so far we have had no evidence that those men received any such benefit.

I cannot allow this opportunity to pass without reminding the minister that there is something else behind this shipbuilding programme which has escaped the notice of himself and of other hon. members around him. I remember, Sir, when I was going to school long ago one of our books contained an article about a boy called "Solomon Slow," who was said to be the son of a gentleman. I have no doubt that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is "the son of a gentleman" and also more or less of a Solomon Slow. It will be remembered that in 1909 this country adopted a naval and shipbuilding policy. We could have built ships at that stage for $50 a ton, whereas we are now paying nearly four times that sum. But for political purposes—and this is what I want to bring home to the minister and to the people of this country—the party which sits behind the minister and this Government—because, after all, it is one and the same Government—abandoned the naval policy and abandoned also the shipbuilding policy we then adopted. As any person will see on perusing the speech of the Right

Hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) who spoke on that resolution on the 29th of March, 1909, the very policy now being pursued was then outlined in his speech and in the speech of the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier; in fact, everything we are doing now was contemplated at that time. After hon. gentlemen opposite came into power we did all we could to impress upon them the necessity of getting to work at once and building ships, but year after year went by, the war came, prices went up, and what could have been obtained for $50 a ton at the time we were urging action is now costing them $190 and possibly $200. I think it is only right to bring to the notice of the country that this dilatoriness and the hope of gaining a party advantage by refusing to accept our policy have landed the country in the expensive program which is being carried out to-day.

I wish to pay some slight attention to my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) in reference to the plate mill at Sydney. He finds fault with the building of that mill. I took issue with him on that point when it was discussed last summer. He says that on account of the attitude I then took I lost the leadership of my party. I would say to my hon. friend that if the two things were put up to me: McKenzie, you are going to lose the leadership; or the plate mill is going to be built at Sydney, I would say every time: Let me lose the leadership, and let the plate mill be built. I am satisfied, Sir, that the course I took on that occasion was the proper course, and that the building of the plate mill will be one of the best things that ever happened for this Dominion. Some hon. gentlemen are very much opposed to subsidizing the building of ships. I never had occasion to consider the question, and therefore I am not going to commit myself one way or the other.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. McKENZIE: Some hon. gentlemen say ironically "hear, hear." I have been quite a long time in this House and I have never yet hedged on anything.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. McKENZIE: When I had to do a thing I did it right square up. If I have to put myself on record about subsidizing the building of ships, when the occasion arises I shall not have very much hesitation about it one way or the other. But I do say to you, Sir, and to hon. gentlemen, that if the question of subsidies is such a frightful thing, it ought to be equally bad in all respects. I would like to ask hon. gentlemen from the West, and particularly my hon. friend from Red Deer, if he is opposed even to-day to the subsidizing of the building of the Canadian Pacific? Is he opposed to the subsidizing of the building of railways in every part of Canada, particularly in the West? Subsidies are necessary for railways to encourage their building and to give railway facilities in places where the roads would not otherwise be built. If that is a good thing,—and nobody in this House would contend that the subsidizing of railways was a mistake, —what is wrong with subsidizing steel, as we had it done in Sydney, or subsidizing the building of ships, if we cannot get them built otherwise and the progress and development of the country require their building? I see very little difference between one and the other, and although we have paid hundreds of millions of dollars by way of subsidies for the building of railways throughout this country, I do not think any hon. member would take the responsibility of saying that those subsidies should not have been granted.

Now, we have not yet reached the stage of finally passing judgment upon whether or not subsidies for shipbuilding shall be granted, but if the subject should come up I am sure, Sir, it will receive careful and deliberate consideration, and whatever is regarded as in the best interests of the country will be done. I hope that my hon. friend, who has got himself into so much trouble in connection with these contracts, will in the future, in connection with shipbuilding or any contracts that he may have to deal with, himself look up the statutes, even though he is not a lawyer, and not depend for everything, his shorter catechism and all the rest, upon the uplifting influence of my good friend the President of the Council.

Mr. MAHARG: How many of these boats were in service in inland waters during the last season?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: None have been placed on inland waters as yet, but now that we are getting from the yards a large number of ships which are of lake size I should think that a good many will be placed on the Great Lakes shortly.

Mr. MAHARG: The minister can do nothing better than place as many of these boats on our inland waters as it is possible to place there. So far as transportation is concerned there has been operating in our inland waters the octopus of high rates,

whose tentacles have stretched out to such an extent that we are now paying freight rates three or four hundred per cent higher than we were paying a few years ago. The minister has a splendid field there, a good, profitable field. He may encounter some little opposition; I venture to say that had his programme been primarily intended for the inland waters he might not have received the support that he got a few days ago from some members representing constituencies particularly interested in inland water transportation. However, he may rest assured that he will have strong support from Western Canada if he will undertake to deal with this octopus which has been operating in our inland waters.

Mr. DEVLIN: I do not wish to delay the passing of this item. The matter is one of considerable importance; it involves the payment by the taxpayers of Canada of several millions of dollars. I assume that the Minister of Finance will find some way of getting the money, and then the taxpayers will have to pay the bill. However, what I particularly wish to discuss is the statement made by the minister a moment ago that now that we are getting so many of these ships, some of them will be operated in inland waters. For several years there was discussed in this House the advisability of utilizing the great natural waterway of the Ottawa district right up to the head of the Lakes in order to enable Western Canada to ship its grain to Liverpool with only one transshipment, and that at Fort William. That could easily have been done. It would have cost a few millions, but Governments a very few years ago were wary about spending millions even for the purposes of such great utility. The present Government, for reasons best known to themselves, thought it wiser to expend millions in the building of what is to-day known as the Welland Canal. I am not going to criticize the Government for the building of the Welland Canal. I have always been in favour of extending our water transportation, for it is the cheapest means of enabling our farmers to get their products to the markets of the world. But, Sir, the Welland Canal is becoming a very expensive institution. This year the poor Finance Minister will be called upon to take a few more millions out of the pockets of the people to be expended upon that project, and I do not think any member of the Cabinet can tell us when that expenditure will cease. Will the minister make a statement to-night whether in putting his boats on the inland waters he proposes to take such steps as will enable the Western country to send its grain through Fort William to the markets of the world via the Ottawa district waterway system? When I speak of the Ottawa district, I speak of it as extending all the way to Fort William. I do not want to intrude upon what the member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) has so ably advocated in the House on numerous occasions, but among the districts served by the utilization of this water route would be the New Ontario section and the Timiskaming section, on the Quebec as well as on the Ontario side, a district abounding in lumber and pulpwood. Will the minister give our mines, the richest in all Canada, a chance to be developed?—and when I say mines, I include the iron ore that is to be found in great quantities within reach of Ottawa. Will he give those who wish to take that iron ore from the ground a chance to ship with only one transshipment? Will be give to the farmers of that great section extending to Fort William a chance to ship conveniently their products out to the markets of the world? Is it the intention of the minister, when placing these boats on inland waters, to place them on one of the greatest waterways that Nature could give to any country? I speak of the Ottawa waterway known to most members of this House, in its immediate vicinity, known from say Deschenes right outside of Ottawa city to the Chats Falls, a distance of twenty-five miles, without a perceptible current, without the necessity of putting a lock or a dredge on the river and with a deep channel, perhaps, with a few locks higher up and a few more higher up still. The West will benefit; the East will benefit, Ontario and Quebec will benefit; my hon. friends from Nova Scotia will benefit, because when the ships come back after they have been unloaded, they will be able to bring to the people of Ontario the coal and steel of Nova Scotia. It is a well known fact that coal cannot very well go past the city of Montreal to-day on account of the high railway rates and on account of its bulkiness making it difficult of transportation by rail. It is, however, the easiest thing in the world and the cheapest way to transport it by water. I know the minister might say to me that the building of such works is dependent upon the Public Works Department; but I ask him on account of the statement he made to-night, if, in connection with the ships that he has built, he will advocate my suggestion with his

colleagues in the Cabinet, with the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell), with the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton), who has a happy way of finding millions of dollars. Formerly, we were shy when we asked for a few hundred thousand dollars to expend on this system; aye, a million or two was a big amount; but to-day, if a man speaks in the millions, he is hardly understood.

The CHAIRMAN: I regret very much to have to call the hon. member to order, but this is not only a passing reference to the construction of the Georgian Bay canal. He has already admitted that it is not relevant to this item.

Mr. DEVLIN: I comply with your ruling. I do not know if I mentioned the Georgian Bay canal; I mentioned the Welland canal, and perhaps I was out of order. I know, however, the rules of the House and I do not wish to appeal from your ruling at all. I simply wish to ask the minister to make a statement whether, when he is putting the boats on the inland waters, he will consider placing them on the Ottawa river higher up.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I shall be very glad to bring the hon. member's proposal to the attention of the management.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I be permitted, as the Minister of Finance is in his seat, to ask him if the Government considers that it is going to be possible to meet this expenditure of $20,000,000 and other proposed expenditures that have been brought down without a further loan, or whether we may expect a loan in the course of the next fiscal year.

The CHAIRMAN: I am very sorry to say to the hon. leader of the Opposition that his question is not in order at the present stage. We are now in Committee of Supply, and it could only be asked in Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I bow immediately to your ruling Mr. Chairman, nevertheless this question has a very important bearing on whether or not we should vote such a large amount as $20,000,000. Before we do so, we should know where the money is to come from. It is one thing to vote $20,000,000 out of current revenue, and it is another thing to be asked to vote that sum to be met by a further loan. For my part, I prefer to hold the Estimate until we get from the Minister of Finance a statement in that connection.

The CHAIRMAN: I may assure the hon. leader of the Opposition that the money cannot be expended until it has been provided by the Committee of Ways and Means. When the House sits as a Committee of Ways and Means, the hon. member's question will be perfectly in order.

Mr. ROBB: With all due regard to your ruling, Sir, it is very important that the committee should know where we are to get this money from.

The CHAIRMAN: I have already decided when the question may be asked and when it must be answered. If the hon. member wishes to appeal from my ruling, he has, of course, an absolute right to do so.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Probably, if you are willing, Sir, the Minister of Finance might make a statement.

Mr. POWER: Am I to understand that the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) is to make a statement.

The CHAIRMAN: I have ruled three times that the question is out of order, and I hope the committee will abide by the ruling.

Mr. POWER: I asked the question simply because I thought the Minister of Finance wished to speak. I should like to ask the minister a question with regard to a question which I put to him this afternoon when the Orders of the Day were called. I drew his attention to the fact that there were four ships belonging to the Canadian Merchant Marine at present lying in the harbour of Quebec, and that cargoes could be provided for them by utilizing the Canadian National railways. We have been told again this evening that one of the principal reasons for creating our merchant marine was that it should work in conjunction with the Canadian National railways. There are, however, four ships now lying in the harbour of Quebec; the river is open; the port authorities at Quebec, the Board of Trade, have, I understand, requested the minister to load these ships and to send them to sea; and when I asked a question in reference to this matter this afternoon, I was told that that the minister had nothing whatsoever to do with the matter, and I was referred to the management of the Canadian Mercantile Marine. Surely, the minister who gives us a report as to its profits and loss in a year's operations, should be interested in knowing whether or not his hirelings, his employees, are conducting the affairs of this mercantile marine properly. It must cost some money

for ships like those lying in the harbour of Quebec to remain there for some time when cargoes could easily be obtained. Why does the minister not inquire from his officials, from those under his jurisdiction, or rather under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Railways and Canals? I may say in passing that before we opened this discussion, I had thought of asking this question, and that is why I asked the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. J. D. Reid) to remain in the House. Some hon. gentlemen thought it was a joke when I requested him to remain here and that I was trying to be satirical and ironical when I referred to the valuable contribution he had made to the debates last Tuesday. I had no such intention; I simply wanted the Minister of Railways to tell us why he permitted ships to remain in harbour when they might obtain cargoes. Since he is not here, I shall have to ask the Minister of Marine to give me some information with regard to the matter.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The answer is a very simple one. Those ships were not ready to go to sea before the ice formed so thick that it would be impossible to send them to sea. There is a second reason. All the ships at Quebec at the present time are having tween-decks put in them.

Mr. POWER: Was not this work performed during the winter? In the past considerable work of that nature has been done at the port of Quebec, and elsewhere, I suppose.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: This work has been carried on during the winter.

Mr. POWER: Then why are not the ships ready for navigation in the spring?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: They will be ready when navigation is open.

Mr. POWER: Navigation is open now.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am sorry I must differ with my hon. friend.

Mr. POWER: A boat, The Labrador, left Quebec not ten days ago for the north shore and back. It went as far down the river as there was any likelihood of meeting serious trouble from ice or from the climatic conditions at this season of the year. In other years boats have left for Gulf ports during the months of January and February. I find that boats have left for the Gulf ports on March 16, 23, 24, 26 and 31. A boat left on March 28 for the Gulf ports one year and returned on April 6, so there is no great exaggeration in my statement that navigation is open. In any case, if navigation were not open at this very moment, it seems to me it would be the duty of this Government and of the company which undertakes the operation of these boats to have a cargo ready for them. The minister will surely not suggest that navigation will not be open from the port of Quebec to the sea long before it is open from the port of Montreal to the sea. So I think it would be well to arrange for cargoes at Quebec in order to utilize these boats. I think the minister ought to give some other explanation than the one he has given. I do not think it will be satisfactory to the seafaring people of my constituency and of the district of Quebec, who know something about climatic and navigation conditions at this time of the year. I think the minister owes it to his own reputation, to the port of Quebec and to the country, to see that proper precautions are taken to see that these boats are not laid up a long time, and that the best possible service is given by the boats under the control of himself and his colleague.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Have any contracts for ships been given out since the first of October last?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: How many?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Seven or eight contracts have been actually signed since then, but they were agreed upon considerably prior to October.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Were there any contracts agreed upon after the first of October?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Two ships with the Coughlan Shipbuilding Company of Vancouver, and two with the Wallace Shipbuilding Company. The reason for the long delay in signing contracts with both companies was because of a difference of opinion as to price, owing to a change in the ships from coal-burning to oil-burning.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Do I understand the minister to state that a contract was agreed upon after the first of October?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I do not know the exact date, but I should say, yes.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Mr. Chairman, I think we have here a clear example of the danger of letting contracts without tender. In the month of September last I had an interview with a high official of the Department of Marine, and I inquired from him whether the Government was going to let

any more contracts for ships. Some clients of mine from British Columbia had asked me to get this information. I was assurred then by this high official that no more contracts would be let. That was in the month of September last. Now we have the admission of the minister——

Mr. BALLANTYNE: May I ask a question? There are only two steel shipbuilding companies in Vancouver, and contracts have been placed with both of them. Will the hon. member give me the name of the firm he represents?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Never mind the name now. I do not think any hon. member will doubt the truth of my statement. I repeat, I had an interview with a high official of the Department of Marine regarding contracts for ships, and his statement was that the Government programme was completely filled, and that there would be no more contracts let. That was in the month of September last. Now we have the admission of the minister that there were four contracts given for ships after the first of October. I submit that was a clear case of patronage. I submit that it is a very dangerous thing to depart from the law which compels the calling for tenders for any item over $5,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: When I asked the question a moment ago, I was endeavouring to facilitate the passing of this item, and unless means can be found whereby the Government can state its position in the matter of a further loan to-night, I would ask the minister to allow the committee to rise and report progress—it is about midnight—so as to give the Government a chance to bring down a statement.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I might make our position perfectly clear so far as we on this side of the House are concerned. We believe that the people of this country are not prepared to vote millions of dollars as a result of only a few hours' discussion, without knowing where the money is to come from to meet those expenditures. We believe the people of this country will want to know whether these expenditures will be met out of the revenues the Government believes it is going to be possible for it to get in the regular way, or whether they are to be met out of further loans. That reaches the very foundation of the Estimates the Government is going to bring down. I might as well inform my hon. friends opposite that we on this side of the House will continue to press for a knowledge of the Government's position on that matter. I certainly do not feel like voting $20,000,000 for the purpose that is suggested here to-night, until I know whether the Government is going to demand a further loan out of which to meet the expenditure. I feel in exactly the same position in regard to most of the other items that have been brought down in the Estimates. So I say to the Government, they will facilitate the business of Parliament if they make a statement on this point at the earliest possible moment, for until they do I should not like to see another item carried.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The hon. gentleman must surely know that the methods of raising money that the Government proposes to adopt are not disclosed until the Budget is brought down, and it is entirely improper and irregular to make any reference to Budget proposals before that occasion. Further than that, we cannot go. I am perfectly willing, however, to tell my hon. friend that at the moment I certainly have no idea of another popular loan.

Mr. DEVLIN: The Minister of Finance has just made a statement which would have been sound and would have held sway in this House some fifteen or twenty years ago. But to-day the people of Canada are not so much concerned about formality and the technicalities of the rules of this House in the consideration of the taxes which they have to pay. My hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, in the stand which he has taken has simply stated that we on this side of the House, who claim to have some responsibility to the public—and hon. gentlemen on the other side will readily agree with me that we have some responsibility, because we do represent some of the taxpayers of Canada—are not in favour of the practice, which seems to have been in vogue during the last few years, of having expenditures of millions of dollars foisted upon the Canadian people by a system of Orders in Council or by the mere statement of a minister who gets up and says: I assure you it is all right, and we need the money. I say with all deference to my hon. friend, the Minister of Naval Service (Mr. Ballantyne), that I for one should not like to be a judge of any man on either side of this House. I should not like to be charged with the keeping of any other conscience than my own; but I do say that it will facilitate and shorten the labour of the session, and help the work of ministers, if they would give all the information sought by

the people through the requests made by the Opposition. If they would do this they would find that it would be cheaper in the long run. I readily agree with what the Minister of Finance has said, that it is usual to wait for the Budget speech for a statement as to the country's finances and how public needs are to be met. But, Mr. Chairman, the minister will readily understand that when it comes to consideration of an item which carries with it the expenditure of millions of dollars, neither he nor I, nor any of the taxpayers of Canada who will be called upon to pay this sum of money, will be satisfied with a simple statement that the time to give information as to whether we shall meet this money by a loan or otherwise, will be given in the Budget speech.

Mr. ROWELL: I must ask my hon. friends to accept the ruling of the Chair. My hon. friends know perfectly well that the ruling which the chairman has given is but the statement of the invariable practice of the House. What my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) is suggesting at the close of the day, when it was understood the item would be disposed of—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There was no such understanding.

Mr. ROWELL: At the end of the day my hon. friend raises a question which he knows is contrary to the whole practice and procedure of Parliament since Confederation. Supply has never been held up pending the bringing down of Budget proposals, and there can be no new statement by the Minister of Finance as to general sources of revenue until the Budget is brought down. If my hon. friend wishes to take the responsibility of seeking to overturn the whole parliamentary procedure and practice in connection with the voting of Supply he is quite entitled to do so, but he cannot rise and say that so far as he is concerned the business of the House will be held up on that account, or intimidate the Government by any such statement. The Government is anxious to proceed. For two days full information has been given on the item, and all questions have been answered and now my hon. friend says that unless the Minister of Finance will rise and outline the financial proposals of the Government in reference to the raising of revenue, then the Opposition will hold up this item. The position, I say wth great respect to my hon. friend, is wholly unwarranted and unprecedented. The Government could not possibly accede to any such proposal as he has suggested, that the Budget speech should be anticipated on a question like this in Supply. All I ask my hon. friends to do is to recognize the ruling of the Chairman, who has but stated the invariable parliamentary practice in this House.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I desire to say that I have given frankly and fully every bit of information which it was humanly possible for me to give to hon. members. I could not have given it more fully if the members were ordinary shareholders in any large corporation. I appreciate very much the attitude of the leader of the Opposition and hon. members on the other side. They were quite within their rights in asking the questions they asked, and I am only too glad to have been given an opportunity to answer them as fully as I did. Now that that has all been done. I hope the leader of the Opposition and those associated with him will allow the item to pass.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I should wish to be the last to delay the proceedings, and, as I said a moment ago, I had in view only the facilitating of the passage of this item. The President of the Privy Council is entirely unwarranted in the statement that I am trying to change the procedure and practice of this House. It is no fault of the Opposition that we are now at the Easter recess and the Budget has not been brought down. I will point out to my hon friend that since Confederation there has been an understanding, in regard to the voting of Supply, that the revenues would be raised in the regular way. The irregular practice of the financing of loans was not a consideration formerly; to-day it is the biggest consideration in this country. I contend that there is no question in which the people of Canada are as vitally interested as the question of public expenditure and the taxation that may be necessary to meet it. It is quite impossible for us on this side of the House, who recognize the obligation we have to the people of the country, to be indifferent to the question whether or not further loans are to be raised in Canada to meet public expenditures, and what particular taxation the Government intends to resort to. To give point to what I say, let me repeat that I think it would be well for the minister to bring down the Budget at a very early date and, before proceeding much further with the Estimates, to inform the House how soon we may expect it. Because I may tell my hon. friends opposite

—not in any spirit of intimidation, but solely for the purpose of safeguarding the interests of the Canadian public—that the stand that we intend to take on this side of the House with regard to public expenditures will depend very much upon the nature of the Budget which is presented. I am glad the Chairman raised the point he did because it will enable us—and perhaps will enable the Government also—to see where we stand in the matter of further discussions on the Estimates. I cannot make it too plain that, until we get some intimation from the Government as to how it purposes to raise the revenues, it will be difficult for us to say whether particular items shall or shall not pass.

Mr. JACOBS: Before the item passes I wish to say that I am much disturbed in my mind as to the position in which the Minister of Marine finds himself owing to the fact that these contracts have been let without tender. If I remember well when the matter first came up the minister told the House that the contracts were of such a nature that it was impossible—having regard to the business of the country and the business of the department—to have tenders called for, that the nature of the business did not permit of the calling for tenders. Now, as I understand it, to-night the minister has changed his view. He says that an emergency existed and that consequently the rule requiring the calling for tenders had to be suspended and done away with. I do not agree with him, Mr. Chairman, and I wish to record my protest against the action of a responsible minister of the Crown in ignoring the solemn text of the law as its exists in this case. If the ministers of the Crown, if the keepers of the King's conscience, do not obey the law, how can you expect the rank and file to do so? Never was there a clearer case made out against the Government and a minister than has been made out here, and it seems to me that some action ought to be taken by this House and by the Government to protect the minister against proceedings which may be brought against him—probably in the nature of impeachment, or otherwise; I am not here to suggest what the proceedings should be or what the minister has laid himself open to. But it does seem to me that when a Minister of the Crown wilfully disobeys the law in the manner in which the Minister of Marine has done, surely the arm of the law is long enough to reach that minister.

What I particularly object to to-night is the fact that the minister should have shifted his ground. We went away last week comfortably believing that the minister in his wisdom was right when he said that the nature of the business did not permit of the calling for tenders. He explained why and gave us the details. Why is it that the minister has now changed his view? I think it ought to be made clear to him that in matters of this kind the law ought to be followed, and that for every ship there should be a tender.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: In view of the statement which the Minister of Finance has made that at the present time he does not contemplate another loan, so far as I am concerned I am quite prepared that this particular item should pass, but I wish again to repeat what I have already said, that the sooner the Government can see its way to bring down the Budget the better it will be for expedition of business in many directions.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Yes

The CHAIRMAN: In my opinion yeas have it. I declare the item carried.

Progress reported.

On the motion of Hon. Mr. Ballantyne the House adjourned at 12.10 a.m. Wednesday.

Wednesday, March 31, 1920.

The House met at Two o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill No. 40, respecting The Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Davis.

Bill No. 41, respecting The Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Nesbitt.

Bill No. 42, respecting The Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company.—Mr. Clements.

Bill No. 43, respecting The Kettle Valley Railway Company.—Mr. Green.

Bill No. 44, respecting Montreal, Joliette and Transcontinental Junction Railway Company.—Mr. Denis.

HOUSE OF COMMONS OFFICIALS—ORGANIZATION.

Mr. Speaker laid on the table of the House letters from the Clerk of the House submitting a plan of organization of the staff; and

also a plan of organization of the Joint Distribution Office.

BANKRUPTCY ACT (AMENDMENT).

Mr. S. W. JACOBS (George Etienne Cartier) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 45, to amend the Bankruptcy Act.

An hon. MEMBER: Explain.

Mr. JACOBS: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is introduced to amend the Bankruptcy Act in several particulars. Section 1 amends the first two lines of section 20, and provides that a trustee shall deposit in a separate bank account the respective proceeds of each estate which falls into his hands.

Another section provides for the payment of an indemnity to inspectors for the services which they render to the bankrupt estate. Under the present law inspectors are not entitled to any remuneration or indemnity.

Finally, we ask for the striking out of section 97 of the Bankruptcy Act, which declares that any person who maliciously makes a petition in bankruptcy upon another is liable to two years' imprisonment. We objected to this section last session, but it went through as drafted. I may say that the Bankruptcy Act has been carefully studied by the mercantile and financial interests of the Dominion, and the suggestions in orporated in this Bill have been made by the British Export Association of Canada—an institution which has in its membership about three hundred of the largest exporters of merchandise from Great Britain to Canada—at whose request I introduce this Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

SOLDIERS' WIDOWS AND CHILDREN.

Mr. MACKIE (Edmonton):

1. Have the widows with children or orphans received any share of the forty million dollars voted by Parliment last session?
2. Do widows with children or orphans get anything from the Canadian Patriotic Fund?
3. Do said widows receive as much assistance as if the father had returned?
4. Do they come within the scope of any scheme for re-establishment such as: Vocational Training, Special High School or College Training, Agricultural Training, Hospital Accommodation, Sanatorium Accommodation or Land Settlement?

[Mr. Speaker.]

Rt. Hon. A. L. SIFTON:

1. No.
2. Widows with children, or, orphans, are assisted by the Canadian Patriotic Fund when they are ineligible for a federal pension and when the man has seen service overseas. Under certain conditions assistance of an emergency character is sometimes rendered to widows even if they are in receipt of federal pension.
3. It is impossible to say if widows receive as much assistance as if the father had returned, as there is no way of telling the amount that he would have been able to provide in that event.
4. When necessary, and under certain conditions, the Canadian Patriotic Fund pays for hospital or sanatorium treatment.

SUPERANNUATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.

Mr. BURNHAM:

1. Is an employee of the Government superannuated when so entitled, according to age or according to capacity?
2. Does this apply only to those who pay into the Superannuation Fund or does it apply to those in the Government's employ who do not so pay?
3. What body administers the superannuation or discharge of Government employees?
4. Is that body authorized to set aside at any time the provisions of the rule or law governing the discharge or superannuation of Government employees?
5. If so, by what provision?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1, 2 and 3. The Governor in Council may grant a superannuation allowance to any person who has served in an established capacity in the Civil Service for ten years or upwards and who has attained the age of sixty years or becomes incapacitated by bodily infirmity from properly performing his duties, provided that said person has contributed to the Superannuation Fund in accordance with subsection 17 and 18 of Chapter 17, R.S.

The superannuation of every civil servant shall be preceded by an inquiry by the Treasury Board:

(a) Whether the person it is proposed to superannuate is eligible within the meaning of the Act; and,

(b) Whether the superannuation of such person will result in benefit to the service, and is therefore in the public interest; or,

(c) Whether superannuation has become necessary in consequence of the mental or physical infirmity of such person.

No civil servant shall be superannuated unless the Treasury Board reports that he is eligible within the meaning of this Act

and that such superannuation will be in the public interest.

Retirement shall be compulsory on every person to whom the superannuation allowance is offered, and such offer shall not be considered as implying any censure upon the person to whom it is made; nor shall the person be considered as having any absolute right to such allowance, but it shall be granted only in consideration of good and faithful service during the time upon which it is calculated. Nothing in the Act shall be understood as impairing or affecting the right of the Governor in Council to dismiss or remove any person from the Civil Service.

4 and 5. The Treasury Board simply makes recommendations to the Governor General in Council in accordance with the terms of the Act.

CANADIAN MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. CANNON:

1. How many vessels were built by the Canadian Merchant Marine?
2. Where were they built?
3. By whom were they built?
4. How many trips were made by each of the vessels of the Canadian Merchant Marine during last year?
5. What is the revenue of each of these vessels?
6. What is the cost of maintenance of each of said vessels?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. The Government contracted to build 63 vessels of which 19 have been delivered to the Canadian Government Merchant Marine for operation during 1919.

2. The vessels delivered to the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, Limited, were built at the following yards:

Seven built at Montreal by Canadian Vickers, Ltd.

Four built at Collingwood by Collingwood S. B. Co.

Four built at Port Arthur by Port Arthur S. B. Co.

Three built at Vancouver by Wallace Shipyards Ltd.

One built at Three Rivers by Tidewater S. B. Co.

3. Answered by No. 2.

4. Voyages were completed and accounts closed during 1919, as follows:

Vessel.	No. of trips.
Canadian Voyager	4
" Pioneer	1
" Warrior	3
" Ranger	3
" Recruit	3
" Volunteer	2
" Trader	3
Canadian Sailor	2
" Trooper	1
" Seigneur	2
" Signaller	2
" Miller	1
" Adventurer	1

Balance of boats delivered late in year and did not complete trips by December 31, 1919.

5. Total Gross Revenue, $3,448,030.25.

6. Total operating expenses, $2,041,262.87.

It is not considered to be in the public interest to publish the results of the individual vessels.

Mr. CANNON:

1. What is the surplus or the deficit of the last year's operations of the Canadian Merchant Marine?
2. What are the names of its vessels?
3. Who is responsible for the choice of these names?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. Nineteen boats in service, many of which were delivered during latter part of year and the results therefore cover portion of year only; surplus, $1,406,767.38.

2. Canadian Voyageur, Pioneer, Warrior, Ranger, Recruit, Volunteer, Trader, Sailor, Trooper, Seigneur, Signaller, Miller, Adventurer, Gunner, Aviator, Sower, Navigator, Settler, Spinner.

3. Department of Marine and Fisheries.

STEAMER CHAMPLAIN.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Has the Department of Marine and Fisheries given any contract for uniforms for the officers and employees of the steamer Champlain?
2. If so, to what company was the contract awarded?
3. Were contracts given for winter and summer uniforms?
4. Were the contracts given privately or by tenders?
5. If by tenders, what were the names of tenderers, the price paid by the department for said uniforms, and when was the contract awarded?
6. When, where and by whom were the measurements taken?
7. Are the uniforms finished and have they been given to the officers and other employees of the C.G.S. Champlain? If so, when? If not, why?
8. Is it true that the Government intends to deduct the price of each uniform for winter and summer from the bonus which these officers and employees are entitled to receive for 1919-20? If so, on what authority is the Government acting in such manner?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. Yes.

2. Summer uniforms: Faguy Lepinauy & Frère, Quebec. Seamen's trousers: H. B.

Simard, Quebec. Winter uniforms: The Christie Clothing Company, Montreal.

3. Yes.

4. Summer uniforms and trousers by tender. Orders for the winter uniforms were placed after a satisfactory price was arranged for a suitable quality of material.

5. Names of tenderers: A. Donati, H. B. Simard, Theodore Godbout, Jules Gauvin, F. Simard & Cie., Faguy, Lepinay & Frère, P. E. Gaulin, Syndicate de Quebec, F. A. Anctil & Cie., J. F. Belleavance, Napoleon Jacques. The prices paid were as follows: Summer uniforms, $27.50 per suit; trousers, $6.75 per pair; winter uniforms, suits, $45 per suit; long overcoats, $44 each; reefer overcoats, $42 each; peajackets, $39 each; trousers, $6 per pair; $1 per man extra allowed for taking measurements. Summer uniforms ordered 20th August last; winter uniforms, 17th December last.

6. The measurements were taken by representatives of firms making the uniforms. The information as to when and where is not available.

7. The uniforms are finished. The summer uniforms were issued to the Champlain on 24th October, 1919. Winter caps, mitts and mufflers issued 19th December, 1919.

8. No.

ST. LAWRENCE NORTH SHORE MUNICIPALITIES.

*Mr. SAVARD:

1. How many municipalities are there on the North shore of the St. Lawrence from Tadoussac to Esquimaux Point?

2. What is the population of each of these municipalities?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1. The erection of municipalities comes under provincial jurisdiction. The Government has no record showing the number of municipalities between Tadoussac and Esquimaux Point.

2. Answered above.

UNITED GRAIN GROWERS LIMITED.

*Mr. SUTHERLAND:

1. What was the value of the several lines of agricultural implements dutiable and free, imported into Canada by the United Grain Growers, Limited, for the year ending March 31, 1919, and what was the amount of duty collected on each of the several lines?

2. What was the value of said implements imported by said company for the six months prior to June 5, 1919, and what was the amount of duty collected on same?

3. What was the value of the several lines of agricultural implements held in bond by the Customs Department for the said company on June 5, 1919?

4. What was the value of the agricultural implements imported by the United Grain Growers, Limited, dutiable and free, for the six months immediately following June 5, 1919?

[Mr. Ballantyne.]

Hon. Mr. BURRELL: It is contrary to the practice of the Department of Customs and Inland Revenue to give information which would disclose the business of an individual importer.

DOMINION GENERAL ELECTION.—LOST DEPOSITS.

Mr. DENIS:

1. How many candidates in the last Dominion General Election lost their deposits?

2. How many in each province?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. 169.

2. Ontario 51, Quebec 54, Nova Scotia 5, New Brunswick 9, Manitoba 12, British Columbia 18, Saskatchewan 11, Alberta 9.

ANALYSES OF STOCK FOODS.

Mr. SUTHERLAND:

1. How many samples of each of the following named stock foods or feeding stuffs have been analysed by the Dominion Analyst with a view to determining as to whether they comply with the Acts relating thereto, since June 1, 1919: Grain Products, Commercial Feeding Stuffs and Re-cleaned Elevator Screenings (Standard Stock Food)?

2. How many convictions have been secured for violation of the several Acts referred to?

3. What have been the penalties imposed, if any, the amount of fines paid, and by whom?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. On 6th October, 1919, the Dominion Analyst wrote Inspector Maisonneuve at Fort William for representative samples of Elevator Screenings. Three samples were furnished on the 15th October, classified as (1) Original Screenings, (2) Standard Stock Food, (3) Refuse Screenings. These samples were analysed with the following results:

(a) Hulls and dirt	30	per cent
Wild oats, black bindweed, snall wheat	20	" "
Mustards	15	" "
Lambs quarters	20	" "
Field pennycress	10	" "
Foxtail grass	4	" "
Stick weed, thistle, etc...	1	" "
	100	
Feed value—Fibre	16.1	per cent
Fat	5.9	" "
Protein	15.2	" "
(b) Hulls and dirt	40	per cent
Mustards	15	" "
Pennycress	15	" "
Lambs quarters	18	" "
Foxtail	9	" "
Others	3	" "
	100	

Feed value—Fibre	15.3	per cent
Fat	5.3	" "
Protein	13.8	" "
(c) Black bindweed	80	per cent
Wild oats, flax and wheat	15	" "
Mustards	3	" "
Others	2	" "
	100	
Feed value—Fibre	7.3	per cent
Fat	3.9	" "
Protein	13.2	" "

Registered Feeds:—Bulletin No. 438, dated February 12, 1920, period August to December, 1919.

204 samples reported.

Shorts:—Three samples in February, 1920.

Stock Feeds:—Three samples in June, 1919.

2. and 3. Seventeen convictions have been secured and penalties to the amount of $506.30 have been paid; seven cases are still pending.

Bran and shorts have not been largely dealt with during the period named, because an extensive inspection of these forms of feed had just been completed, and published as Bulletin No. 422 in June, 1919, and the staff of analysts has been so much depleted by resignations and by death that the whole force has been fully occupied in the routine work of the department.

Bulletin 422, dealing with bran and shorts covers the period July and August, 1918; represents 165 samples of which eleven were penalized, with fines amounting to $342.20. The names of those penalized under cases referred as above (Bulletin 438), are as follows:—

Sovereign Poultry Supply House, Edmonton; G. Harris, Dorchester, Ont.; G. A. Morris, Dorchester, Ont.; W. A. Blyth, Ottawa (paid by manufacturer); Crampsay and Kelly, Toronto; Canadian Feed Mfg. Co., Toronto; Wm. Hamilton & Son, London; Chisholm Mfg. Co., Toronto; Faramel Limited, Toronto; Campbell, F. M., Toronto; United Grain Growers, Vancouver; J. A. Beckett, Smith's Falls; W. A. Blyth, Ottawa (paid by manufacturer); Canadian Feed Mfg. Co., Toronto; Shand Brothers, Windsor, N.S.; Canadian Feed Mfg. Co., Fort William.

HISTORY OF CANADIAN BATTALIONS.

Mr. BOYCE:

1. What was the cost of printing Les Poilus Canadiens, Le Roman du Vingt-deuxieme Bataillon (Canadian-Francais)?

2. What was the total edition?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to issue a similar history of all the other battalions which went from Canada?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. $3,838.75.

2. 50,000.

3. Histories of a number of Canadian battalions were published by the Canadian War Records Office, but following the signing of the Armistice the publication of these histories was discontinued.

UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PAPERS.

Mr. CHISHOLM:

For a copy of all correspondence, reports and other documents in any way referring to a proposed change in the site of Beatonville Post Office, Inverness County, N.S.

THEFT OF $50,000 FROM EDMONTON POST OFFICE.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE (Edmonton East) moved:

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams, reports by detectives and others, and other documents relating to the theft of fifty thousand dollars from the post office in the city of Edmonton, and to George Armstrong, postmaster of the said post office, as well as to all employees in the said post office so far as all these may relate to the said theft of fifty thousand dollars.

Hon. Mr. ROWELL: Before the motion is adopted I have one observation to make. If any of the correspondence referred to is such that its being made public might lead to a disclosure of the plans of the police in connection with the apprehension of the criminals, it should not be brought down, but generally, I think, the correspondence might be brought down.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE—MOTION BY MR. MOWAT.

Mr. H. M. MOWAT (Parkdale) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient that the men of Canada between the ages of eighteen and twenty-five, other than those who are crippled and infirm, should receive physical training, to increase their ability in civil and industrial life, and to fit them to defend their country against invasion or aggression, and that for this purpose the Department of Militia and Defence should organize training schools and camps so that all such men should have an opportunity of putting in four weeks' time annually for training for seven years, with the option of increasing the yearly period of training in any year so long as the training does not exceed twenty-eight weeks of a man's life.

And that in the opinion of this House national service should be universal in a democracy and not left to whim or preference and that a volunteer system tends to produce class feeling and is unfair.

And that it is expedient to curtail the customary expenditure for military purposes and that the Government of Canada should, as

soon as may be, cease to employ or maintain a permanent or standing army, and that when a sufficient number of young men have been trained they be formed into a reserve for defence purposes, and that no pay be given other than for subsistence and separation allowances, together with a reasonable sum for pocket money and comforts in the field.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this resolution brings up for debate in Parliament the important question of national defence, which has already been settled by our sister dominions the Commonwealth of Australia, the Dominion of New Zealand, and the Union of South Africa.

I know that there are some who dislike even the discussion of the question of physical training and measures of defence; who think that any such discussion is the thin edge of the wedge of militarism But there are few—none in this House, I should think—who will say that Canada, now a nation, should have absolutely no means of defence. We must, therefore, consider from time to time whether we have the right kind of defence; whether we have paid too much for the system that we have employed in the past and whether we can with advantage improve it.

If this motion is carried it will affirm three principles: First, that it is important to improve the physique and morale of the younger men of the country; second, that volunteer training in time of peace is unfair, because the burden should rest on all instead of a few; third, that it is desirable to replace when the time arrives a permanent army with a trained unpaid force. It is needless to say that the motion refers to conditions in peace time, not in war time. Not long ago the country differed sharply on the question of compelling men to go to war. That question is not touched by this resolution; it is covered by the Militia Act, which, I suppose, will now take the place of the Military Service Act, 1917. So that the question of conscription or the question whether we shall or shall not take part in outside wars has nothing to do with this motion.

As to the improvement of the physique of our people, I think I had better leave that phase of the subject to some other members who desire to speak with regard to it and who will be better qualified to do so than I. But it is important to remember that when our young men went up for examination with a view to taking part in the great war, sixty per cent of them were found physically defective and ineligible for enlistment. They were found to be defective in eyesight, to have defective teeth, to be defective in limb and in heart action—all these things which prevent a man from being in a perfect or even an ordinary state of physical health and fully equipped to cope with the world and make his living. So I leave that question to others, hoping that they will deal with it.

Then, there is the question of the morale of the people. Morale, as I understand it, is that indefinable influence which makes for efficiency, fraternity and cheerfulness under adverse conditions. I am sure that Canada would be none the worse if these desirable qualities were obtained. Morale includes discipline. When one speaks of discipline one arouses the ill temper of the individualist who says that his son is not, if he can help it, going to be made to obey or to salute another man's son. That class of person, on account of unfamiliarity with training, does not understand what discipline means. Discipline is the bringing about of that state of mind which makes a man willing to submit his general conduct for the time being to those whom he acknowledges to have the right to impose their will upon him for the purpose of attaining an object admitted to be beneficial to all. Faithful performance of duty is the joint product of patriotism and self-respect. Some think that there is a lack of discipline of mind in Canada and that consequently our ways could stand improvement in that respect. It is more than doubtful whether we are happier because of the scarcity of that kind of discipline. Discipline produces respect for elders and for women; it produces self-respect tempered with considerateness. If these desirable qualities can be obtained by universal training, then we cannot too soon commence going about their attainment. One speaks with some consideration for those men whose environment and habits of mind have produced a prejudice against discipline, order, mutual action and unity of effort. But the trouble with such citizens is that they are useless to the State in time of peril. These clog their protests against compulsory training with a tyranny of words such as "slavish," "un-English," "militarism," "coercion," forgetting that the Allied nations were not the creatures of kings and autocracies, but were democracies and had to pay for their democracy by providing strength to enforce its principles.

On this feature of the question I should like to quote from a speech made by the Hon. H. S. New, of Indiana, in the United States Senate not many months ago, in mov-

ing that his Bill for universal training rather than a large permanent force, be referred to the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate. He said:

> What is true of the men of Pennsylvania is equally true of the troops from other states. Few of them had ever seen machine-guns until they were forced to face them, so that it was pathetic. It was the inevitable consequence of our smug complacency. It could have been prevented in this instance; it must be in the next, if there is to be a next, and no idealistic dreams of leagues of peace and the brotherhood of man convey guarantees that there will not be. Unless occasion comes, the citizen army need never be mobilized, but its members will have the benefits that accrue from judiciously applied physical training, of discipline and the improved conceptions of the obligation of citizenship that military training brings.

I think that is a fair statement of the view held by a very large number of men in both countries who believe in a change in the system of defence.

The motion involves the declaration that voluntaryism, which we have had so long, is unfair. Voluntaryism leaves the work to the few, those who may have a liking or think they have a liking for physical training, and it allows to escape all those who are indifferent. It tends to build up a class or a caste in the country, and that is certainly not for the benefit of Canada. Compulsion, of course, is always looked on, especially in Anglo-Saxon countries, with some aversion, but we all know that we must have it in order to carry on with our ideals of Government. We must have compulsion, most people think, in education; we cannot leave it to the parent to say whether his child shall be educated or not, because there must be the education of the whole community to conduce to the greatest good. That principle was first advocated in 1845 by Lord Macaulay, and now there is no nation of any pretension to civilization that does not require compulsory education. We have compulsion in the matter of taxes. It is not left to the whim or the dislike or the preference of the individual whether he shall pay taxes or not pay them. He may thoroughly disapprove his municipality; he may disapprove his Government, and he may think that the best way to exhibit that disapproval is by refusing to pay his taxes; but no country could get on under such a system, and so the payment of taxes is compulsory. Some men object very much to paying the income tax and the excess profits tax, but these taxes must be paid. In the matter of health, there must be compulsion to aid the efforts of the officers in forcing certain men to do certain things. A man is sometimes quarantined for weeks at a time, although he may think that very unnecessary, in order that the health of the community may be protected. His business suffers; his state of mind is rebellious against the Government because its will is imposed upon him, but this must be done. The rule of the road is a compulsory thing. Many men think that in the central parts of Canada we should have the rule of the road which exists in the coast provinces of Nova Scotia and British Columbia where the people drive to the left instead of to the right, and many people think that is the correct thing, but the rule of the particular province must guide, and there is compulsion to make a man take a certain direction. Therefore, it is unfair that the argument that this measure is compulsory should militate against it.

It is unfair that the defence of the country should rest entirely upon the ardently patriotic man and good citizen, leaving the slothful or indifferent man to do nothing but make money and indulge in his private affairs. That produces a class. We all know that the militia until now has been looked upon by large portions of the community as a class or a caste, and the militia themselves get to feel that they are such; all of which militates against good citizenship. If we could have a force which would get the rich man's son and the poor man's son living together for some weeks, we would produce a good feeling between the classes which would redound to the common well-being. Each would be performing a national duty, and it would affirm the principle, with which I think nobody will quarrel, that all obligations in a democratic country should be borne equally. There are many authorities for universal service which have perhaps been lost sight of, as we got so accustomed to having the small voluntary militia, but it may not be out of the way to refer to one or two historic instances. Let us take Thomas Jefferson, President of the United States, who was regarded as the greatest exponent of democratic simplicity who ever was produced in that country. He was in favour of universal citizen service, and in 1813 he wrote to Mr., afterwards President, James Monroe:

> We must train and classify the whole of our male citizens, and make military instruction a regular part of collegiate education. We can never be safe till this is done.

Also, in a letter to J. W. Eppes, in 1814, he said:

> I think the truth must now be obvious that our people are too happy at home to enter into

regular service, and that we can not be defended but by making every citizen a soldier, as the Greeks and Romans who had no standing armies; and that in doing this all must be marshalled, classed by their ages, and every service ascribed to its competent class.

In his "Fifth Annual Message" to Congress, in 1805, he wrote:

You will consider whether it would not be expedient, for a state of peace as well as of war, so to organize or class the militia, as would enable us, on any sudden emergency, to call for the services of the younger portions, unencumbered with the old and those having families.

It is contemplated by this motion that only young men of from eighteen to twenty-five years of age—and I think they should be single men—should shoulder the burden of defence now that we have given over 500,000 men to the war. Some say: What is the use of defence now? We have all these young men who were at the war. But that suggestion is grossly unfair; these men have done their bit, and it is now only proper that the younger men coming on should assume the responsibility.

Going back further, we have the statement by no less a statesman than Demosthenes, in 380, B.C., who, because the Athenians had failed in their wars by reason of depending on mercenaries, addressed them thus:

Yet, O, Athenians, yet there is time! And there is one manner in which you can recover your greatness or dying, fall worthy of your past, and the manner of it is this: Cease to hire your armies. Go yourselves, every man of you, and stand in the ranks; and either a victory beyond all victories awaits you, or falling, you shall fall nobly, and worthy of your past.

Coming to later times, I might quote what Theodore Roosevelt, who I suppose was regarded as the greatest citizen of our neighbouring country to the South, said to his son, Col. Roosevelt, who mentions it in his book just published. "Ted," said Theodore Roosevelt, "every man should defend his country. It should not be a matter of choice; it should be a matter of law. Taxes are levied by law. They are not optional. It is not permitted for a man to say that it is against his religious beliefs to pay his taxes."

Canada's military force since 1855 and up to 1917 was entirely a voluntary one. The active militia was said to consist of 46,500 men. These figures are obtained from the report of General Sir Ian Hamilton, who had access to all the records of the Department of Militia and Defence in making his report. Of these 46,500, I would say that no more than 6,000 could be considered as even fairly well trained for a campaign of modern warfare. About 15,000, or one-third of the whole, who attended training camps and parades were more or less ardent military men. The rest were attracted by the pay and the opportunity for obtaining an enjoyable twelve days' holiday with their fellows. In other words, Canada did not take its defence seriously, and there was little of the spirit that makes for a respected force. Outsiders looked on joining the Militia as a sort of game. Men who made a hobby of golf, football, lacrosse or hockey did not realize that training was a national duty as well as an individual pleasure. We might very well consider whether it might not be better to go back and adopt the example of Nova Scotia, which up to Confederation had a universal training law, as my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) well remembers. In 1865 Nova Scotia with its small population trained 58,760 men. Perhaps all these men were not fully trained, but at all events they had to answer to their names on muster. It is a great question whether we should ever have done away with the old system, when every man in the country was a soldier. That was given up, weakly, most people think, in 1855 and until the necessities of the war demanded a change.

The proposal in this resolution is first of all that men between the ages of 18 and 25 should submit to an obligatory annual training, thereby getting rid of the optional element which is the basis of our present system. The resolution asks that a universal training law should be passed as soon as possible. It may be said that this is not an opportune time to bring this matter forward, that we have just gone through a great war and are war-weary, that the clash has been so great that we shall never have war again. That, however, is a question, and it is also a question whether it is not at the time of the greatest weariness that we should look to the future. The man who has undergone the greatest fatigue from frost, for instance, wishes to lie down in drowsiness. That is the dangerous time, and his companions on the march or in the Arctic regions have to rouse him and keep him going or else he will perish. I am not going to give my opinion as to whether this great war, because it happens to be called great, is the last war. Others, however, do not think it will be. Marshal

Foch, whose sagacity is incomparable, said in January last:

> Who can say that Germany, whose ideas of democracy are recent and perhaps quite superficial, will not rise rapidly from her defeat and in a very few years will not try a second time to destroy us.

Mr. J. M. Keynes, who was a delegate to the Peace Conference which our ministers attended, and who is one of the principal financial men of Great Britain, in his book, "The Economic Consequences of the Peace," which is of a most interesting character, and which is now being read so widely, in the United States at all events, where they are making the Treaty a political football, says that the Treaty itself is more fruitful of the possibilities of future wars than if it had not been drawn. I do not dare to give my opinion as contrary to the two authorities I have cited.

As to the statement that the introduction of such a measure would mean militarism or produce the habit of mind of militarists, I do not agree with that. It seems to me there is nothing beyond that mere statement by those who think it would have that effect. Those who have studied the question do not agree that it would have the effect feared. I urge that educationalists in Canada are in favour of such a measure. They have studied the aspirations and needs of youth, and that alone is a good reason for introducing such a measure into Parliament at the present time. A commission of prominent educationalists from the provinces of Canada met not long ago and studied the question thoroughly, and we cannot afford to ignore the conclusion which they came to. This commission was composed of Dr. Burwash of Victoria College, Dr. Gordon of Queen's University, Dr. McKay, Superintendent of Education of Nova Scotia, Dr. Cody of Toronto, Dr. MacMillan of Halifax, Colonel Dauth of Laval, Rabbi Jacobs of Toronto, Principal Hutton, and others. Referring to the training of coming citizens, they made this statement:

> Genuine patriotism is developed by it. Not in an arrogant or offensive consciousness of national importance, but of faith in himself and his country that is one of the basic elements of a strong and balanced moral character. Drill defines in a boy's mind the need of active co-operation with his fellows and gives him a greater consciousness of his own individuality.

The next point which I wish to draw to the attention of the House is the necessity, which I quite admit, of having organized labour behind this measure. Unless they approve of it, it would not likely be enacted and could not be effectively enforced. I am convinced that when organized labour studies the measure in the light which has been thrown upon it by their leaders for many years in all countries, they will not oppose such a measure, although I know it is the popular impression that they would. Labour has made many mistakes, as they will be the first to admit, in the last thirty or forty years. They have discarded some tenets which they formerly held most devoutly, and I am inclined to think that if there are in the ranks of labour those who are opposed to such a measure, they must in time see that it is for their own protection. The unthinking man, if I may put it in that way, in the ranks of labour who has not thought or read much, looks upon an armed force as something which would impede his effort to get his rights by strikes. But that is due to the fact, in Canada at any rate, that there has been a caste or class, the militia, which has been called out to interfere with the actions of the men when on strike. That is the very thing I wish to avoid in asking that this measure be enacted, because, if the proposal were adopted, the very ranks of the militia of Canada, which I have hope will be the only military force, would be filled with organized labour itself. The trouble with labour, since we have had organized labour, has always been the failure of strikes, except in rare instances, because they have not had the discipline necessary to carry them on, nor have they had the willingness to obey the leaders. The consequence has been that, without proper discipline and training, any organized strike has soon become a mob, and has been unable to effect by force what it has desired. Let me say that the leaders of labour are in favour of this measure. One of their principal representatives is J. Ramsay MacDonald, at present not a member of the House of Commons in England, but soon to become so, I should imagine. After reading the French author, Jaures, he was opposed to this principle, having a lurking idea that he might interfere with the right of labour to strike. I think he reveals not only his own mind, but probably the opinion of the vast majority of British organized labour, when, speaking of the late war, he makes use of the following language in a book which he has written on the subject:

> The country has been grievously misled by a kind of pious pacifism which lulled it into a false sense of security, which refused to face the truth, which allowed it to drift into war while it was preaching peace, and which, when war broke out chirped about this being the last of the wars, and linked its aims in

those of war as the saviour of society and the herald of peace. The character of our present alliance is lucky for us, but it would be indeed a foolish nation that would trust everything to chance because it was once favoured by good fortune.

Ramsay MacDonald recognizes the risk run in being unprepared to combat such a scientific enemy as our late foe, and we members of this House of Commons heard Mr. Samuel Gompers after a session of the House last year, when that gentleman himself stated that at one time he was a pacifist but that, in view of the danger to organized labour that lurked in the national passion and prejudice of an enemy, he had been converted into what he described as a first-class fighting man. Some one has said that labour has no country. This cannot be asserted in view of the efforts and accomplishments of labour in the last war. There is implanted in the minds and hearts of men of moderate means and income, an attachment to race and country which does not exist among capitalistic or aristocratic classes, for the reason that the workingman depends upon the security of his home to a far greater degree than do the affluent and leisure classes. The workingman cannot travel or set up establishments in other countries than his own, as the wealthy can do; as a result of his nomadic life the wealthy man is apt to become denationalized. We all know such people, and we know what nuisances they become. The man who travels incessantly, staying in his own country only part of his time becomes a cosmopolite on whom you cannot rely. But it is only because such a man has ample opportunity to travel that he loses the deep interest in his own country which every citizen should cherish. Jean Jaures is indisputably a leader in the ranks of labour, and in his book "Armee Nouvelle" which, translated into English is "Democracy and Military Service," says at page 77:

> Leaving this formidable monopoly—
>
> Meaning a standing army.
>
> —to paid troops is repudiated. . . . . The whole instinct, the whole thought of the working classes in every country goes in the contrary direction. It is the workmen and socialists who demand military service for all. The people's one chance of avoiding the oppression of the army is to make that army their own. If democracy will only come to grips with militarism she will prove the stronger power.

At page 78 he says:

> If a nation is found bent on following a policy of peace and justice, why should it hesitate to call on every man for the common good.

It may be said by the unthinking in the ranks of organized labour that it is a capitalistic idea to have a large force. But I would ask, if labour in Canada were represented in the army, how could it be possible to call out that army to suppress labour troubles?

Australia has passed an Act such as I am now advocating and pleading for, and it was passed at the instance of labour. Oh, it will be said, that is because they wished to keep out the Asiatics, who they fear will bring down the price of labour. That may be so; but suppose that is the reason for their passing the law, are we exempt from the same menace in Canada? We know what a strong feeling exists in the minds of Canadians in the western coast province that they must keep their province intact in the matter of labour. Such a nation as Japan, powerful and wealthy, or China, may insist that it shall not be treated in the way in which it has heretofore been treated. I am not of course stating this as a matter of probability, but let us suppose, rightly or wrongly, that either of these nations should insist upon different treatment from that which has been accorded it in the past. Where, I ask, is the force among the labouring people of British Columbia to insist on their rights? They would be helpless. They might argue and resolute, but they would have no force worth speaking of to maintain the rights which they now claim. It therefore behooves labour, for whom I am now speaking, to see to it that the strength of the force of Canada shall not be altogether composed of the class that may be opposed to their interests, but that they shall enter that force themselves.

Then, in regard to the historical interest of the subject, I appeal to my hon. friends here, who come from the province of Quebec, to give the matter their favourable consideration. The province of Quebec gave us our present defence system. The militia originated in French Canada, and as a fact of historic interest, I may be allowed to say that it dates back to 1649, and was intended at first to be a protection against the warlike Iroquois. It was reorganized in 1676 by Frontenac, and remained up to 1760 under the form given to it by that pro-consul. The British authorities adopted the plan of the French and maintained it for nearly a hundred years; it was a universal service allowing, in its letter, no favouritism or individual preference. It received no pay or equipment, each man furnishing his own piece. The parishes were responsible for units of varying size. The captain of mili-

tia was a man of influence and ability. He co-operated with his seigneur and the curé and he had a special banc d'honneur in the church. Training in camp and organization, transportation, etc., were unnecessary as they were in the blood, and the habitants training was confined to practice at the target.

I am relying for these facts upon the papers and books of that capable writer, Mr. Benjamin Sulte, who is now enjoying an honoured old age in this city and whose capacity to deal with historical matters of that sort will not be disputed. The old militia was governed by ordinance up to 1777 and in 1808 an Act 48 George III was passed in Lower Canada known as the Militia Act, the preamble of which is as follows:

Whereas a well regulated militia is of the utmost importance to the defence of this province; and

Whereas the laws now in force for the training thereof are in some respects defective.

It enacts:

3. That every male inhabitant, from sixteen to sixty years of age, shall be deemed capable of bearing arms and shall enroll his name as a militiaman on the first training day x x x be under a penalty for neglect of a fine of ten shillings.

This was the Militia Act for Quebec and that with the Act of Upper Canada which followed gave us the militia which we had for so many years. It was an obligatory militia. Nobody complained of it and if those who were parliamentarians in 1855, when that system was changed, so that training became optional, had been far-sighted enough the obligatory system would have been maintained to the present day. Any way the fact that the militia was constituted as it was and that it practised rifle shooting with assiduity shows

3 p.m. that when it was called upon to defend the Canadas from the invader it was there and the record of the stubborn resistance and heroism of the trained men of the citizen army displayed at Chateauguay, Queenston Heights, and Lundy's Lane, will forever remain. But for the militia, assisted, it is true, by the loyal Indians, Canada undoubtedly would have been lost.

The Act of 1855 was continued until the Union of the different provinces in Confederation. The Act of 1868 remained until 1904 when a revision of the statutes was made by 4 Edward VII chapter 25. Then the salutary and comprehensive provision that all men of fighting age should compose the militia was cut down and was made to read that they should be liable to serve in the militia. Instead of the authorities being able to reach out for the men needed there would have to be some legislative Act carried and perhaps only after a long and protracted debate could the men be procured. If the militia law that had existed for 200 years was a good thing for Canada my plea is that this provision should now be restored.

We have, in addition to the eminent educationalist of Laval University that I have referred to, an opinion expressed less than a year ago in this House by the hon. member for Gaspé and for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux). He says this:

I said a moment ago that I am not a militarist, but I believe, especially after the magnificent part Canada played in this war, that we should be proud of our militia and that we should maintain, within proper limits, a militia organization on a sound footing. In order to perpetuate that organization I think we should begin at the beginning. After all it is a manly sport. Reviewing my college experiences, I have observed that the students who turned out best were those who had joined the cadets and had done their part as good boys in the cadet corps. Just to give an example, I was reading some statistics on Sunday in a Montreal daily. The minister knows that possibly the best cadet corps in Montreal is that of the Mont St. Louis College. Because of the organization which has been maintained for years and years, and which has been a source of pride to the citizens of Montreal, during the war, from that institution alone, 325 boys joined the colours. I attribute that to the fact that they were trained as cadets in that institution. As much as possible in our colleges, academies and high schools all over the country, without spreading any militaristic spirit we should have cadet organizations in which the boys would take pride and which would give them an opportunity of taking part in a manly sport.

I find much to commend in the Swiss system. In Switzerland every man knows how to handle a gun, and we had evidence of that during the war. Although Switzerland was not engaged in the war, from the end of July, 1914, the whole Swiss army, which means practically the male population of age, was under arms in order to guard the boundary of Switzerland. In Switzerland, from the earliest moment of a man's life, he is called upon to practise all the military exercises. Yet it is a democratic country, probably the most democratic in Europe, and the entire organization is carried out with little expenditure. I am not for a carnival of expenditure in what I am propounding this evening; I think with a minimum expenditure you can have our young men fairly well instructed in their country's defence. I think the militia organization should be maintained on a proper basis, because it is a school which will bring the best results to our young men.

I also find in a newspaper published in the sister province, L'Evenement, the following:

On our side, we would ask the younger French Canadians to take a greater interest in the militia. Not only is there a very honourable career open to our young men if they will but profit by the advantages which are offered to all who wish to enter into that profession, but it is manifestly to the future interest of French Canada that we should not leave this vast field of activity exclusively to our compatriots speaking another language.

I hope my hon. friends who have come from the province of Quebec will not think it invidious if I refer to that province especially; they will understand that I do so because of the frame of mind which they seem to get into in regard to conscription for war. Of course, this has nothing to do with war at all but when we recall the history of the past and see what they have done in military matters, they should be the first to welcome such a movement as this. I have looked through the Militia List and I have seen that there are a great number of pages containing the names of cadet corps organizations in schools and colleges. You will find that in Quebec there are more cadet corps to population—and I am quite sure most of them are efficient—than in any other province of the Dominion. It must be that they have found it an advantage, just as has been said here by the hon. member for Maisonneuve that the training of the young men is a good thing for the country.

In coming to a decision as to what is to be done by ourselves it may be interesting to know what has been done by other Dominions and by the United States. I will conclude with a short resumè of the legislation in the other Dominions and in the United States. For twelve years a universal service law has been in force in Australia and for quite a number of years in the Dominion of New Zealand. I have the Acts of these different Dominions and of different provinces in these Dominions and I shall be glad to show them to anybody who cares to see them. In the Union of South Africa there is a universal training law and it has been found a very good law. If that has been the case why should we hesitate to put on the statute books a law with which they are perfectly satisfied and which conduces to patriotism and a feeling of national strength and self respect in those Dominions? Mr. Massey, the Premier of New Zealand, in making a speech in Canada in May, 1917, pleading that the state was entitled to demand the defence of all its citizens said:

In New Zealand it has proved a splendid success and has made it possible to have the whole manhood of the country (it exempts none) qualified to take up arms in defence of the Empire. Even if war were abolished compulsory military training for all men in the Empire would be an enormous physical benefit for the British race.

The Bill was carried in the House of Parliament by a vote of 65 to 4, or practically unanimously. Commenting on this a New Zealand paper states:

It is seldom that a principle so novel and so drastic can command so overwhelming a majority, but we believe that the proportion of twenty to one represents pretty accurately the feeling of the country.

Passing to our own continent, we find that this question is being debated with great vigour in the United States. In the Empire State of New York on May 6, 1918, after a long and deliberate debate—and we all know that the House of Representatives and the Senate of that State are composed of men holding diverse opinions on religion and politics—a law was passed making it compulsory for young men of sixteen and under nineteen to take training for forty-one weeks. To show how severe they made the penalty for refusal, that law provides that boys who have not certificates of attendance at training camps cannot remain at school, nor can they be employed by any person or corporation, and any person or corporation contravening the law in that respect is also subject to a penalty. Training camps are provided for summer training, and suitable buildings are made available for winter training, so that the ordinary work of the young men is not interfered with.

I hope we will adopt a similar plan in this country, which would easily give us at least 100,000 well trained men, and, as I will show in a moment, such a force would be vastly cheaper than the 4,000 men we maintain under our present system. The training could be taken up at different times to suit the convenience of the community. For example, a farmer might very well take up his training in the winter when his work is not so engrossing as it is in the summer time; while a young city man would do very well if he went to camp in the summer time. Apart from the physical benefits resulting from such training, the young men would also gain the advantage of making life long friendships, the dull monotony of their lives would be relieved, and in ten or twenty years with proper medical treatment—which I hope some other member better qualified will speak about—we will produce a race of men equal to any in the world and of whom we will be justly proud.

My remarks would not be complete without a further reference to the Republic of Switzerland, where the system I am advocating has been reduced, so to speak, to perfection. Switzerland has a population of about 3,000,000, and for many years it has enjoyed immunity from aggression by its powerful neighbours, solely by reason of the fact that all its men are trained in defence of their country. But compulsion is not necessary because every citizen welcomes the opportunity to serve his country. It is considered a disgrace there if a man by reason of physical disability or of his habits of mind is not capable of entering the militia, and even then he must pay a certain sum in lieu of service. It is said on good authority that the disgrace of having to pay is very keenly felt.

As we all know, Sir, Switzerland is composed of three races—the Italians in the south, and the German and the French in the north, and the parliamentary proceedings are conducted in three languages. The Swiss are a proud and self-respecting people, and during the greatest war of history they were able to maintain their independence and prevent invasion by their northern and eastern neighbours solely because those neighbours were afraid to overrun a country where every man was trained in military defence.

Mr. BELAND: Does my hon. friend believe that the Swiss army was more formidable than the Belgian army, which did not save Belgium from invasion?

Mr. MOWAT: Yes, undoubtedly, if my opinion is worth anything, and recognized authorities say so too, for the reason that every Swiss knew something about soldiering, whereas only a certain portion of the Belgians were trained as regular soldiers, and they were recruited from men engaged in industrial life. What did Switzerland do two days after the outbreak of war? In that short time the republic mobilized 526,000 men fully armed and equipped. Just think of the difference between Switzerland and this country in that respect, and of the painful efforts we made, extending over years, to raise a force which was not equal to the Swiss. The Swiss mobilization took place quietly and efficiently and without panic, for their system does not take their men away from industrial pursuits but simply makes them better citizens, and although they have no regular troops, they were in two days able to put themselves in a formidable state of defence. The permanent force of Switzerland is but a mere corps of instructors numbering 276. The Swiss does not want liberal pay for his militia service, he takes pleasure out of the early training. He gets nothing more than some comforts, tobacco, cigarettes, and so on, and sixteen cents a day, out of which is kept back two cents for a company fund, to which the Government contributes five cents. If we can obtain this boon it is to be hoped that similar principles will prevail here.

I look upon the pay system of the Canadian militia as a great evil; it holds up to a man the hope of getting some money out of the country, and that idea may be more emphasized than the idea of service. I sincerely hope that our men will not insist upon being paid for their services—and I am sure they will not, when the matter is properly put before them—during the few weeks that they spend under training each year for their country's good.

The question arises, does this universal military service in Switzerland interfere with the standing of Switzerland as an industrial nation? Does it take away from its ability to produce and be prosperous? Mr. Coulton, an Englishman, has written a very fine book entitled "The Case for Universal Service." Mr. Coulton addressed a questionnaire to one hundred business firms in Lausanne, taken at random from the directory of the city. Forty-six firms replied—a pretty good average, because it was no business of theirs, of course, to reply to this stranger's inquiries. These forty-six firms employed 9,263 persons. To the question, "Do you judge compulsory military service to be disadvantageous to Swiss trade and commerce?" forty-five answered "No;" many gave an enumeration of causes which more than counterbalanced the small loss of time involved; one returned a doubtful answer, but did not say "Yes." The concensus of replies was that the training engenders habits of discipline, cleanliness and efficiency which could not be brought about in any other way; and that is a cheap price to pay for training which makes a man a more efficient worker and a more useful citizen for twenty years thereafter.

I have some notes here with regard to the results of an inspection of the Swiss system by prominent labour men in the Old Country. Mr. John Ward, Labour member in the Imperial Parliament, who had made a visit to Switzerland, said in the House on one occasion:

I can give the House an illustration of what conscription means in one little State. Re-

cently I was engaged in making some investigations in Switzerland; and I went into a big engineering works at Zurich. I asked the manager what position he occupied in the Swiss army, and he replied that he was a private. I said, 'What! a man of your ability and education a private in the army?' He answered, 'Yes.' I then inquired, 'How is that?' and his reply was, 'I cannot shoot. I have always failed at shooting, and as that is considered an important item in the advancement of the Swiss officer, I am only a private.' Then I inquired, 'Who is the officer in command of your battalion?' and he told me he was a fitter in his shop. There you have a country where an opportunity is given to the workingman to be an officer over the manager of his works when they happen to be out for training. Of course, such a thing as that is opposed to all our ideas of exclusiveness. Aristocratic ideas are gradually encroaching upon the military organization of the country, as is the case in other branches of our national life.

About the same time, Mr. Seddon, another Labour member of the British House, said:

In visiting a continental country where they have a citizen army, what struck me most was the fact that many of the officers who were at the manoeuvres were the servants of the soldiers who were there as well. I had one concrete case where a major in the Swiss army was giving orders to a non-commissioned officer, and it turned out that the major was a commissionaire at the bank and the non-commissioned officer was the manager of the bank.

I now come to the United States. The month before last, two committees, one of the Senate and one of the House of Representatives, reported a Bill for universal military training in the United States. The Bill is No. S-3792, section 51 of which reads as follows:

All male citizens of the United States (excluding residents of Alaska and the insular possessions), and all male persons who reside therein and who have declared their intention to become citizens, other than persons excepted by this Act, shall, upon attaining the age of eighteen years, or within three years thereafter, be subject to military or naval training, and shall be inducted into the army or navy of the United States.

And so on. It may be said that that Bill will not pass. I do not know whether it will pass or not; I am not sufficiently familiar with American politics to be able to express an opinion. But although it has passed both committees, it has not been before either House. The Democratic Party met in caucus and came to the conclusion that as there was to be a Presidential election this year the time was not ripe for the adoption of such a measure; it would be unpopular with certain of the electorate. President Wilson, who is in favour of universal military service, wrote to them asking that they not take such a proceeding, having regard to the importance of the measure and the necessities of the case. However, they ignored him, as they seem to be ignoring him in some other things, and apparently the Bill is halted by the action of one party. Mr. Baker, Secretary of War, who was formerly an ardent pacificist, is now in favour of a measure of universal military service and has so expressed himself. In view of these facts, and of the fact also that New York State has passed such an Act, the matter is of vast importance to Canada. If our friendly neighbours to the south see the absolute importance of providing a system of universal military training of young men between the ages of eighteen and twenty-five and act accordingly, how are we to hold up our heads if we do not do something of the same kind? It is perfectly obvious that the United States has conclusively made up its mind that its mission in the world as one of the chief democratic nations requires it to become and remain a nation of military power. It took the United States a year to prepare for the war; such a risk will never again be taken by that country. We should be, and, I think, will be, too proud to give our neighbour to the south any concern that she may be called upon to afford protection to us. Our pride should be sufficient also to cause us so to train our manhood that Canada may be regarded not only by the United States but by all other countries as no mean ally.

The matter of the expense of carrying out such a system is important. We have a permanent force in Canada to-day of about 3,700 men. These men are taken out of industrial life and are therefore a loss to the country, and the cost of maintaining each is about $1,300 a year. For that amount we could train thirteen citizen soldiers; for I think $100 a year would cover the cost of maintaining a man in camp or barracks for one month each year. So that by adopting this system we should benefit in the ratio of 13 to 1. I grant that a man so trained may not at first be as efficient as the regular soldier, but in a few years the difference would not be so very great. Anyway, if we got into trouble we would have the citizen-soldier, with his keen feeling of patriotism and desire to serve his country, to offset to some extent the superior training of the regular soldier.

A comparison with Switzerland as to cost is interesting. According to the last figures available before the war, it cost Canada to maintain a peace army in 1913, $10,272,000, or $220 per man. It cost Switzerland $8,500,000 to maintain an army of 500,000 men.

Think of the difference--500,000 men as against 46,000 men and the former better trained than our men, except the regular soldiers, were. These figures work out that Switzerland, by definitely and earnestly taking up this question, as I say we should take it up in Canada, is able to maintain its soldiers at $17.30 per head as against our $220. We spent $10,000,000 in 1913 on our militia; this year our Estimates are $13,000,000, and although the particulars have not yet been brought down, I venture to say that that does not include the training of infantry in Canada this year. If it did, the amount would be very much greater.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE (Edmonton East): In the resolution the hon. member has moved, he speaks of training for four weeks a year for seven years. Has the hon. member any figures as to the number of men who would be in training during the seven years? The resolution calls for a reserve for defence purposes. What would be the number in reserve; how many reserves are there to be, and what would be the cost?

Mr. MOWAT: I should be very willing and glad to answer the question, and I think I could, but my answer would not be authoritative. After we have adopted the principle, then it could be worked out by those who understand such matters, but I understand that the number of men of this class, who were found by the registration of two years ago to exist in Canada, was 336,000. A large number of these may be excused, and while I do not know how that would work out, I should be inclined to think that you would find 200,000 young men, practically boys, for the force. If you called out 100,000 the first year so as not to make the thing too expensive at one time and took out 25,000 of these each time at different periods of the year, you would have a sufficient force to make a test whether this scheme was going to be a success or not. As regards the reserve, after the young man has completed his training and become a fairly efficient soldier, then he is put into the reserve and will not be called on again. I make the option, which I think is a wise one, that if a young man wants to do all his training at one time and get rid of it in order to go into business, or whatever his motive for doing so, may be, he can do so. But I am inclined to think that many, if not most young men will desire to have the annual training because it will give them freedom and a holiday which they will all enjoy. If the instructional staff which we shall have in Canada under such a scheme as this will be anything like the instructors in artillery, engineering, rifle shooting and infantry training which they have in Switzerland, we shall not be at all ashamed of the force that we shall have in Canada. The figures are startling, showing that we are wasting—that is not to strong a word to use—money upon the force as we have it at present, and if Switzerland can raise 500,000 men in two days at a less sum than that at which we can raise 46,000 men, and then have a great deal of doubt as to their efficiency, it is time for the Parliament of Canada to come to some conclusion about the matter.

BRIGADIER-GENERAL W. A. GRIESBACH (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I do not entirely approve of the terms of the resolution which has been moved by the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat), and which I am seconding, but the main principle of universal service is to be found therein, and for the purpose of bringing that before the House, I have very much pleasure in seconding the motion. In the discussion of this very important question, there are, it seems to me, two aspects of the case for discussion: First, the system which we have and have had and the system which we propose or which we might have. It is an important question, worthy of the consideration of this House, for we have just come to the end of a great episode in the history of this country, which has cost us 60,000 lives and an expenditure of $1,500,000,000. Nothing in the history of this country so stupendous and so far-reaching has ever happened before, and for that reason alone a discussion of our methods in the past and our proposals for the future is a matter which, in my humble opinion, exceeds in importance almost any other subject that we can discuss.

As my hon. friend has pointed out, we have had and probably will have in this country a system of defence which, in previous years, has cost us about $10,000,000 a year. Our paper strength was about 66,000 men and we were usually some 18 or 20 thousand men short; the officers were unqualified; the men had poor, and, in some cases, scarcely any equipment. We were emphatically not fit to take the field, and when war broke out it was six months after the declaration of war before we were able to put a division, 19,000 men, in the field. In other words, we required six months' training, and we asked of our Allies, and particularly of the British army that we should have six months in which

to train before we got into the field at all. Two years passed before we were able to develop our maximum strength. We went into this war under this haphazard system, or scarcely any system at all, and we may attribute to our system and to our unreadiness a very large proportion of our expenditure in money and not a little of our expenditure in human life. For one thing, we put into the front line trenches in this war, from the very outset to the last day, all the married men that we could get hold of. We began immediately to pay their wives and children separation allowances, and the Patriotic Fund made tremendous payments. And to-day we are confronted with a tremendous pension bill, a very substantial portion of which may be attributed to the fact that we had no system or method of selection whereby the young active and aggressive men did the front line work and the older married men were put elsewhere or were not called until very much later when they were required. Under the system that prevails and has prevailed, only men with leisure and money can afford to be officers. You will read in the newspapers now, if you are interested, a discussion which is going on about filling positions for commanding officers for units in Canada, and you will be surprised to hear that men who distinguished themselves as leaders of battalions and companies and units generally in France, find themselves unable to accept command in time of peace. Men who served with great distinction are now obliged to refuse for the reason that under the system that has prevailed a commanding officer must spend a great deal of his own money in providing amusement and entertainment in order to make the service attractive. He has to coax men to the defence of their country.

Then there is the argument put forward by some that the question of defence is not a live one in Canada, at the present time at all events, because we have in the country now about half a million men who have received military training, and they are and will be available. That is a fallacy. Furthermore, it is not a policy; it is an expedient. The major portion of the men who served in the front line, that is the men who did the fighting, are to-day between the ages of 22 and 32. In ten years' time they will be between the ages of 32 and 42. Now a man over 33 or 34 is too old for fighting troops. So it comes to this. In ten years' time the half million men that we think we have, or the proportion of them between the ages I have named, and the proportion is not so high as some think, will be over age. We shall not have this reserve, and without the adoption of a policy now we will be worse off then than we are at present. A military policy is like the construction of a building. It must be based on a broad foundation and must grow as the nation grows. You cannot improvise without heavy loss. You cannot improvise officers or material, and if you undertake to improvise an army you must do it at tremendous cost. I sometimes think I should like to see an inquiry set on foot in this country to ascertain precisely what this war has cost us.

In order that people who are interested in this matter may have something to visualize as a system of defence, I may say that last year I brought out and circulated through the press a scheme for the defence of Canada, based upon universal military service. I found in discussing this matter that almost every man who had served overseas, almost every officer who had anything to do with the militia of Canada, and almost every man who had given the matter any consideration whatever, agreed that the old system was a failure, that it was expensive, and absolutely a broken reed to depend on in time of trouble. If the old militia system had any merit or virtue at all, it was that it kept alive in this country the military spirit, upon which we were able to build up an army. It did little beyond that, and when one considers the amount of money that has been spent upon it, one wonders that some better system has not been devised. In answer to that question, in consultation with other people who are interested, I prepared a scheme for the defence of this country which I circulated from one end of Canada to the other, and concerning which I have received a number of very satisfactory replies. Some criticized, some offered suggestions, but there was general agreement more or less.

Let me explain the system. We had in all the provinces, and particularly in the province of Quebec, a cadet system. In some provinces the system is good, and in others it is poor, but we have a system of cadet training from one end of Canada to the other. I proposed that at the age of 12, which is the cadet age, the training should be standardized throughout the whole country, and that the boy of that age should receive medical, dental and oculistic examination, with free medical, dental and oculistic treatment, to be supplied by the State. I proposed that they should receive

this medical inspection and treatment throughout the term of their military service.

Mr. BELAND: From the age of 12 to 25?

BRIGADIER-GENERAL GRIESBACH: I will come to that in a moment. My system provided for junior cadets from 12 to 15 years of age, and senior cadets from 16 to 18. In that respect it conforms to the New Zealand and Australian systems. Let me not be misunderstood. I say that the training should be universal and compulsory. The boy will receive his training and his medical treatment by the State. No person shall escape. My proposal was that at the age of 19 the young man should go into a depot and receive three months' training in any one of the four quarters of the year which suited him best. Thereafter he would be drafted to a unit of the Canadian militia, and would be required to do one month's field training with the unit of the service which he selects. That continues to the age of 22. When he reaches the age of 23 he passes to the reserve, and is called up once a year, until he is 30, for medical examination and to fire a course in musketry. In other words, apart from the cadet training I would have every young man in Canada who is medically fit and who is not excused because of certain exceptions which would have to be provided—ministers of religion, judges, and so on—come up for training, and under this system every such young man would give six month's and seven day's military service to the country; three month's at the age of 19, one month at the age of 20, 21 and 22, and thereafter seven day's service in the reserve.

As to the training of officers, when a man had gained the rank of corporal in any formation he would be eligible to take the entrance examination for the officers' class; then after passing take three months' training and a graduation examination. Then for every subsequent step up in rank he would have to take the necessary examination. That would put the rank of officer and promotion within the reach of every man in Canada, with the result that in a future war twenty or twenty-five years hence, every man in Canada, whether he sat in this House or directed some of our great national enterprises, would be a reasonably well-trained soldier, and would be able to give his country a form and quality of service such as was not given to it by the various enthusiastic people who endeavoured to run this war for us in the last five years. I have some figures as to cost which I believe will prove interesting. I am sure that hon. members from Nova Scotia will be interested to know that in the year 1866 there was in that province a militia which might well serve as a model. With a population of 337,600, they had a military expenditure of $114,460. They had a military strength of 58,000, and trained 45,767, and their expenditure per head of population was thirty-two cents. The individual soldier cost them $2.50, and 16.22 per cent of the population were trained soldiers. In 1912 Canada with a population of 7,206,643, had a military expenditure of $9,352,570, as against Switzerland with a population of 3,758,300 with a military expenditure of $8,430,000. In Canada that year, with the expenditure I have just mentioned, we trained 48,000 men, and in Switzerland in the same year there were trained 331,610 men. The expenditure per head of population in Canada was $1.30, and in Switzerland $2.24. The individual soldier cost Canada $193.96, and under universal training the individual soldier cost Switzerland $25.42. New Zealand has the system which I recommend, and the individual soldier cost them in 1912 $94.03 as compared with our $193.96.

I quote from "Canada and National Service" by Colonel William Hamilton Merritt, page 214, a comparison of costs and results in Nova Scotia, Canada, Switzerland and New Zealand, from the years stated:

COSTS AND RESULTS.

	Nova Scotia	Canada	Switzerland	New Zealand
	1866.	1912.	1912.	1912.
Population	337,600	7,206,643	3,758,300	1,100,000
Military expenditure	$114,460	$9,352,570	$8,430,000	$2,560,200
War strength of militia	58,000	66,014	538,610	52,079
Trained militia available	45,767	48,213	331,610	27,225
Militia expenditure per capita of population	$0.32	$1.30	$2.24	$2.32
Militia expenditure per capita of militia strength	$1.97	$141.67	$15.65	$49.16
Militia expenditure per capita of trained militia strength	$2.50	$193.96	$25.42	$94.03

COSTS AND RESULTS—*Concluded.*

	Nova Scotia	Canada	Switzerland	New Zealand
	1866.	1912.	1912.	1912.
Cost of Headquarter and District Staff	.....	$194,460	$317,177	$82,760
Cost of Permanent Corps (without barracks, maintenance, etc.)..	.....	$2,199,907	$359,763	$568,620
Permanent officers and men, No.	.....	2,280	233	530
Percentage of militia war strength to population..	16.22	0.91	14.33	4.73
Percentage of trained militiamen available, to population..	12.80	0.64	8.85	2.47

There can be no question as to the value of the service; the efficiency of military service based upon universal training admits of no dispute. But an argument is frequently advanced that in such training there is an inherent danger of militarism. Now, "militarism" is a vague word which is veriously defined by those who make use of it. Its definition is very comprehensive, running all the way from the description as a militarist of the man who is a soldier of any sort, to the application of the word to the military despots of Europe. It has been laid down by the most eminent thinkers that in a democracy one of the principal obligations of the citizen is his duty to defend the state. From that duty there can be no escape, and John Stuart Mill says that universal training is the incident of citizenship in a democracy. The Swiss Republic, probably the most democratic country on earth, has for years trained every man to be a soldier, and it is an historic fact that wherever there has existed a small professional army under the control of an autocrat, the people not being trained to arms, therein have flourished rampant autocracy and absolutism, together with an absence of civil and religious liberty. On the contrary, in any country where the people were trained to arms, taking the national defence into their own hands, the freedom of conscience and political and religious liberties progressed. No nation in history has lost its liberties under a system by which the citizens were trained to arms. On the other hand, the nations which have lost their freedom and their rights are those who entrusted their defence either to aliens or to small professional paid armies. It is argued that a system of universal training would be subversive to our institutions and contrary to our principles. Well, at the moment compulsion exists under the common law; it exists under the Militia Act. Compulsion has existed in England since the days of the Edwards, and we resorted to it in the late war. Should we have another war we would resort to compulsion immediately, and we would do so because it is the only efficient method, the only method wherby power is given to the country and certainty imparted to plans of defence. It is the method which best lends itself to the proper disposal of the man-power of the country.

Some figures have been given by the hon. member who preceded me as to the value to the state of medical, dental and oculistic treatment and physical training. Our figures in this respect, in connection with our enlistments in Canada, are poor, but in the United States, of thirteen million conscripts examined for the army, three million of these young men were found to be medically unfit to defend their country. The medical officers who had charge of that branch of the service have expressed the opinion, which is borne out by almost all medical men in Canada, that of these three million men of military age who were found medically unfit, a very large proportion—more than half of them—suffered from complaints which could have been cured by timely treatment—complaints which the men need never have had had they been treated in the earlier stage; in other words, had preventive measures been taken. I venture to say—and in this I am supported by the best medical opinion—that if we had some system of training involving annual medical examination, with appropriate treatment, we could practically abolish venereal diseases in Canada. We could perhaps deal to a large extent with the drug habit which is growing upon our people, and we could deal a heavy blow at tuberculosis. In other words, with such a system of medical, oculist and dental examination, and with physical training we could build up a nation physically superior to almost anything that has gone before.

There is a third aspect of this training to which I should like to call attention. The other day the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Steele) introduced a resolution which attracted a good deal of attention in this House on the question of Canadianizing the alien. Some gentlemen who spoke upon that question commented upon the fact that, whereas many had spoken as to the propriety of doing something to Canadian-

ize the alien, nobody had brought forward a concrete proposal as to what ought to be done. Here is a concrete proposal. Let us examine the figures that bear upon the question for a moment to ascertain how important it is. The census of 1901 divided up the population of Canada as follows:

	1901 Per cent	1911 Per cent
British descent	57.03	54.08
French descent	30.71	28.51
Foreign descent	14.46	17.40

British and foreign immigration during the years from 1909 to 1918 was as follows:

	British	Foreign.
1909	52,901	94,007
1910	59,790	149,004
1911	123,013	188,071
1912	138,121	216,116
1913	150,542	151,890
1914	142,612	242,256
1915	43,276	101,513
1916	8,664	39,873
1917	8,282	67,092
1918	3,178	75,896
	730,379	1,325,718

The census for the coming year will disclose precisely how our standing now is but without doubt the percentage of British-born people and of French-born people is sinking slowly but surely and the percentage of foreign-born is increasing equally slowly but just as surely. I know of no other or better system whereby we can reach the alien and foreigner on so broad and comprehensive a plan as by the means of universal military service. I know of no better or other method of mixing the young alien with the native-born, teaching him our language, our laws and our social customs and giving him a conception of the ideal of sound democracy. I say that I know of no other or better system and indeed no other or better system has been suggested. For those reasons, on medical grounds, and having regard for what we can do for the foreigner, I commend this system to the careful consideration of the members of this House.

There is the argument sometimes advanced against universal military service that it may have a very serious effect upon immigration, that people would not like to come to a country where such a system prevails. I find that it does not affect immigration to New Zealand, Australia or South Africa. It does not seem to affect the emigration to the Argentine Republic, a country with less population than we have, a less area than we have and less inducements to people to come. Yet, between the years 1910 and 1913 a comparison of the figures shows that the Argentine Republic is about 26,000 people behind us in total immigration. We received 1,176,547 in the years from 1910 to 1913 while the Argentine Republic received 1,140,862 immigrants.

4 p.m.

Mr. M. CLARK: They have a very low tariff in the Argentine.

BRIGADIER-GENERAL GRIESBACH: I am not so sure of that.

Mr. M. CLARK: But I know.

GENERAL GRIESBACH: What they have had is a very severe, very strict and lengthy form of universal military training. The hon. member from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) may prove his point while I prove mine.

I should like to discuss for a few moments the phenomenon of war. Ever since I can remember a man who in Canada suggested, or advocated the desirability of being prepared for that which he believed to be certain to come, was considered to be an amiable donkey who must be tolerated and listened to because one had to listen to him but one in whom no particular stock was to be taken. Within my own lifetime we have had three wars in Canada which taxed our resources and caused us heavy loss in life and money. I have come to the conclusion that even although it may not be popular, even although it may apparently waste the time of some people, it is the duty of those who feel they know something of this subject to at least keep it under the consideration of any one they can reach, because, as I said a moment ago, the last war cost us 60,000 lives and a billion and a half dollars.

The ability of a country to defend itself and take appropriate action in great international difficulties is of paramount importance. Some people are disposed to take the view that war will be abolished as we become more enlightened, more educated, and more civilized. Well, those who study war do not come to any such conclusion. It is true that in the past there were wars based on dynastic causes, or they were the result of irresponsible rulers quarrelling with each other. These causes are now perhaps laid on one side; but the great and underlying causes of war that students recognize have not disappeared by reason of any improvement in education or in general knowledge. On the contrary, these causes still remain, they have become more certain, they operate with greater swiftness and with greater certainty.

If a number of families are crowded into restricted quarters, where sanitary regula-

tions are ignored and disease follows, the unfortunate people are brought before a magistrate and punished for their failure to observe those regulations; but it will be agreed that it was wholly wrong to blame those people, that the cause of that condition goes very much deeper and is to be found in the social and economic causes which contribute to such an unsanitary state of living.

And so it is with war. It is believed by certain people that because an Austrian prince was assassinated in a small town near Serbia armies were mobilized, swords drawn, and the great war started. No one really believes that such a catastrophe as overwhelmed this world could be attributed to any such cause. Other observers go deeper and believe that the war was due to the education and propaganda which had been current in Germany for the last thirty years, and which produced a great army and the war spirit. Well, that is quite wrong; the cause lies deeper still. It was due to Germany's over-population, over-production, and exhaustion of natural resources. All these causes working on one another led to the education, to the propaganda, to the spirit, to the army, and finally to the war.

Now, we have won the war, as we think, but we have not removed the cause. We have not taken any steps to reduce Germany's population and production, nor have we taken any steps to supply her with natural resources. So that the cause of the disaster still remains. We may have arrested for a time the breaking out of these people, but logically, we can do only one of two things to cure them: Give them the natural resources and the room for expansion which they demand; or exterminate them. We have not seen fit to do either. Probably Germany will seek expansion in Russia. If so, it will be at the expense of the Russians; and if not, we may expect trouble again. It will have been noticed that the newspapers of yesterday and the day before continued to chronicle the fact that with all the disturbances in Germany the authorities there had managed to conceal 12,000 field guns which were supposed to have been handed over to the Allies. The Treaty of Peace which we have made with them, running over a period of thirty-five years, will be so fruitful of all sorts of difficulties, that as the Allies cohesion weakens by reason of the diversity of their interests so we shall have Germany reasserting herself.

It is no use to talk about a defence system unless the possibility of war be admitted. Therefore, I want to lay down certain propositions which, in my judgment, govern and lie at the bottom of the wars which have been and of the wars which will be. My first proposition is this: When a nation militarily weak, small in population, occupying a large territory with natural resources greater than its needs, comes in contact with a nation militarily strong, with a large population that has exhausted, or is about to exhaust, its natural resources, war will in course of time ensue.

Secondly: When a nation militarily weak, having vast natural resources and unoccupied territory, denies commercial, industrial and social equality to a nation militarily strong, over-populated, with exhausted natural resources, and pre-eminent in social, commercial and industrial energy, war will ensue.

Thirdly: When a nation sparse in population, great in natural resources, and militarily weak, occupies such a geographical position that its neighbour, militarily strong, cannot expand except at the expense of the weak nation, war will ensue.

The trouble is that most men study history in periods of ten years and do not look at it for any length of time longer than their own lives, forgetful of the fact that six thousand years are recorded in history, and what has happened before inevitably happens again—nothing which now happens has not happened before. It is towards the study of history that I desire to direct the attention of the House for the purpose of showing that the very conditions existing to-day have existed before, and that precisely the same results have come from those conditions.

It is urged as against the possibility of future wars that the League of Nations is an instrument upon which we should rely. Well, the League of Nations is, after all, only a pious hope. Last year when the matter was under discussion the point I made—and I desire to make it again—was that our interest in the League of Nations goes no further than a pious hope that the nations which won the war will hang together long enough to secure as great a degree of compliance on the part of Germany with the Peace Treaty as it is possible to get. Beyond that it does not go; beyond that we should not rely upon it for a single moment.

To summarize, I have said that our present system is, having regard to results, expensive, and, as it is not efficient, it is wasteful. It is undemocratic, since it does not call for equal service and sacrifice on the part of all citizens, but rather lays the burden on such only as are willing to bear

it. It is inefficient; it does not give us a force that is fit for anything, either in training or in equipment. The war proved that; all our equipment was scrapped and six months' training was necessary before we could take the field. What right have we to ask or to expect that in the next war the sons of Britain shall make a rampart of their bodies behind which we may take six months to train ourselves? That is precisely what we asked them to do, and they did it.

I will be fair with the present system; it is better than no system at all. It kept alive in this country a military spirit upon which we were able to build up our army. It did give an opportunity in days gone by to men who were willing to give the time and the money to fit themselves as well as they could for the great responsibilities which they had to discharge when the war came—and that in the face of the parsimony of Parliament. When the Estimates of the Minister of Militia come up I shall support them throughout. I should like to point out that the militia Estimates for this year are one-forty-third of the total expenditure, while in 1913 they were one-fourteenth of the total expenditure.

Now, what is it that we propose? We propose that the burden of defence shall be laid equally upon all citizens—equal service and equal sacrifice for all. Is there anything wrong with this principle? If there is, what is it? We propose for the defence of our country that the best brains of our country shall participate in the work. We propose that leadership and command in the defence of our country shall be within the reach of the humblest citizens who demonstrate their fitness therefor. We propose a great annual stocktaking of the physical condition and educational standard of the nation whereby we may almost banish disease and illiteracy. We propose a great, comprehensive and far-reaching system whereby the immigrant, the foreigner, at his most impressionable age shall take his place in the ranks of the citizen army and learn our language, our customs, our laws; where in company with the rich and the poor, capital and labour, urban and rural, he may get the spirit of a sound democracy of equal privilege, equal service, equal opportunity, liberty without license and respect for authority. In other words, we plan a one hundred per cent Canadian nation. It is said that we propose to interfere with the economic life of the nation. To that I say, "No." Our proposal is to add one hundred per cent to the health of the nation; one hundred per cent to the Canadianism of the nation; one hundred per cent to the efficiency of the nation. Should our proposal cost five times our present military expenditure, it would be worth it.

Lastly, our proposal would give us an army—not a paper army, not a camouflage army, but a real army for the defence of our country; and the nations of the world would not pity us for our feebleness, but would respect us for our strength.

I have touched upon the phenomena of war. It is hateful, destructive, and so far as our limited understanding goes, senseless. But war has been, and war will be. Half the world is at war at the moment. We shall have wars. In all history no nation has grown great, no nations have survived, without war. Preparedness does not make war. If it did, nations not prepared would escape war, but they do not.

In that connection I should like to read from a book entitled "Our Military History, Its Facts and Fallacies," by General Leonard Wood, probably the next president of the United States:

> Every dictate of common sense, the teaching of history and the lesson of the moment, suggest strongly and unmistakably the urgent necessity of the organization of the might of the nation, in order that we may be ready to meet force with force, if other means fail. Reliance on peace treaties is not a safe policy. Experience shows they often mean little in the face of a great crisis threatening the life and interests of a nation.
>
> Preparedness does not mean militarism or an aggressive military spirit; it means simply the application to the military questions of the day of something of the experience and lessons of the past as well as those of the present. A man armed against thieves is not prone to become a thief unless he is one at heart. A nation can be strong without being immoral or a bully.

I do not hope that anything we say here to-day will bear immediate fruit. That would be too much to ask. We should not be true to our national mentality if we did not worship our false gods to the end. But I do ask that you will take this great question into your consideration. I ask that when next you send your sons and brothers to war, you give them a chance for their lives—that you send them with proper equipment, with reasonable training, and under skilled officers. If you do that, you will do a great service for Canada. And if you fail, you may live to see our national life go out in overwhelming disaster and bitter humiliation.

Mr. M. R. BLAKE (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, in supporting this resolution in favour of universal military service, I desire to deal with that aspect of the question which relates to the health of the nation as it would be improved by the training and by the inspections that would take place during that training.

Our present system of looking after our men who are at war is well organized; our Army Medical Corps have done their share towards winning the war by keeping up the efficiency of the men. Napoleon could have won out if he had had a well organized Medical Corps to look after his army, but he had not, and we know what the result was. In South Africa a great many more men died as a result of tyhpoid than were killed by Boer bullets. The first really well established medical service in war was that of Japan; the results of the services rendered by her medical officers very greatly reduced the losses and thereby increased the army's efficiency.

It is even more necessary to look after our manhood in time of peace so far as health is concerned, because efficiency depends upon the health of the nation. Our developing manhood has not in the past received as much attention from a national standpoint as it should have received. The best stockman, any man who takes an interest in stock, will look after the development of his young cattle, horses, sheep or whatever it may be, and aid them and in every way bring them along to perfect full-grown animals. The health of the young manhood of our nation can be much improved by training and a better and nobler manhood thus produced. If the stockman finds it necessary to look after the development of his stock, it should be the nation's bounden duty to look after the development of its manhood. One of the benefits of training may be shown in the fact that, while the military regulations required men to have a chest measurement of 34 inches, after the war had continued for a year or two, it was found that the chest expansion under military training and proper exercise developed, so that in the later years of the war, men were taken in with deficient chest measurement, the medical officers knowing that they would develop and come up to the requirements through training. One officer told me that it was a recognized thing that the tunics all became too small after three months' training, so as to necessitate a supply of new tunics. That was not due to the surplus food with which they were being served in the canteen, because I think the people of no nation in the world ordinarily enjoys better food than do Canadians. It might be said of those who come from the slum districts of London that the improvement was due to proper food, and exercise in the fresh air, but that would not apply to Canadians who ordinarily get the best of food and are accustomed to outdoor life. This marked development in the chest and lungs of men on military service proves the benefit resulting from military training. We would not have had so many shell-shock cases or psycho-genetic afflictions if we had had the men trained before the war. Their psychology would have been trained; they would have been used to manoeuvres; they would have been accustomed to cannonading; they would have the military spirit; and with the changed psychology there would have been a great deal fewer of the shell-shock cases, or the psycho-genetic cases that have resulted from the war. I feel that a young man's education is not completed until he has had a good training in discipline. Sir Willian Whyte, who was Vice-President of the Canadian Pacific, attributes a great deal of his success in life to the training he had received in the volunteers of Ontario in his early days. Shakespeare has made some reference to the fact that a man's training is not complete until he has learned to dance, and he goes on to say how much better a man is in bearing and deportment after he has learned to dance—all of which may be true. Men who have been trained in discipline are more prone to make a success in the commercial world than those who have not. Many of the homes in our cities are not overburthened with discipline; the children do very much as they like from their ealiest years, and it is lamentable to see in too many of the homes such a lack in this respect. This lack would be supplied by military training, and not only would the health be improved, but the psychology and viewpoint would be changed. Our youth would regard life more seriously, and, when they got a job, they would not be waiting around for five o'clock and pay-day, but they would on the contrary get down to business and produce an honest day's work. Such would be the effect of discipline, and the result would be of incalculable benefit to the nation. The good book says: "He that ruleth himself is mightier than he that taketh a city." Self control, which is brought about only by discipline, not necessarily stern, but firm and kind, is something that will help

a man to rule himself in his after years and make him more efficient.

Millions of dollars of this country's money were spent in training men for a while to fit them for overseas service, and then many of them failed either in this country or after they got to England, because they could not stand the strain. When you consider that it cost about $2,000 to send such a man to England, you will realize how much better it would have been had the physical defects been discovered before the man left Canada, and how still better it would have been had disciplinary training revealed the defects at an early stage. It cost us $2,500 to put a man into France, so that you can see what a great sum of money might have been saved to the nation by the proper training of our young men and by eliminating the weak ones.

In the United States, it was found that out of every thousand men examined in the whole of the American army there were 557 defective. These figures are startling, and they show that by preparedness much could be done to offset this unfortunate condition. I am told that Kid McCoy, the great prize fighter, appeared before the military medical tribunal and was told that he was not fit for service. I believe flat-footedness was his trouble. He said: "But I am physically fit; I am very fit. Do you know who I am?" "I do not care who you are," said the medical examiner, "You are not fit for training and I must reject you." He said: "I am Kid McCoy." The medical officer replied: "I do not care who you are; your feet are flat." This deformity does not come on suddenly; it is improved by calisthenic exercises, and most up-to-date orthopedic surgeons agree in giving calisthenic exercises such as standing up on one's toes, to strengthen the muscles and preserve the contour of one's foot. If there had been proper inspection of the youth by medical men and these corrective exercises indulged in during their earlier years, Kid McCoy and thousands of others like him would not have flat feet. Rupture or hernia affected many of the men, and with proper inspection, these cases would have been probably all or nearly all operated on and cured before they were called upon for active service.

In Manitoba to-day 12½ per cent of our deaths are due to tuberculosis. Most people probably do not take a full breath every day and never exercise their lungs sufficiently. The benefit that exercise has upon the lungs may be exemplified by the case of the blacksmith who, with his right hand, is hammering with a heavy hammer and with his left, merely turning over the steel, and the result is that his right biceps is from one and a half to two inches larger than his left. Exercise produces strength and an athlete does not prepare for a contest by lying in bed, but rather by going in for severe and hard training. The same thing applies to the lungs, and men who take physical exercise, who live in the open, who do laborious work, are free from tuberculosis. A friend of mine applied for admission to the flying corps. He was told: "We cannot take you; your chest measurement is deficient." He went home and worked at the dumb bells and practised deep breathing every night and inside of two months he passed a successful medical test for the flying corps. That man's mind had not been directed into the proper channels before; but when he saw the deficiency and was told how to remedy it, he learned a lesson and attained the object he desired. Had this large percentage of 12½ per cent of the population who die from tuberculosis in Manitoba been treated in early or middle life, and been taught proper methods of living, proper exercises of the lungs and the benefits of living in the open, the mortality would not be nearly so great. It is said by the best pathologists that 80 per cent of the population at large have had tuberculosis, have it now, or will have it before they die. When you walk down a crowded thoroughfare and realize that four out of every five people come in one of these three categories you can see what a dread disease is abroad in the land. Only ten per cent of this 80 per cent, that is, eight out of a hundred, die of tuberculosis. If that other eight could be saved, or even half of them, by being taught how to look after themselves, it would be of great benefit to the nation. Many of our youths are never taught at home how to take care of themselves. One of the worst maladies that afflicted our troops was trench-mouth or what is known as pyorrhea, which caused great havoc in the army. Many men went overseas with it before the Dental Corps was thoroughly organized. Later on, they were taught to use the tooth brush, which many of them had never used before. If these men had been taught beforehand the proper protection of their teeth a great deal of the losses due to these causes would have been avoided. Neuritis, rheumatism, trench fever, and kidney trouble are all caused to a great extent, if not entirely, by pyorrhea.

Another thing that would be of great benefit to the nation as a whole would be the teaching of sex hygiene in the camps. This is a matter that is being considered by educationalists all over the country. I have always felt that if we could get the proper teachers sex hygiene should be taught in the higher grades of the public schools. It is a very delicate subject, of course, and would require careful handling, but I think it is a step that should be taken in the matter of education. Young people know nothing of veneral diseases. None of them are warned against them, and I do not know of any better place where young men could be taught this subject than in the military camps, just as our troops were instructed through lectures on other subjects. Then when they had received this instruction in sex hygiene they would be more cautious when the calico looks like silk. There would be more restraint and less loss from venereal diseases. I have not the figures of the losses from venereal diseases, but one has only to enjoy a large practice in any city to see the ravages that are being made upon our young manhood and womanhood by these diseases. I am satisfied that the teaching of sex hygiene could be better done in the military camps than anywhere else, even in our public schools. An army to be efficient must be healthy and strong, and the same applies to a nation. By directing the people along the best lines to produce perfect health would, I think, result in a saving to the nation that would compensate for all the expenditures that have been suggested here to-day, and would develop a more moral and a more noble manhood.

Mr. J. E. S. E. D'Anjou (Rimouski) (translation): Mr. Speaker, I may say at the outset that I emphatically object to the resolution introduced by the hon member for Parkdale, (Mr. Mowat). As I understand it, if it were adopted by Parliament and if steps were taken to apply it, it would lead to compulsory military service. Then it is militarism which is to be foisted upon this country, that same militarism which for five years the Allies have fought against Germany to destroy—I have always been and I am still an anti-militarist. I am not going to change my mind, and, as far as I am concerned, I think that such a resolution should not be voted by this House. It is high time we should cease talking of military organization. The hon. gentlemen who have in hand the destinies of this country say that Canada is now a nation, that she is a member of the League of Nations and that from now on we shall have no more wars. Why then should we establish training camps? Why compel our boys to do military service? It seems to me that it would be more useful for us to take an interest in peace work rather than pass such resolution. Even previous to the war Canada used to expend exorbitant amounts on military camps. Just now, as we are passing through a dreadful crisis, and this country is on the verge of bankruptcy, when there are dificits on all sides, when not later than yesterday the hon. Minister of Railways stated that the Government railways had a deficit of about $50,000,000 for the last year. I think it is more important to economize, to see to the development of our natural resources, to promote agriculture and anything that may ensure prosperity to this country, than to try and establish military organizations.

I do not propose to detain the House much longer, I wish merely to personally protest from my seat against that resolution, because such are my opinions and, also, as representing a constituency which, like myself, is opposed to militarism. I shall have then done my duty toward my electors, myself and my country in stating that I most emphatically take exception to that resolution. Anticonscriptionist I was, anticonscriptionist I am and anticonscriptionist I shall remain.

Mr. J. A. MAHARG (Maple Creek): It seems to me this is rather an inopportune time to start discussing the subject of compulsory military training. True, hon. gentlemen who have preceded me have assured us that this proposal does not contemplate war. That is all very well, and it may be their sincere conviction that military training does not engender a warlike spirit. But you cannot convince the people as a whole that when you undertake a system of universal training you have not in contemplation the possibility of war sooner or later. Whatever hon. gentlemen may think about the matter, the establishment of military training will work its fear on the minds of the people. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we have had sufficient fighting and military display, at least for a time. We are a war-weary people; we are heartily sick and tired of strife; and almost on the heels of peace—in fact, peace is not yet declared so far as all the belligerent nations are concerned—we are now talking of taking up the matter of compulsory training. I think, to say

the very least, we should postpone this subject for a few years. Surely we do not expect to be plunged into the throes of a great war in the immediate future. At least, let us hope not. But is it not a remarkably significant fact that the most peaceful country in the world—at all events, the most peaceful nation that took any part in the great war—was the one that almost always formed the spearhead when any tremendous task confronted the allied armies. Our own country, Canada, was the most peaceful of any of the nations that fought in the war. Yet, on all occasions when there was any severe task to be performed, the little Canadian army was invariably the one that proved the spearhead in the great undertaking. This surely must be an argument that compulsory military training is not indispensable to the creation of an efficient army. Compulsion is not the most efficient force in any work that calls for great and sustained effort. If you have to drive individuals into performing any task you will fail to achieve the best results. There are better means than compulsion, and we have them within our own borders. We are capable of building up the type of people who will make for the maximum of efficiency in war if they should ever be called upon to take up arms. Why was it that our men fought so bravely and won such signal success in the late war? The prime reason, undoubtedly, was the fact that they were fighting in a just cause, and the battle is half won if you have a just cause. The next reason was the loyalty of our men. We have built up in this country, I think, a class of men who have on every occasion proven that their loyalty is sound to the core. We have only to look back over the period of war to find conclusive evidence of this fact. But, apart from all this, I think there is another great reason for the success of our soldiers, and that is the fact that we are a nation of athletes. There is not a single season in the entire year—scarcely one week in the twelve months—when we are not engaged, from one end of Canada to the other, in some form of athletic sports; and it is the athlete that makes the outstanding citizen when it comes to stamina, resourcefulness and efficiency. If you can develop men by friendly rivalry and by the inculcation of a spirit of good fellowship and the ambition for worthy supremacy, you will build up a much more virile and successful people than any military training can produce.

I have much sympathy with some of the arguments advanced by hon. gentlemen who have preceded me as to the effects which military training will have upon the physical development of our men. Unfortunately, however, as it appears to me, at the age of eighteen or twenty is rather too late in the life of a man to undertake physical development. If this Government deemed it proper to spend money for the purpose of physically developing our young men —and, by the way, that is one of the strong arguments in favour of military training— it seems to me that we should also develop our women if we desire to build up a sturdy race of people. But you cannot develop virile men by starting to train them when they have reached the age of eighteen or twenty. I think that a much better plan, if it could be devised, would be for this Government to give assistance to the provinces in such a way that they could begin the physical development of our youth in the primary schools, where, in my opinion, physical training should unquestionably commence. We could also undertake some of the other things suggested as being part of the programme of military training. In regard to the suggestion of the hon. member for Winnipeg, we could provide instruction for our young people in the schools in connection with the prevention of contagious diseases. It is obviously too late in life, when a person has attained the age of eighteen or twenty years, to begin to think of instruction in this matter. In early life, before our youth have become victims to preventable diseases, we should teach them the proper means of avoiding contagion, and it is but a fatal mistake to leave this responsibility until harm has resulted. Someone has said: Give me a group of out-door athletes, and I will pit them against any other class of men, no matter where they may come from; and this opinion I endorse. We have very largely developed into a nation of athletes; we are fond of out-door sports. Why do thousands of people line up to obtain admission to a hockey game during zero weather? They will jostle good-naturedly with one another to secure tickets, and afterwards as good-naturedly shout themselves hoarse for one or other of the opposing teams. It is this love of wholesome sport that makes not only for sturdy athletes but for strong and vigorous people generally, and more benefits than one accrue from the pursuit of healthful and hardy sport.

Another point which I desire to emphasize is the fact that in this country—indeed, for that matter, in any country—we should always bear in mind, in the training of the young, the great spirit of mutual service and helpfulness. If you develop that spirit you need have no misgivings about the spirit which the people will show in the nation's hour of trial. If they have had instilled in their hearts the proper spirit of service, and if they cherish good will one to another, the same worthy spirit will be evident when their country's welfare is at stake. One of the hon. members who have spoken has drawn attention to several of the countries in which compulsory military training has been practised. The hon. gentleman laid particular emphasis on Switzerland, and attributed that country's success in keeping out of the war to the fact that she was fully armed. Now, it perhaps is not a pleasant thing to say, but I think there was a very different reason why Switzerland remained out of the war. I do not think that Germany had very much of a desire to attack Switzerland, and it would have been out of the question for our allies to do so unless Switzerland had given some open and flagrant cause. The hon. gentleman also mentioned South Africa by way of illustration. I do not think any one for a moment will place us in the same category as South Africa. South Africa has different problems on its hands from those which we have here. The people there have to contend with the native element—we have nothing of that kind to contend with here. They have also other things to contend with as was shown in the recent election. Our position is entirely different from that of South Africa. Then the hon. gentleman cited Australia and New Zealand. Here again our position is different from that which they occupy. They are situated out in the southern seas and are open to attack from any quarter whatever. We have lived for over a hundred years peaceably with our neighbours to the south of us. That is the only country which we could possibly develop a military force to combat, and I think we might as well forget it altogether as to attempt to build up an infantry that will be able to compete with our neighbours to the south. In the first place, I do not think it ever will be necessary—we hope not—and even if it were it would not be very successful. The hon. gentleman said that our neighbours to the south were taking up this method of training. That may be but they have not adopted it yet.

[Mr. Maharg.]

We must not forget that we are in the aftermath of the war and that possibly in a year or two, when matters have had time to simmer down, we may change our ideas entirely along some of these lines.

There is another reason that I would like to mention why it is not wise for us to take any action at this particular time. The financial condition of our country, as has been pointed out, is not of the best. Surely at this particular time we should forget, in so far as it is possible for us to forget, the necessity for any expenditure in connection with military matters. I believe we should try to avoid such expenditure for several years to come. I do not think there is very much danger of our being involved in another war in the near future and I think we may possibly take the chance of conserving our finances as far as we can for some time. I was rather struck with the strangeness of the argument in favour of compulsion that was advanced by the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat). He instanced a lot of different methods of compulsion, but if I followed him correctly, in each case that he mentioned in which compulsion had been used it was for the protection and benefit of the people. He holds that up as a reason why we should use compulsion to train our people in order to produce the very opposite effect. It seems a most remarkable and far-fetched argument that because we may have adopted compulsion which says which side of a street a man shall take in order to avoid accidents, or that a man must undergo certain treatment to prevent disease and such like, we should train our people by compulsion to produce the very opposite result—for the ultimate result of military training must be destruction of life and property; it cannot be otherwise. That argument, surely, is a very weak one.

5 p.m.

In conclusion, I would suggest that military training of any kind whatever should be dispensed with just as far as we possibly can for at least a few years to come. We gave our assistance to the minister last year when he asked to be permitted to increase our permanent force but we were given to understand that it did not mean that the force was going to be increased. It was just making it possible in case a contingency should arise that made it necessary to increase the force to about double the number it had been previously. But, it has not been necessary to take that action so far, and things do not point to its

being necessary in the near future. My advice in the meantime would be to let the people quiet down. Let us try and get away from this thought of strife for a little while. If we do we will find that we will be able to employ better means. Let us give the League of Nations a little chance and not, while we are trying to form this League of Nations to prevent war, go on and make preparations for war. It has been said that if George Washington had not had the hatchet he never would have damaged the cherry tree. I think we might possibly take a little lesson from that and go along in our peaceful way at least for some little time to come.

Mr. G. W. ANDREWS (Centre Winnipeg): Mr. Speaker, in the first place I desire to congratulate the hon. members for the way in which they have presented their case in favour of military compulsory service. It has been exceedingly well done, and if I thought we were going to have another war within the next ten years I could only support it. But I do not think it is reasonable to expect another war in ten years. The money has been spent without which it is impossible to carry on a war. The youth of the belligerent nations has been largely spent without which it is impossible to carry on a war. Surely we have enough trained men in this country to last for all ordinary purposes for the next ten years. Finally, before preparations be made for the next war, it more befits Canada to do everything in its power for those who fought the last.

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Beauce): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the hon. mover of the resolution (Mr. Mowat), the seconder (Mr. Griesbach) and also the speakers who have followed them. Although I feel inclined to agree with many of the suggestions that have been offered, especially by my hon. friend, the member for Winnipeg (Mr. Blake), I must say at the very outset that I cannot agree with the spirit or principle of the resolution. The contention has been made in the House to-day that military training for about 360,000 young men was necessary. It was necessary, first, as it was claimed, because we needed it. May I put the question to my hon. friend from Parkdale: How is it that we need in Canada a trained army of 360,000 men? Are we likely to be attacked by any power on land except the United States? The United States have refused, as I understand, to adopt compulsory military training. I will go one step further. Even if the United States did adopt the policy of training their young men in their own country, I would still be opposed to the training of young Canadians, because the north half of the American continent would be the hell which Central and Continental Europe was before the great war.

It has been hinted that we need military training to improve the physical condition of our young people. I am not opposed to physical culture, and, as a matter of fact, we to-day have physical culture in this country. But what is the difference between physical culture and military training? Physical culture is to develop the body, while military training is more than that, it is an attempt to create and develop the spirit of militarism.

I would dwell for one moment longer upon the remarks offered by my hon. friend from North Winnipeg (Mr. Blake), whose medical attainments I am the first to recognize. He submitted as a reason for supporting the resolution that military training might be effective in doing away with venereal diseases. That is the very reverse, Mr. Speaker, of military conditions, if the experience of the last five years is worth anything.

But there are other grounds upon which to base strong opposition to this resolution. One is economic. My hon. friend from Parkdale will concede that the training of all young men in this country between the ages of 18 and 25 will mean that in the course of those seven years 360,000 of our adolescents will be engaged in military training four weeks every year. That means twenty-eight days. If we take 360,000 men away from their economic activities, for each man we take away we deprive the country of at least $3 per day, because the work of a sturdy Canadian between the ages of 18 and 25, I think, fully represents that figure. Now, 360,000 men at $3 a day would mean in round numbers $1,000,000. And if we continue that for 28 days we have an economic loss of $28,000,000.

But that is only the loss we sustain if we deprive the country of the economic activities of these young men. It is pointed out in the resolution of my hon. friend that the country is not going to pay them any indemnity or remuneration. I will accept that statement as a basis of argument. But let us go one step further. Does any one imagine that after a few years we will have 360,000 men training for four weeks each year without our incurring a very large expenditure? Let us figure it out. To have

360,000 men training for 28 days would mean 10,380,000 days. Does my hon. friend think that the actual cost to the country will be less than $2 a day, without any indemnity or remuneration of any kind being allowed? Certainly not. Then if we take 10,380,000 at $2 a day that means in round numbers over $20,000,000. So that economically and financially speaking the cost to the country would be in round numbers $50,000,000 a year to carry out the plan suggested. Are we in a position to bear such an enormous expenditure? It is not for me to say, it is for the hon. the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton). He was in his seat a minute ago. The right hon. acting leader of the Government (Sir George Foster) is in his seat. We have been waiting to know the stand taken by the Government on this important question, but not a word comes from them. Are the Government in favour of general compulsory military training, or are they opposed to it? That is what the country is interested in knowing.

There is another reason for opposing the resolution. We all know that the great war was fought to a successful conclusion by the Allied armies to, in plain words, crush militarism. Had we lost the war I might understand my hon. friend coming forward with his resolution. But we have won the war, and now that it is won what do we see? In England they are resuming their pre-war position militarily speaking. Not only that, but the news has been flashed over the world by Sir Auckland Geddes that they are going to almost cut their naval expenditure in two. Shall we give to the world the spectacle of a country that had no military training before the war, of a country that raised 600,000 young men who distinguished themselves on all the fields of Continental Europe and even in Siberia and Russia—shall we give to the world, I say, the spectacle of that country, after having won the war for the purpose of crushing militarism, being almost the only country trying to develop amongst its population this military spirit which has been the curse of humanity?

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I am bringing to this debate too much heat. I confess that I do not believe my hon. friend is serious in bringing forward his resolution. The sentiment of the country is opposed to military training not only in the province from which I come—and I am not speaking as a member representing an electoral division of the province of Quebec, I am speaking as a Canadian—but in the whole Dominion it is strongly opposed to such a movement.

I was very pleased to hear the remarks that fell from the lips of my hon. friend for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Andrews). He is opposed to the resolution,—and he has been on the field of battle. Was there a more gallant soldier than my hon. friend? We are all proud of his achievements, and I congratulate him on his separating his lot, as it were, from that of my hon. friend for Edmonton West (Mr. Griesbach). The spirit of the country is against compulsory military training. And it must be so as a result of the war; otherwise this world would not be worth living in.

Mr. Speaker, these are the only remarks I intend to offer. I think that the Government should stem the attempts of its friends to create such a sentiment in the country. The Government have to face a financial situation which, in the words of the ex-Minister of Finance, "if not desperate, is most serious." We realize that we have to pay out every year $142,000,000 for the interest on our national debt, we know that we have to disburse $27,000,000 more for pensions, not to speak of further disbursements for soldiers civil re-establishment and land settlement, and not to speak of this monstrous figure of $47,000,000 of a deficit in the operation of our national railways which the Minister of Railways (Mr. J. D. Reid) advised us of last night.

In the face of this financial situation are we going to suggest to all the sane people of the earth that Canada has really entered upon a mad race to bankruptcy? That would indeed be the case if we decided to spend $50,000,000 more for military training. The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) smiles. I do not know what makes him smile. He is a rich man; perhaps he can afford to smile when we talk of spending hundreds of millions every year. But if he were Minister of Finance he would hold very tightly the strings of the national purse; I do not believe that he would decrease the tariff at all, but he would not smile; my hon. friend the Minister of Finance does not smile.

So, I say, let us be reasonable; let us stop this incipient movement towards military training. Let us confine our efforts to physical development through well recognized methods of physical culture. Let us devote our efforts to the development of our country economically and commercially, in all the activities of the human body and human intellect. I hope that the Government will say to the member for Parkdale: "Sit down; go away back with your military training." My hon. friend

represents a division of the city of Toronto. The member for Edmonton West (Mr. Griesbach) represents a division of the city of Edmonton. And my hon. friend (Mr. Blake) represents a division of the city of Winnipeg. I am not perhaps, so conversant with the feeling of the people in the cities, but I can assure you that throughout the length and breadth of Canada the rural constituencies are to a man opposed to this proposal of universal military training.

Mr. O. R. GOULD (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to record my disapproval of the resolution proposed by my hon. friend (Mr. Mowat), and in doing so I know that I express the sentiment of the people of the Western plains. I am particularly pleased that representatives of the Eastern districts have also recorded their disapproval of the proposal. The objectionable feature of the proposal is not so much the resolution itself as the fact that certain individuals have conceived the necessity for it and have risen in their places in this House with a view to persuading the rest of the members of the House that what they have conceived is the right thing for every hon. member to believe and to try to make those whom he represents believe.

Since the war broke out there have been many evidences that all the effects of the Allies were put forth to defeat that same militarism which is exemplified in the resolution now proposed. "To make the world safe for democracy" has been upon millions of lips; it has been reiterated thousands of times. Yet some people in this country seem now to visualize another enemy, and they go forth to prepare. They wish to make the yet unborn, for that matter, prepare for this enemy which they see. I have tried to visualize the member for Parkdale as a politician standing in the German Reichstag in the year 1870, after highly militaristic Germany had beaten highly militaristic France—because during the years of the century immediately preceding that year all Europe had been continuously engaged in war. The argument of the nation highly specialized in militarism did not and could not hold good at that time, but because it was the policy of one of the nations to specialize in this particular industry, as we may call it, the obligation was forced upon the others. The result was that more property and more lives were destroyed. And such will be the case if the principle of militarism is now generally adopted. I can picture also the member for Parkdale writing in 1911 the book whose authorship is attributed to General Bernhardi, in which the writer points out how much further Germany must go along the line of militarism in order to make of her a world power. That was militarism; that was the spirit which prevailed in 1870. The Germans had been looking forward to "der Tag," to "the Day." It is because I see something of the militaristic spirit in this resolution that I entirely disapprove of the whole principle of the thing. I cannot see the great big enemy of the future which is so apparent to the hon. gentlemen who are fathering this resolution.

The member for Parkdale used the phrase, "when the time arrives." I quote that to prove that those who are responsible for this resolution and for these proposals see an enemy in the future—not in the near future, perhaps; when they expect that enemy to menace us, we do not know, but they wish to burden this country with a system of taking the youth of our land and training them in camps. As the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Maharg) pointed out, the best athletes in the world are those who go out and compete one with the other; the spirit of competition is most valuable in connection with physical training.

The evils which the member for North Winnipeg (Mr. Blake) suggested as existing in connection with the physical condition of our people are not all real ones. The records of disease contracted by men who went over to the front will prove that in many cases they did not come back quite as free from venereal disease and other disease as they went away, in spite of this new system of chest measurement and the providing of new tunics every three months. I think that could be easily proved, and I may say that I do not want to see my children put in that position. Highly specialized Germany, who broke forth into the world war in 1914, was beaten not by highly specialized individuals such as the hon. member proposes to develop in this country, but by the clerk from the store, the miner out of the mine, the agriculturist from the land—raw recruits. These men, with muscle and sinew, and with the desire to go out and win—these were the men who defeated militarism. It was the principle involved that brought about the winning of the war, not the highly specialized training of the Canadian troops, the American troops, or any other troops. We know that in Great Britain and in France, when the stress of war was the greatest, it was anybody else but the specialized

soldier who went out and defeated the hordes of Germany.

I would point out again that the next war, if such a war should come, is not going to be fought with men of the different nations facing each other and firing off guns. It is my honest belief that the fate of the next war will be decided by the scientists, by the most capable men in the offices of the scientists. It is terrible to conceive and believe that such could be, yet the human mind does and will wander in such channels, and I believe that science will and can devise ways and means whereby thousands and millions of acres of crops will be destroyed, and whereby people may be destroyed in the cities. It does not take any longer to kill a highly specialized soldier, a man who can point a rifle straight or throw a bomb, than any other man, and I believe it is all folly to spend time training men in the way it is proposed, when it is a fact that science will dictate the manner in which the next war, if there ever be such a war, will be waged.

Mr. M. CLARK: It will be fought in the air.

Mr. GOULD: It will be fought in the air; it will be fought on the ground, and our crops and everything else will be destroyed. It is my honest belief that all our energy should be devoted to canning this thing; we should put our heels on it wherever it raises its head. I will not take up any more of the time of the House; I am quite sure the sentiment of this House is diametrically opposed to the principles and thoughts involved in the resolution, and consequently it is not necessary to take up time in giving reasons why it is inherent, deeply rooted principle in the minds not only of members of this House, but of the people throughout the Dominion of Canada, that militarism is a thing that should be destroyed.

Rt. Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Acting Prime Minister): I have listened carefully to the debate from its inception until the present time and I have received a good many ideas that I had not before. I have heard arguments and assertions quite as strong as any that I have heard before in this House. But whether they are well founded or not, I am not going to say at the present moment. I am not going to take up the time of the House in speaking on the question. I am going to state just a fact or two and ask the House to take a certain course in consideration therewith. There are quite a number of members of this House who are not present this afternoon and who have expressed a desire to have their opinions stated in the House. For that reason, and because of the absence of others who are particularly conversant with military matters, I think it would not be quite right for so thin a House as this to express itself upon a matter of such great importance. I, therefore, move the adjournment of the debate so as to give an opportunity for a future discussion by members who are not present this afternoon and for an expression of opinion from various hon. members on both sides of the House who, I am sure, are dying to express their opinions, but who are not quite ready yet.

Motion agreed to, and the debate adjourned.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. FIELDING:

For a copy of all correspondence, Orders in Council, reports and all other documents respecting the apportionment of expenses of the League of Nations and the payment of the sum of $64,043.15 on February 13, 1920, as Canada's share of such expense.

Mr. COPP:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams and other correspondence that has passed between one George Carvill, of the city of St. John, formerly city ticket agent for the Canadian Government railway (formerly Intercolonial railway) at the said city of St. John, and any and all others for and on behalf of the said George Carvill and the Minister of Railways and Canals, deputy minister or any other ministers of the Government or any general manager, assistant manager, superintendent or other officials of the Canadian Government railway in reference to the dismissal of the said George Carvill from said railway on the 30th day of April, A.D. 1917, and the request of the said George Carvill for an investigation under oath before an independent tribunal into the causes for his dismissal and the refusal of the management of the said railway to grant such an investigation.

Mr. POWER:

For a copy of all telegrams, papers, letters and correspondence with reference to the application for naturalization of Professor F. V. Richthdorf, alias Frederick Edwards, 205 Scott Block, Winnipeg, also for copies of all correspondence to date with reference to the resignation of the said F. V. Richthdorf, alias Frederick Edwards, from the employ of the Department of State, and in particular correspondence with the President of the Privy Council, Controller McLean and Mr. A. Brophy of the said department.

KAMOURASKA BY-ELECTION.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING: I should like to ask the leader of the Government if the Government have been informed that Mr. Adolphe Stein, Liberal candidate

in Kamouraska, has been elected by acclamation.

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have just heard that from my hon. friend who, I am sure, gave the information with great happiness of heart.

HOUSE OF COMMONS OFFICIALS—ORGANIZATION.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Beauce): May I ask whether, after you, Sir, have laid on the Table the plan of the organization of the staff of the House, it is the intention that a special committee of this House will be appointed to deal with the matter before it is finally passed upon?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: In reply to the question asked by the hon. member, I can only repeat the answer given yesterday by Mr. Speaker to the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains (Mr. Ethier), when he informed him that this is a question for the House to decide when the report is considered.

Mr. BELAND: Has the leader of the Government anything to suggest?

Rt. Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Following the general course, I will move this motion on Tuesday next:

That the organization of the staff of the House of Commons as submitted to the House by His Honour, the Speaker, on the 31st March, be approved and confirmed.

The House will then have an opportunity of discussing the matter and of coming to a conclusion.

QUESTIONS NOT ANSWERED.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North and Victoria): I should like to call the attention of the leader of the Government to question No. 8, which stands in my name on page 4 of the Order Paper. I do not think it requires very much or difficult research to answer it. I hope the leader of the Government will call the attention of the proper authorities to it.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I see no reason why it should not be brought down.

Mr. P. F. CASGRAIN (Charlevoix-Montmorency): I should like to ask the Government when I may expect an answer to Question No. 62 standing in my name on to-day's Order Paper? The Questions from No. 62 to No. 132 were passed over to-day.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, we asked that Questions Nos. 62 to 132 inclusive stand when we came to them to-day. They will come up in their proper order next week, so my hon. friend will not be troubled with the information during the Easter recess.

On the motion of Sir George Foster, the House adjourned at six o'clock until Tuesday, 6th April, at 3 p.m.

Tuesday, April 6, 1920.

The House met at Three o'clock.

MEMBER ELECT.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery certificate of the election and return of Adolph Stein, Esq., for the electoral district of Kamouraska.

NEW MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Adolph Stein, Esq., member for the electoral division of Kamouraska, introduced by Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King and Mr. Ernest Lapointe.

PEACE TREATY—BULGARIA.

Hon. N. W. ROWELL (President of the Privy Council) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 46, for carrying into effect the Treaty of Peace between His Majesty and Bulgaria.

He said: The Bill is, in form, the same as the Bill introduced and passed at the last session relating to the treaties of peace with Germany and Austria. Hon. members will recall that the Senate amended the Bill last session so as to make it include other treaties of peace. Objection was taken—and, I think, reasonably so—by members of the Opposition to passing legislation affecting treaties before those treaties had been submitted to the House. It is therefore necessary to have a special Bill to deal with the Treaty of Peace with Bulgaria.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CIVIL SERVICE INSURANCE ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Sir Henry Drayton (Minister of Finance) it was ordered that the House do go into committee to-morrow to consider a proposed resolution respecting Civil Service insurance.

CANADIAN MERCHANT MARINE— BUSINESS STATEMENT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Leader of the Opposition): The Minister of Marine said the other evening that he would have placed on Hansard a business statement of the results of operation of the ships comprising the Canadian Merchant Marine. I am informed that the record does not appear on Hansard, and I would ask the minister to have it placed there if possible.

Hon. C. C. BALLANTYNE (Minister of Marine): Such a statement, if not read, could be placed on Hansard only by unanimous consent. I was not aware that unanimous consent was given on the occasion to which my hon. friend refers; otherwise, the statement would have appeared in Hansard.

ACQUISITION OF LOTBINIERE AND MEGANTIC RAILWAY.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North and Victoria): A despatch is going the rounds of the press to the effect that the Government has acquired the Lotbiniere and Megantic railway, which is said to be about thirty miles long. Will the Minister of Railways tell the House whether or not that is the fact?

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways): An Order in Council has been passed authorizing us to take over the Lotbiniere and Megantic railway. It is a small line, and is being acquired in accordance with an Act passed a couple of years ago in connection with the taking over of the Quebec and Saguenay railway. I do not think that we have actually taken possession as yet, but we are to take possession in a short time.

Mr. McKENZIE: Has the price been settled?

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes, the price was laid down in the Act.

BRITISH COLUMBIA INDIANS.

SETTLEMENT OF DIFFERENCES CONCERNING INDIAN LANDS.

The House resumed consideration in committee of Bill No. 13—Hon. Mr. Meighen—to provide for the settlement of differences between the Governments of the Dominion of Canada and the Province of British Columbia respecting Indian lands and certain other Indian affairs in the said province, Mr. Boivin in the chair.

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

On section 2—Power given to Governor in Council to settle differences between Canada and British Columbia respecting Indian matters.

The CHAIRMAN: When this Bill was last in Committee we had reached clause 2, which had been allowed to stand.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) is specially interested in this Bill, and I suggest that the Minister of the Interior agree to either a postponement of its consideration, or the taking up of the third reading on a subsequent occasion when the member for Three Rivers is here.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will agree to the second proposal.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall clause 2 carry?

Mr. CAHILL: Read the clause.

The CHAIRMAN: The clause was read when the Bill was last under consideration in committee.

Mr. CAHILL: When does the minister expect a final adjustment to be arrived at as outlined in clause 2 ? A lot of money has been spent.

Mr. MEIGHEN: As soon as we can get the British Columbia Government to agree. We know our mind in the matter and have communicated with the British Columbia Government accordingly. We have not been able to get their acquiescence, nor have we been able to get as yet a definite statement of their position in the premises. We intend to address ourselves to a solution just as soon as we have the power to do so.

Mr. CAHILL: How much additional cost will be involved?

Mr. MEIGHEN: None at all. The expenditure was all made long before I took over the department.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: The minister stated the other day, when we were discussing the Bill, that the report had been made some time ago. I should like to know if the report is printed and available to the members.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I could not say definitely as to the report being printed, although I am morally certain that it was printed. But I know it is available to members; it was laid on the Table of the House some years ago and may now be found in the hands of the proper custodian.

Section agreed to.

On section 3—power to order reductions or cut-offs from Reserves without surrender by Indians.

Mr. McKENZIE: Possibly it is my fault that I do not know very much about this subject, but perhaps the minister would not mind giving us some explanation as to the extent of land that is dealt with in this Bill and what is included in the purport of this legislation. Although we might have had an opportunity of seeing this report, we did not see it, and the minister might, therefore, give us a brief explanation of the report.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The report, as the hon. member knows, is the report of a joint commission appointed by the Government of British Columbia and the Government of the Dominion of Canada pursuant to Orders in Council passed by the respective Governments, embodying an agreement entered into by Sir Richard McBride and representatives of the Indian Department. The agreement provided for the final settlement of differences that had arisen during a period of two or three decades, having to do primarily with the claim of the province of British Columbia to a reversionary interest in all Indian lands in that province, and to a definition of what reversionary interest, if any such exist, should be, and having to do as well with the areas of Indian Reserves in the province, their sufficiency for the purpose of the various tribes or their superabundance in area for the purposes of the tribes. The commission performed its work extending over a very long period of time and made certain recommendations as to the disposal of the question of reversionary interest, as to delimiting Reserves that were believed to be larger than necessary and as to increasing others that were believed to be smaller than essential. The provision of the report covering the subject of reversionary interest aimed at deciding the question in this way, that where land was to be sold that had already been alloted to Indian tribes in Reserves, the proceeds should be divided equally between the province and the Dominion, the Dominion to utilize its moiety in trust for the purpose of the administration of the affairs of the Indians themselves, the province to be entitled absolutely to its share. The Dominion has not, and indeed the Government of the Dominion as a Government would not have constitutional power to admit the existence of a reversionary interest at all; but the terms of section 13 of the Act of Union and of subsequent Orders that were passed were such that a claim was put forward to this reversionary interest, the same to take effect upon the giving up of any Reserve by the tribe. If a Reserve is given up by a tribe permanently and a new Reserve has to be found, it is essential for the purposes of Indian administration that the proceeds of the sale of the first Reserve should be placed in the trust fund, the same as in the case of all surrenders in the province, for the administration of the affairs of the tribe. The report, as I have pointed out, looks to a settlement of the reversionary interest claim along the lines indicated, and looks to a readjustment of the areas of the various Reserves by means of cut-offs and additions, the amounts being specifically set out in the report. I can give the committee the details as to the amount to be cut off in any special Reserve or as to the amount to be added; the cut-offs exceeded the additions. The principle difficulty involved is in connection with this Kitsilano Reserve in British Columbia. As the hon. member will remember, the Kitsilano Reserve has been taken by the Harbour Commissioners of British Columbia; settlement has not yet been made; but if pursuant to the passing of this Bill we are able to agree upon a settlement in acceptance of the terms of the commission's report, then we shall be able to get the moneys paid by the Harbour Commissioners for the Kitsilano Reserve and to distribute it in pursuance of the terms of the report.

The British Columbia Government has never indicated a willingness to accept the terms of the commission's report. The Orders in Council establishing the commission did not bind either government definitely and absolutely to an acceptance of the report; they bound the governments only to a sympathetic reception of the report and to acquiescence therein to the utmost extent that could be deemed reasonable by each. As a matter of finality that agreement amounted to very little. We have stated our willingness to accept the report in toto; the British Columbia Government made certain tentative suggestions which they afterwards recalled; but they have never placed us in definite and final possession of their views or their position in the premises at all. They, however, obtained from their legislature at its last session, powers to negotiate with the Dominion Government looking to such further adjustments as they think right and to settle with

the Dominion Government finally upon the terms of the report as so adjusted. We are seeking similar powers, and if this Bill passes, we shall have them. It will be obvious to the committee that there would be no use in the Dominion Government taking power to settle the terms of the report, and to agree with the Provincial Government thereon, if it were still in the power of an Indian tribe to refuse acquiescence to any single feature of the report. Consequently, in this clause we ask that we be given power to make such cut-offs—there is no need to do so in respect to the additions—as are essential to the carrying out of the report as it may be jointly amended, if it may be at all, by the two governments. That is the whole purport of this legislation.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not doubt that all the objects of this Bill are good, but I cannot help thinking that the clause under consideration is unusually broad. Possibly it has a broader effect than my hon. friend intended. It provides that notwithstanding anything in the Indian Act, the Governor in Council may make agreements to carry out this purpose. That is a very broad statement. You set aside the whole Indian Act and transfer all its powers as regards this transaction to the Governor in Council. That is giving a good deal of power to the Governor in Council, and it seems to me that if it be intended to depart from the Indian Act, the minister should bring down an amendment to that Act dealing with the case. The clause further provides that the Government:

—may carry on such further negotiations and enter into such further agreements with the Government of the province of British Columbia as may be found necessary for a full and final adjustment of the differences between the said Governments.

These adjustments may involve the payment of money. I do not know whether my hon. friend would contend that under that clause the Governor in Council would have the right to pay money. However, my main purpose in calling attention to this is to point out that the Governor in Council are taking to themselves a very, very broad power. I do not question that it is a good one; I am quite satisfied that it is all intended for a good end, but I would ask my hon. friend if he thinks it wise to give power to the Governor in Council to set aside absolutely the Indian Act?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think the clause has the scope the hon. member fears. The negativing of the Indian Act applies only to the extent of not requiring surrenders from the Indian tribes themselves. Clause 3 reads as follows:

For the purpose of adjusting, readjusting or confirming the reductions or cut-offs from reserves in accordance with the recommendations of the Royal Commission, the Governor in Council may order such reductions or cut-offs to be effected without surrenders of the same by the Indians, notwithstanding any provisions of the Indian Act to the contrary.

It is only to that extent that the provisions of the Indian Act are affected at all. We can only negative the Indian Act to the extent that it always required surrenders. The hon. member will see that surrenders by the Indians are essential before the Indians are substantially affected, or before they can be removed from their reserves, but if surrenders by the Indians are to be required in the case of every little cut-off that is essential here and there, the whole object of the negotiations may be frustrated by the caprice of one tribe. It is only to that extent that the Indian Act is affected, not generally at all. Further than that, we only ask power to effect a settlement in accordance with the terms and principles set up, and modified by the negotiations. It will be our purpose that the modifications will be just as slight as possible. We are prepared to accept the report now; we do not want to modify it at all; so from our point of view the modifications will be as slight as possible. I do not contend or think that the Act would give us power to expend money. We would have to come to Parliament in the case of any readjustment involving the passing of money. I do not think there is any money to pass at all, except in this way, that when a certain cut-off from a reserve is sold, in pursuance of the recommendations of the report, half the proceeds from the sale will go to the province of British Columbia. That is one of the terms of the report which is now before Parliament, and which we must abide by if we accept that feature of the report, as we are prepared to do. The money must come, of course, before it is paid out.

Mr. McKENZIE: I understand that the land is now held by the Dominion Government in trust for the Indians, and that a reversionary interest is claimed by the province of British Columbia. I have not been able to follow the machinery, but, of course, somebody must be put in a position to give title to this land when it is sold. Does the province of British Columbia

agree to surrender their title to somebody who with the assistance of this Government will be in a position to give title to the purchaser? Has the minister arranged for the machinery by which title can be given to this land when it is sold?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There can be no difficulty about the title for the reason that section 13 of the Act of Union, of July 20, 1871, provides that the province of British Columbia shall transfer to the Dominion out of its own domain reserves for the Indians. They have done so. Consequently, we assert, and with undoubted right in my judgment, that title is in the Dominion. They contend that we enjoy that title only as trustees for the Indians, and that if we sell, if the Indians move away, the proceeds are theirs. We hope to effect a settlement with them on that point. They can make no claim to title. We say the Indian can make no claim to title, that the title is ours. We will simply grant patent on the sale of any portion or all of the reserve. Of course, the Indians themselves of British Columbia have for a very long time been setting up a claim to aboriginal title in that province, but we cannot dispose of that question in this Bill. The Dominion claims title freed entirely from aboriginal claims, and the Dominion will give patent to these lands when sold. Surely that would be just as good title as the Dominion has been giving for forty years for land in the railway belt and the Peace River District, for example.

Mr. CAHILL: About what is the acreage and value of the cut-offs?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The total cut-offs amount to 47,058.49 acres. We have had two valuations, and according to one estimate, the total value is $1,522,704.72, and according to the other $1,247,912.72. The net increases of acreage are 87,291.17—a great deal more acreage than the cut-offs, but the value is only about one-quarter as much, namely, $444,838.80.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: The minister says that the province of British Columbia is claiming a reversionary interest in the proceeds of these land sales. Assuming that they are entitled to reversionary interest, will other provinces have the same rights in relation to Indian lands that are sold?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No. The grounds upon which the province of British Columbia bases its claim for reversionary interest do not exist in relation to the other provinces. They arise by reason of the terms of section 13 of their Act of Union, and orders passed.

Mr. FULTON: Does the province claim a reversionary interest in the reserves of the railway belt?

Mr. MEIGHEN: From memory, I think it does, but of that I am not very certain.

Mr. FULTON: My recollection is that there is a distinction between the reserves in the railway belt and those outside on account of the transfer by the province under the terms of Union. I think the question has been raised, but I have never heard that it has been decided.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It has never been decided, that is certain.

Mr. CAHILL: About what percentage of the Indians have consented to this transaction? Have any of them consented, or are they all opposed to parting with these lands?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Indians, as Indians, are wards of the Government. They have not been approached with a view to obtaining their assent to an adjustment of claims as between the Dominion and Provincial Governments. I do not think it makes much difference to them. We recognize our responsibility to take care of the Indians as wards wholly.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The wards have rights as well.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly, we take care of all the rights of the Indians as wards; we recognize that duty. As to the matter of a reversionary interest in the Indian reserves, that is a claim of the province of British Columbia. In fact, it does not make much difference what stand any one takes, for it is a matter of the law on the rights of the Government and of the Indians.

Mr. CAHILL: The Indians must be interested in any change taking away from them 47,000 acres of land in one place and giving them instead 87,000 acres somewhere else. But is it not customary for the Government to get the consent of Indians before they ask them to leave any reserve? In this case, have they been consulted?

Mr. MEIGHEN: They are not leaving any reserves except in the case of Kitsilano. In that case they did surrender. Under the Indian Act we must always obtain surrenders before the Indians give up possession at all, or even the right to cut wood

upon reserves. But for the purpose of obtaining a settlement—in the finality, not affecting the Indian rights at all, because the Indians are undoubtedly getting every thing that is coming to them—it is absolutely essential that we be able to take proper action and consequently we ask for power to do so without the necessity of surrender. If the necessity of surrender were interposed there would be no way of carrying this out at all, and I am at a loss to comprehend how the question is ever to be settled otherwise. The Kitsilano Reserve is occupied to-day by the Harbour Commissioners and not a dollar is paid for it for the simple reason that there is no place to pay it to. The Indians consequently have not the benefit of the money that is due them because it is not in our hands to give them. It is imperative that we should come to some settlement of this matter if the Indian is not to suffer, and this is the method we are desirous to adopt.

Mr. CAHILL: Does this apply only to the reserves in Vancouver mentioned by the minister? This 47,000 acres is not all in one reserve?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Mr. CAHILL: Are other reserves in a similar condition to that of the Kitsilano Reserve?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Kitsilano Reserve has been surrendered because in that case the Indians have been moved up to another reserve, Saanich. In the other cases it is merely an adjustment of reserves. Lands which the Indians are not using are being taken over and they are given new lands.

Mr. CAHILL: Are they satisfied?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think their consent has been asked for in this case. We doubtless will obtain it in every possible case, but if it is to be made a condition precedent, then there is no use in passing this legislation.

Mr. CAHILL: The transferring of Indians from one place to another might be an advantage to them in the opinion of the minister, while the Indians might regard it in altogether a different light. The question is, are they satisfied? It is not a question whether the Government is satisfied, but are the Indians themselves satisfied that the transfer should be made, in other cases than that in Vancouver?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Generally speaking, I think they are. I do not know of any specific objections to the action that has been taken. At any rate, I have not heard of any.

Mr. McKENZIE: I take it that the Kitsilano lands were subject to the same laws regarding title as every other Indian reserve. Some years ago we heard a great deal in this House about the Kitsilano incident, and were informed, possibly correctly, that the habitations of the Indians were burnt, everything which they had in the shape of dwellings having been destroyed, with the result that they were forced off the land. I cannot recall what was done in the matter, but apparently, from the words of the minister, possession has been taken by the harbour commissioners. I do not suppose that the harbour commissioners forcibly dislodged the Indians and wrested the title from the trustees; I do not imagine that such a thing would be permitted in a civilized country. I should be glad to know, however, how the commissioners got possession of the land and how they secured title without having paid for it. No doubt the harbour commissioners are a corporate body, and they are in the enjoyment of lands formerly occupied by the Indians, of whom the last we heard was that they had been virtually driven off by force. Perhaps the minister will explain how it is that the Government of Canada surrendered the title and gave patents to this corporation without any money having been paid. What arrangement has been made in the matter?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I can give from memory a fairly accurate account of the Kitsilano matter, from which the hon. member will see just how the harbour commissioners came to be in possession. First of all, let me say that I do not recollect any contention having been raised in this House that the Indians were not well treated. On the contrary, I do remember the contention being very strongly pressed that they were a little too well treated. They had too much money in their own hands, and treated themselves pretty well in consequence. The harbour commission felt that immediate possession was necessary, and the Government of British Columbia, in the interests of the city of Vancouver and the province generally, as well as harbour improvement there, were most anxious that surrender should be obtained. They obtained it, no doubt feeling that they had a certain authority in view of their claim to reversionary interest. At all events, they went about obtaining surren-

der and claimed to have paid the Indians between $200,000 and $300,000 as part of the surrender value, and the Indians did actually surrender the land. At the same time the Royal Commission that was in operation made an interim report regarding the Kitsilano reserve, recommending that that reserve be temporarily occupied by the harbour commission, and that the Government of Canada and the Government of British Columbia proceed to arbitrate the value of the reserve and the value of the province's reversionary interest therein. The Government of Canada concurred in that interim report, and agreed, by means of correspondence with the Government of British Columbia, that whatever might be the finding of the arbitration as to the value of the province's reversionary interest, British Columbia should in no event receive less than $300,000, that being estimated as the amount to be paid by the province for the surrender, together with interest and expenses connected therewith. The subject matter then went to arbitration and the board of arbitration found that the land was worth—if I remember correctly—$662,000. The Indian Department took exception to the finding, so did the Government of British Columbia; they claimed it was too low. An appeal was entered and went before Chief Justice Hunter of the province of British Columbia, who upset the arbitration proceedings not on the ground that the valuation was too low, or that there had been a failure to take account of relevant evidence, but rather on the ground that the province of British Columbia was not represented before the arbitration board. That simply threw us all back to nowhere. We have no finding. Since that time we have been attempting to settle the matter. We had, as I thought, arrived at terms of settlement once but they were not final in the minds of both parties to the settlement in a way that we could usefully follow out. Therefore, we have not arrived at a settlement yet, and we are still in process of negotiation. The Government of British Columbia insists upon a much higher valuation of the property. The Government of Canada was willing, and is willing yet, that the province of British Columbia shall receive that sum of $300,000 out of the proceeds. I am now in communication with the attorney general of the province and I am in hopes that we will be able to arrive at some settlement of this outstanding dispute as a result. The Harbour Board has evidenced its willingness to pay—I think a figure of—$750,000, that being suggested by way of settlement. No settlement has yet been arrived at but immediately it is we are prepared to carry it out and to provide title and the Harbour Board stands ready at any time to pay the amount.

Mr. McMASTER: Has the Harbour Board still to pay something in addition to what it has already paid to the Indians?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Harbour Board has not paid anything. The province of British Columbia has paid the Indians between $200,000 and $300,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am not quite sure that we should allow this Act to go through without having something to say. It is new law to me, as I am sure it is to the hon. the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen), that a person who claims a reversionary interest has the right to go in and take possession of the property. The reversionary interest goes to the person who really holds it after the person who had held it dies. The land was in possession of the Indians, it was occupied by the Indians and a trust was exercised by this Government. The only right that the Government of British Columbia had was a vague, statutory reversionary interest which had not received judicial interpretation. It strikes me as a very high-handed proceeding that the Government of British Columbia should take possession of the property, deprive the Indians of the use of it and say: "There is a sum of money; take it and get out." It is a most extraordinary proceeding and one which this Government should not recognize at all. They should have dealt with this property from the beginning under the terms of the Act and they should have discouraged high-handed proceeding of that kind on the part of any one.

Bill reported.

THE FOOD AND DRUGS ACT, 1920.

On the motion of Hon. Newton W. Rowell (Minister of Health) Bill No. 27 respecting Food and Drugs was read the second time and the House went into committee on the Bill, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 2—definitions:

Mr. McMASTER: I note that in subsection (c) the word "domestic" is used to qualify the word "animal." The subsection reads:

(c) "drug" includes all medicines for internal or external use for man or for any domestic animal.

Sometimes wild animals are kept in captivity and are possibly treated with drugs.

I do not see why the word "domestic" is put there. It limits the application of the Act. It does not fulfil any useful purpose. In a part of the country which is ably represented in this House foxes are raised for commercial purposes. I presume some of them occasionally get sick. If they are domestic animals I suppose they will fall under this law. If they are not regarded as domestic animals, and I do not think they are, they would not fall under this law. It seems to me that there is no necessity for the word "domestic."

Mr. ROWELL: The Act as it now stands is broadened by this Bill but I see no objection to striking out the word "domestic." The word "animal" will include all animals. I therefore beg to move that the word "domestic" be stricken out in the 16th line of clause 2.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING: Paragraph (d) in the definition of food sets forth that it:

> includes every article used for food or drink—

I want to call the minister's attention to that—

> —by man, and every ingredient intended for mixing with the food or drink of man for any purpose whatever;

Now is whiskey a food, and are we committing ourselves to that definition? Because it is a scientific question as to whether whiskey is food or not, and we do not want to commit ourselves to any dangerous admission.

Mr. McMASTER: Whiskey is a poison.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I wish to ask the minister if I am right in understanding that this Bill is brought down as a consolidation of the Acts already on the Statutes.

Mr. ROWELL: The existing Adulteration of Foods Act covers many matters in addition to the adulteration of food. It was passed many years ago and after several amendments the legislation was consolidated in 1906. Since then it has been amended in many respects, and several new Acts have been passed dealing with different subject matters which are covered by the present Adulteration Act, and by reason of there being several Acts relating to the same subject matter there is confusion and difficulty in administration. In the present Bill we have eliminated all those matters that are provided for by other Acts and perhaps I might enumerate them so that the Committee will have these matters before them as we go through the Bill. The former Act in addition to dealing with foods and drugs proper, dealt with agricultural fertilizers. That class of products has since been dealt with by a separate Act and therefore it passes out from the present measure. Proprietary and patent medicines were covered by an Act passed last session, therefore no provision is made in the present Bill for proprietary and patent medicines. Honey was also dealt with by the former Act, but hon. gentlemen will recall that a special Bill was put through the House the other evening in reference to that product. The former Act also dealt with maple products, but a separate Bill is before the House to-day covering that commodity. The old Act also dealt with commercial feeding stuffs and animal foods such as bran, shorts and middlings. Those are all likewise dealt with in a separate Bill now before the House. The present measure is therefore confined to foods and drugs. In that respect it simplifies the situation and will make the administration of the law much easier than it is at present. In addition, the existing law does not draw any clear distinction between the adulteration and misbranding. Members of the Committee will see there is a clear distinction between putting some ingredient in a food —a deleterious substance which may be injurious to health,—and describing an article by some name other than it really is no doubt for the purpose of getting profit. But where the article is itself good for food and the only objection is that it is not accurately described, this Bill draws a clear distinction between the two things—adulterating, putting something in or taking something out which may be injurious, and misbranding; that is describing an article on the package or on the article itself in a way to deceive or mislead the public. The other changes I can perhaps more clearly indicate as we proceed with the Bill. The Act has been under administration for some twenty or thirty years and the proposed legislation embodies improvements which have been found necessary in actual operation by the department presided over by Dr. McGill. As we come to the different clauses I shall indicate as clearly as I can where the changes are made.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It will expedite discussion very much if the minister will deal with every new point in that way while the Bill is being considered because going through these different Acts is a very

laborious business. I would like to ask the minister one other question: a number of representations have been made by druggists from different parts of the country with respect to what they regard as somewhat drastic legislation in the matter of drugs. I presume these representations relate to the Opium and Drug Act and not to the present Bill.

Mr. ROWELL: The representations relate to the Opium and Drug Act and I have intimated that that measure will not be proceeded with until after the Government has heard the representations which those who will be affected by the legislation wish to make in regard to it.

On paragraph (e)—" inspector "

Mr. ROWELL: I move to amend paragrah (e) by striking out the words " appointed by His Majesty " and substituting therefor the words " duly appointed by or on behalf of the Dominion Government ".

This is a suggestion made by the Department of Justice for the improvement of the paragraph as it now stands. In its present form the paragraph reads:

"inspector" means any person appointed by His Majesty or by a municipality for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act.

Mr. FIELDING: Does the language used in the paragraph not always imply His Majesty?

Mr. ROWELL: I should have thought myself the amendment was not necessary, but in going over the Bill the Department of Justice suggested to me that it might be made.

Mr. FIELDING: "By the Dominion Government" is a very unusual expression in an Act. However, we all know what it means and that is perhaps the important feature of any legislation. The whole theory of the Government is that all appointments emanate from His Majesty.

Mr. BELAND: We are now a nation.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes.

Mr. ROWELL: As I have already said I approved of the clause in its present form thinking it was suitable for the purpose designed, but the Department of Justice, in finally passing upon it, suggested the modification in question. I think perhaps "the Government of Canada" is preferable to "the Dominion Government." I would therefore suggest that we change the wording to read "appointed by or on behalf of the Government of Canada."

Mr. McKENZIE: Is the minister giving power to a municipality to make an appointment of this kind?

Mr. ROWELL: We do not give municipalities such power; they appoint their own inspectors. A municipality has the power to appoint inspectors to deal with laws relating to that municipality.

Mr. McMASTER: May I point out before we get away from this paragraph that as the minister proposes to amend it the inspection must be made by an inspector appointed either by the Dominion Government or by a municipality? But if there are inspectors appointed by the province the term "inspector" would not cover such provincial inspection. Perhaps that is the intention; I merely draw attention to that point as it has occurred to me.

Mr. ROWELL: Just before I answer my hon. friend, I inadvertently misinformed my hon. friend from Cape Breton. Section 11 of the Act deals with inspectors appointed by councils. It provides:

The Council of any city, town, county or village or other municipality may appoint one or more inspectors of food or drugs, etc.

These appointments are therefore expressly provided for.

Mr. PEDLOW: Would the minister explain who is to make these appointments? The paragraph says:

"Inspector" means any person appointed by or on behalf of, etc.

Who will make the appointment on behalf of the Government if the Government do not make the appointment themselves?

Mr. ROWELL: All these appointments are made by the Civil Service Commission under the existing law.

Mr. McKENZIE: I should think that the words " by His Majesty or by a municipality " might be left out and the clause made to read:

" Inspector " means any person duly appointed for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act.

Mr. ROWELL: I have no objection to the change; it seems to cover exactly the same ground. I move an amendment to that effect.

Amendment agreed to, and section as amended agreed to.

On section 4—drug, when deemed to be adulterated:

Mr. ROWELL: The present Act refers to a specific edition of the pharmacopœia; which is now out of date. In this Bill the reference is to the latest edition of the British or of any foreign pharmacopœia. Then subsection 2 provides that if it is not specified that the drug is to be judged by some other standard, the British Pharmacopœia shall be the standard by which the drug shall be tested and with which it must comply.

Mr. FOURNIER: What have we to do with any foreign pharmacopœia?

Mr. ROWELL: We have very substantial importations of drugs from France, and we recognize the French Pharmacopœia.

Mr. FOURNIER: The codex.

Mr. ROWELL: Well, it is the standard which the French have fixed for testing the purity of their drugs, and that standard is recognized here.

Section agreed to.

On section 5—food, when deemed to be misbranded:

Mr. NESBITT: Paragraph (f) of section 5 says:

> If in package form, sealed by the manufacturer or producer, and bearing his name and address, the contents of each package are not conspicuously and correctly stated in terms of weight, measure or number, upon the outside of the package.

I have a letter which draws my attention to the fact that many packages of perfectly pure foods which will not be sold within the year do not comply with this provision and would be deemed to be misbranded. What has the minister to say about that?

Mr. ROWELL: I intend before the Bill leaves the committee to move an amendment in this connection. I have not yet decided the exact form in which to submit it, but it will provide either that the Act shall come into force on proclamation, or, as was done in the case of the Patent Medicine Act of last session, that the Governor in Council may make regulations governing the disposal of existing stocks. There is no intention to confiscate property which was legitimately acquired under the existing law.

Paragraph (a) of this section is substantially the same as the provision of the present law; it formed part of the adulteration clause. These words have been added: "and if it is not clearly and explicitly described as an imitation." Hon. members will see the reason for that provision; if it is explicitly described as an imitation, then it is not misbranded. Paragraph (b) is a new clause. Paragraph (c) is also new: "If it is sold or offered for sale by a name which belongs to another article."

Mr. FIELDING: Is that a workable clause? In the case of an article protected by trade mark there would be no difficulty. But suppose two articles of the same nature, bearing the same name but coming from different sources, are offered for sale, which one is the offender, neither being protected by trade mark? Two different concerns might easily produce substantially the same article. No doubt these things have all been carefully considered by the officials of the department. I desire to do no more than call attention to them.

Mr. ROWELL: I think that the subsection is not intended to cover the specific point my hon. friend has in mind, though I can quite see the difficulty which might follow if it did deal with a case of that kind. It is intended to deal with the selling of an article under a name different from the real name of the article—in other words, an article which is misbranded.

Mr. FIELDING: The question is, to which of the two in the case I mentioned does this provision apply?

Mr. NESBITT: This provision goes even further than my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) suggests. It says: "If it is sold or offered for sale by a name which belongs to another article." The name might belong to another article not at all similar to the article sold.

Mr. ROWELL: I should draw the attention of my hon. friends to the provisions of clause 14 which has a direct bearing on this. Clause 14 provides that:

> The Governor in Council shall have power to make regulations,—
>
> (*a*) prescribing standards of quality for and fixing the limits of variabilities permissible in any article of food or drug the standard of which is not otherwise prescribed by this Act;
>
> (*b*) requiring a label to be attached, in such manner as he may direct, to any article of food or drug, and prescribing what the colour, size and contents of such label shall be;
>
> (*c*) prescribing, in the case of foods in packages, sold at retail in such packages, what the shape and size of such package shall be, and of what material it shall be made.

I think perhaps sub-clause (a) might be made clearer. I understand from the officers of the department that in their view sub-clause (a) covers the matter:

Prescribing standards for and fixing the limits of variabilities permissible in any article of food.

The word "food" would cover the matter. This clause had better stand.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If sub-clause (c) of clause 5 were made to read:

If it is sold or offered for sale by the name that belongs to it.

That would cover it.

Mr. ROWELL: That would appear to cover it.

Mr. McMASTER: Before we pass from this clause, might I point out to the minister the possibility of confusion, and, I am afraid, trouble with regard to sub-clause (b) which reads:

If it is stated to be the product of a place or a country of which it is not truly a product.

There are in commerce a good many names which have acquired a secondary meaning. For instance, there is Belfast Ginger Ale. I am afraid that some zealous inspector, duly appointed, might possibly think that under sub-clause (b) he would have the right to proceed against some manufacturer who was manufacturing Belfast Ginger Ale. There is a danger in that clause, and I should like to hear what the minister has to say about it.

Mr. ROWELL: This clause is intended to meet cases where a certain foreign product has a well known character and reputation in the market and is bought by reason of that. It is not in the public interest, nor in the interest of people who buy, that other products which are not made in that country and have not the quality, should be sold under that name. For instance, I might mention Java coffee and other commodities.

Mr. McMASTER: Would India curry powder have to be made in India?

Mr. ROWELL: I am not familiar with that particular commodity. If a well known brand of powder of that character is made in India and known in our market, then the product of a similar kind made in Canada should not be sold under the name "India," because that would lead people to believe they were getting the product produced in India.

Mr. DEVLIN: Would Washington coffee have to be made in Washington and Paris Green in Paris?

Mr. BELAND: And what about Hamburg steak?

Mr. CAHILL: Would it be possible under sub-clause (a) to sell oleomargarine as a substitute for butter?

Mr. ROWELL: Sub-clause (a) does not prohibit the sale of oleomargarine if it be described as what it really is.

Mr. CAHILL: If it were described as imitation butter, would it be possible to sell it?

Mr. CROTHERS: I think some alteration should be made in sub-clause (e) of clause 5, which reads:

If false or exaggerated claims are made for it upon the label or otherwise.

In trade what is an exaggerated claim? Supposing for instance, a man is selling soda biscuits, and on the label he has printed: "The biscuits contained in this package are superior in quality to those manufactured by any other firm in Canada." Literally that might be untrue, but the courts of this country regularly recognize what is known as puffing, and they distinguish between puffing and a false statement. For instance, a man has a perfect right under the law to say: "The biscuits contained in this package are the best manufactured in Canada." A man has also a perfect right to say: "That is the best piano manufactured in Canada," although it may be a very inferior piano. That is regarded by the courts as simply puffing, and every man who sells anything has a right under the law to make a general statement of that kind as distinguished from a mis-statement of a fact. If a man says: "The biscuits contained in this package are made from number one hard Manitoba wheat and that was not the case, that is a definite, false statement and is contrary to general law. But in a general sense a man has a perfect right to say that such and such is the best material of the kind manufactured, although that may not be actually true. Under this sub-clause, if it is left as it stands, who is going to determine whether the vendor has exaggerated the qualities of a particular article or not? I think this should be either stricken out altogether or modified to a matter of actual fact capable of being proved, and not a matter of opinion.

Mr. ROWELL: The party to determine the matter would be the magistrate before whom the case came for adjudication, but I appreciate the difficulty of using such a word as "exaggerated." The department has encountered difficulties in enforcing the

law, and the officers of the department were very anxious to have something to enable them to reach parties who were real offenders. On the other hand, one can conceive the difficulty that my hon. friend has pointed out, of puffing, which is perhaps not a desirable thing but which is very common, being construed as coming within the provisions of the law. It may be that we go far enough at present if we simply provide:

If false claims are made for it upon the label or otherwise.

I am quite willing to strike out the words "or exaggerated," and try out the provision in the meantime simply on the basis of false claims.

Mr. BELAND: Is the minister going to strike out subclause (c)?

Mr. ROWELL: I should like to let subclause (c) stand in order to discuss with the officers of the department just what effect the change might have. At present I consider the suggestion of the leader of the Opposition would cover the matter.

Mr. CROTHERS: If the words "of fact" were inserted after the word "claims" in clause (e), there would be no question about the matter being one of opinion.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: Sub-clause (a) seems to be contradictory. It does not seem to be advisable to permit any article being sold as something other than what it really is, and sub-clause (a) allows you to do that. Why should we allow a man to sell an article that is an imitation? In the first place, the word "imitation" implies that some man is trying to sell something under a guise or a camouflage, if he sells it as an imitation. Why should we countenance that at all? For instance, a man might put on a package of oleomargarine the words "pure creamery butter," and then in very small letters underneath "but really oleomargarine." That would be a perfectly legitimate thing to do. When a man buys a railway ticket a great number of conditions are printed on the back, but how many men read those conditions, or the conditions of a fire insurance policy? Under this clause it would seem to me that oleomargarine could be sold as pure butter simply by putting the word "oleomargarine" in small type underneath. Why should we allow anybody to sell an imitation, even in the case of a necessary article of food?

Section stands.

On section 6—compounds, mixtures, etc., to be labelled as such, and not to be marked "pure," "genuine," etc.:

[Mr. Rowell.]

Br. ROWELL: Let me illustrate the kind of case this clause is designed to meet. An article, take mustard, for instance, may be put on the market and may be quite wholesome but not pure mustard. The mustard may have a certain amount of flour mixed with it. Similarly with many other commodities that are sold on the market. We are providing that if the word "pure" or "genuine" is used, it must be the genuine article. If they wish to sell an article that is not wholly composed of the substances described on the label, they must not use the words "pure" or "genuine." This is simply to prevent the public from being misled by the use of these words.

Mr. DENIS: What objection would there be to having the manufacturers indicate on the label the composition of the article? A druggist never objects to writing the prescription on the label of a bottle of medicine, if requested, but when it comes to food we allow any one to sell any kind of food under a false name. I should like to know if there is any real objection to having my suggestion carried out?

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friend will see that there would be serious objection to it in the case, for instance, of commodities which are good articles of food but the composition of which is a trade secret. If there is nothing misleading about the name, there seems to be no necessity for stating the ingredients on the label. My hon. friend is mistaken in thinking that the druggists are required to write the prescription on the label.

Mr. BELAND: He had in mind proprietary medicines.

Mr. DENIS: Where there is no trade secret to be given away, I do not see why the public should not be told what the ingredients are.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend (Mr. Middlebro) will find his criticism respecting the use in large type of the words "pure creamery butter" and in smaller type the word "oleomargarine" covered, I think, by this clause, which provides that:

Every article of food which is a compound, mixture, imitation or substitute shall be plainly and correctly labelled as such; and the words "pure" or "genuine" or words equivalent to these terms, shall not be used on the labels or in connection with such articles, and such articles shall be so packed, marked or labelled as not to be likely to deceive any person with respect to their true nature.

Section agreed to.

On section 7—samples may be obtained:

Mr. ROWELL: Subsection (1) is substantially the existing law. Subsections (2) and (3) are important, and I think should be brought to the attention of the committee. Subsection (2) is rendered necessary by reason of the fact that in cases where an inspector has no reasonable doubt about a certain article being adulterated food, in order to justify his taking action he must take a sample and have it analyzed, and under the law as it now stands it is very doubtful if he has a right to require that the bulk shall be detained until that analysis has been made. As a matter of practice, the department is detaining the bulk until the analysis can be made, but we are advised by our officers that it is desirable that that right should be made perfectly clear, so that in the meantime the adulterated food cannot get out of reach of the department.

Subsection (3) is intended to protect us against the importation of adulterated food. I am advised that in the past there have been many cases where adulterated foods which should not be exposed for sale in this country have been imported from outside. Hon. members will see that the right to examine is limited. The inspector must have the direct authority of the minister before he can examine customs entries and detain food until an analysis can be made. The officials of the department say that both these provisions are very important for the efficient administration of the law and for the protection of the public.

Mr. FIELDING: As the minister has explained, provision is made that an embargo may be laid on imports until an analysis can be made. Then the clause goes on to provide that if "the food or drug is adulterated or misbranded, such food or drug shall not be admitted into Canada for use as a food or drug." For what other purposes than as a food or drug would it be admitted?

Mr. ROWELL: There are a number of uses to which an article may properly be put, and some cases have come up within the past few months in the administration of the department. Albumen of egg, which is not suitable for human food, may be used for tanning purposes, and there are certain manufacturing processes in which commodities such as this may be used. I know that within the past five or six months a large quantity of some article imported into Canada for food was seized by the department. It would clearly have been injurious to health to have that article marketed as food, but it was quite useful in some manufacturing business and we therefore permitted its employment for that purpose.

Mr. FIELDING: That seems reasonable, but has the minister the machinery by which he can guarantee that an article, having been once imported as food, may be used only for a manufacturing purpose?

Mr. ROWELL: In the case I have in mind we took bonds from responsible parties before releasing the article. Whether or not we had the authority to do it we detained the article, a large quantity of which had been imported. The analyst having decided that it was unfit for food, we deemed it wise, instead of detroying the article, to take bonds from responsible parties guaranteeing that it would not be used for any other than specified purposes.

Mr. FIELDING: I quite agree that an article which may be unfit for food may serve a very useful manufacturing purpose, but I think the minister should have some machinery that will insure the safety of the public. Unless there is adequate machinery you may find that an article which is condemned as food, but which is permitted to be used for mechanical purposes, may eventually find its way back to the shop and be exposed for sale as human food.

Mr. ROWELL: I think we have the power under the section regarding regulations. If not, I shall bear in mind the hon. member's suggestion.

Mr. McKENZIE: It is a common practice when goods which are imported for food are found to be unfit for that purpose to deem them as being illegally in the country and to confiscate them. There does not seem to be any power of confiscation here. Suppose a man who imported goods that were found to be unfit should refuse to give such a bond as the minister has spoken of, what would be done in the matter?

Mr. ROWELL: There is a power of forfeiture under section twelve.

Mr. FIELDING: But what about the power to authorize the use of goods for other than food purposes?

Mr. ROWELL: Under sections fourteen and fifteen there is a general authority to make regulations, and subsection "D" of section fifteen provides "for carrying out the provisions of this Act." When we come to that subsection, which is very broad, I shall consider the point raised by my hon.

friend, if there is found to be any necessity for modification.

Mr. McKENZIE: Subsection "D" of section fifteen does not help the minister in making regulations. There must be a previous provision in regard to the disposal of condemned goods.

Mr. ROWELL: Section 12 provides for this.

12. (1) Whenever any article of food or any drug is reported by a Dominion analyst as being adulterated or misbranded within the meaning of this Act, the department may order such article and all other articles of the same description which were in the same place at the time the article analysed was obtained to be seized by an inspector and detained by him until an analysis of a sample of the whole is made.

(2) If the Dominion analyst reports to the department that the whole or any part of such articles of food or drugs as have been submitted for analysis by the aforesaid inspector is adulterated or misbranded, the Minister may declare such articles, or so much thereof as the Dominion analyst reports to be adulterated or misbranded, to be forfeited to the Crown, and they shall be forfeited accordingly, and may be disposed of as the minister directs.

Mr. FIELDING: They are disposed of after forfeiture.

Mr. ROWELL: Yes, as the minister may direct. I shall keep my hon. friend's point in mind.

Section agreed to.

On section eight—Inspector has to deal with samples.

Mr. McKENZIE: This section provides for court proceedings and enacts that the certificate of the analyst shall be received as evidence in any proceedings taken against any person in pursuance of this Act. This might be a good way for an officer to get in evidence, but I need hardly remind my hon. friend that evidence of this nature is exceedingly unpopular. The best way to prove a case is the ordinary old-fashioned way of producing witnesses and having the whole matter aired before the court.

Mr. ROWELL: In that respect the law is not materially changed, except that the certificate may be the certificate of a "Dominion Analyst" instead of the "Chief Analyst." My hon. friend will see that this is a case where the government official has no object whatever other than to get at the actual contents of the article examined or analysed. If he makes an examination and finds the article adulterated his certificate is put in as evidence in the case. Having regard to the objects for which the legislation is being enacted, I think it is very desirable that provision should be made to make the enforcement of the law expeditious and convenient. Suppose that the defendant in a case was in a position to show that a mistake had been made, there would be no object in the department prosecuting. All they wish to do is to get at the facts. Section 9 also provides that:

(1) If the person who supplied the article respecting which the certificate referred to in the last preceding section is given, deems himself aggrieved thereby, he may within ten days of the receipt of the copy of such certificate furnished to him, notify the minister in writing that he intends to present evidence in his own behalf to controvert the certificate of the Dominion analyst, stating in full the nature of such evidence. In the absence of such notice the certificate of the analyst shall be taken as final.

He is not precluded from giving evidence but he must give notice beforehand to enable the department to meet the case. Then sub-section 2 of section 9 provides:

(2) Should the evidence submitted by the person above referred to be such as in the opinion of the Chief Dominion Analyst to justify further investigation, the Chief Dominion Analyst may cause the second part of the sample submitted to the Department, as provided in section eight, to be analysed to his satisfaction, and a certificate of such analysis signed by the Chief Dominion Analyst shall be final and conclusive evidence of the facts therein set out.

The sample is taken away, it is divided into three parts and it is only the analysis of the actual sample taken that can be used as the basis of prosecution. Otherwise the man charged might substitute something else and say that that was the article he had at the time the seizure was made. I think ample protection is given by section 9 to meet the case mentioned. I should point out that sections 8 and 9 are substantially the present law with two exceptions. Section 8, sub-section 4 provides, that:

A copy of such certificate shall be furnished by the department to the person from whom the sample was procured within six months of the time of procuring the sample.

There was no provision in the Act as it stood that the certificate should be furnished within any definite time and it is only reasonable that a man from whose goods a sample is taken for analysis should have the certificate furnished within some fixed time. Provision is also made that the certificate of the Dominion analyst may be taken in the first instance rather than the

certificate of the chief Dominion analyst. It would be quite impossible for the chief analyst to personally analyse all the samples taken.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Why should a man have to wait for six months to get that certificate.

Mr. ROWELL: He does not have to wait; it is furnished in due time, or as soon as it is available. This is simply a limitation upon the existing law.

Mr. FIELDING: Has there not been found a difficulty in that samples are taken say, from a grocer's shop? He does not make the goods at all; he buys them in good faith and sells them in good faith. Is it the intention to proceed to examine samples of the product of the manufacturer, the source from which the goods come? It does seem a hardship that the grocer who buys an article in all good faith, believing he is getting the correct thing, upon it being discovered that there is some adulteration, must be pilloried before the public through no fault of his own. It may be that there is no other way of getting at it, but I have known cases in which there has been very great hardship.

Mr. ROWELL: I appreciate the point raised by the hon. gentleman and in order to get over the difficulty provision is made to reach the manufacturer and as far as possible to take samples from him. But it has been found in many cases that the only way to reach the trouble has been to go into a store, actually buy an article and take a sample. Provision is made in section 17 for the case which my hon. friend has mentioned where a man might plead want of knowledge and thereby escape the consequences of his act.

Mr. FIELDING: He escapes the consequences in the way of a penalty in the courts but in the meantime a bulletin has been issued by the department which practically blacklists the grocer who has sold that article. It is true the public do not generally see these bulletins; it is a pity they do not in some cases. I know of a case where a gross injustice has been done to reputable merchants who have been pilloried in the bulletins of the department. I am not complaining of the department for doing this; I have no doubt they are only carrying out their duty, but it seems to me a very great hardship.

Mr. NESBITT: I absolutely agree with what has been said by my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding). Could not the Act be so framed that if an article were seized in a retail store, the manufacturer of the article would be responsible? You might force a manufacturer under this Bill to put his name on the article so that you would know exactly who made it and you could come back at him. I have known of instances where the retail man was just as innocent as a baby in the matter. He did not know that the article that he had sold was not what it was represented to be but still his name went forth to the public. This may hurt a man's business a great deal.

Mr. ROWELL: I may say in answer to both my hon. friends that while I believe in the past the course they have indicated was pursued, it is not now being pursued. No names are published in any bulletin until after a conviction is actually registered. The case that my hon. friends have mentioned would not arise in so far as publication in the bulletin is concerned.

Mr. NESBITT: Is the manufacturer not the man who is guilty and is he not the man who should be punished if there is any deception or wrongdoing?

Mr. ROWELL: I will be glad to discuss the point when we come to section 17, which deals particularly with the matter.

Mr. McKENZIE: If section 8 passes, section 17 will be ineffective. I sympathise very strongly with what has been said by my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) and my hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt). After all the man who produces the article, puts it in the can and sells it, is the man who knows what the contents of the receptacle are and he is altogether responsible to the public for what he puts up. Within the last few days an action for damages has been tried in one of the provinces. The complainant passed the retailer altogether and brought the action direct against the man who manufactured the goods. This is not a new principle at all as it has been upheld both in England and in the United States. That being the case I should think it would be worthy of consideration by the minister as to whether or not he should always go after the manufacturer, and provide the means of reaching him.

Mr. ROWELL: The change proposed in line 7 of section 8 is merely a verbal one. The reference there given should be to section 15 instead of section 17.

On section 10—analysis may be obtained of any sample:

Mr. McKENZIE: What is really meant by "Dominion analyst"? In my own province the certificate of an analyst in a prosecution under the Temperance Act is recognized as evidence, but I think a certain qualification must be provided for before the certificate of the analyst is accepted. It would not do for everybody to call themselves analysts without being able to demonstrate that they possess the necessary qualifications; there ought to be some definition as to what constitutes an analyst, and how the functionary comes to be possessed of the title.

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friend will see that is provided for in subclause (b) of section 2, the definition clause, which says:

"Dominion analyst" means any analyst appointed for the purposes of this Act and includes the Chief Dominion Analyst and the Assistant Chief Dominion Analyst.

"Dominion analyst" only applies to an analyst appointed under the provisions of the Bill.

Mr. PEDLOW: I would like to call the attention of the Chairman to the fact that there is not a quorum of the committee at the present time.

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friend will realize that if he insists upon his objection it means reporting the fact to the Speaker.

Mr. NESBITT: I would like to draw the attention of my hon friend (Mr. Pedlow) to the fact that there is a quorum present.

Mr. BELAND: There are twenty members present, including the Chairman.

Mr. PEDLOW: I admit that it is very desirable we should proceed with the business of the House, but it is also desirable that there should be an adequate attendance of members, and that those hon. gentlemen should take an intelligent interest in the discussion that is going on. I must insist that there be a quorum in carrying on the business of the House.

The CHAIRMAN: If the hon. gentleman insists, it will be the duty of the Chairman to report to the Speaker the point which has just been raised. I will therefore ask the Clerk to make a count of the members present.

Mr. FIELDING: I do hope my hon. friend (Mr. Pedlow) will not press the point. After all this is a Bill of a rather formal and routine character, and I do not think there is any real objection to it. I think it would be a pity, and very undesirable, to have it announced to the public that the House was counted out.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: In addition to that, the procedure will simply use up so much of our working time and nothing will be gained by it.

Mr. NESBITT: There was a quorum when my hon. friend made his objection.

Mr. PEDLOW: I will not press the point. I made it for the purpose of insisting upon a better attendance of hon. gentlemen than we now have.

Mr. BELAND: There are more than twenty members present now.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall clause 10 carry?

Mr. McKENZIE: Just a moment. I was drawing the minister's attention to the question of the qualification of an analyst. It is quite true that the Bill contains a definition of an analyst, but what I maintain is that we should be assured that these analysts have some standard qualifications, that they have taken a degree in some college or are recognized as holding some certificate, and that they are not simply appointees of the Government.

Mr. ROWELL: In answer to my hon. friend I would say that the qualifications for appointment to a position of this kind are determined under the classification of the Civil Service. A candidate for the position of analyst is required to have suitable educational qualifications; he must have graduated from a university or school and possess attainments qualifying him for the position. I have not got the prescribed qualifications under my hand at present, but I shall be glad to furnish my hon. friend with that information.

Mr. McKENZIE: Must we go to the Civil Service Commission to get a definition of the qualifications of an analyst?

Mr. ROWELL: The qualifications are set forth in the classification submitted to the House at the last session of Parliament. When a position is vacant and the Civil Service Commission advertises, the particular qualifications required are specified in detail.

Mr. McKENZIE: Under the provisions of the old Civil Service Act a man could be appointed to a technical position in the Government service without the consent of the Civil Service Commission, but it may be otherwise now. If it is possible for a man without the necessary technical know-

ledge to be brought into the department without going through the hands of the Civil Service Commission it would be very desirable to have a definition in the Bill of what constitutes an analyst. I would not raise the point were it not for the fact that the finding of an analyst is made evidence in a court of law. The old-fashioned way of having the witness go on a stand has been done away with, and a certificate is now required. Therefore we have the right to know in some way the educational attainments of the man who makes that certificate.

Mr. ROWELL: I shall be very glad, before the Bill leaves Committee, to give my hon. friend the information he desires. I may tell him, however, that the applicant for such a position must be a Master or Bachelor of Science, or a graduate in Arts, who has taken a special course in chemistry. He must be in every way well qualified for the post.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Do I understand from clause 10 that in the event of any one believing that some sample of food has been adulterated, it is necessary for them to enclose a fee in order to have that sample analysed?

Mr. ROWELL: That provision is in the existing law. No change is being made in the law in that respect.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Surely it should not be necessary, having regard to all the facilities at the disposal of the department, for a private person to take proceedings against a vendor for violation of the provisions of this Act. I see no good purpose in compelling any one to pay for an analysis and then to enter proceedings.

Mr. ROWELL: It is true that the department exists for the purpose of enforcing the law and that all complaints made to the department are investigated in due course and prosecutions instituted wherever necessary. But in addition to that, this provision would enable a man who was not satisfied with the action taken by the department to proceed as outlined. It is simply carrying forward into the present Act a provision of the old Act.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: If a man was strongly of the opinion that the department was lax, it would be necessary for him to pay for an analysis of the sample by the department.

Mr. ROWELL: That is the law as it stands to-day.

Section agreed to.

On section 11—inspectors appointed by councils:

Mr. NESBITT: Sections 10 and 11 provide that the offender can be prosecuted as well as the manufacturer, and that raises the question that was brought up by my hon friend (Mr. Fielding).

Mr. ROWELL: As a matter of practical administration I am afraid that we cannot consent to limit the prosecution solely to the manufacturer. The department in every case endeavours to reach the parties primarily responsible. But it is a matter of great importance that adulterated food or drugs which are dangerous to the public health should not be sold; therefore it has been considered necessary that the department should have the right to proceed directly against the parties who sell, leaving it to them to establish their innocence.

Mr. PEDLOW: The minister has stated that the Civil Service Commission would appoint inspectors provided for by paragraph (e) of section 2; but under section 11 the council of any city, town, county or village or other municipality may appoint inspectors. Is there not a conflict of authority here?

Mr. ROWELL: Dominion inspectors will be appointed by the Civil Service Commission. There is also the right on the part of local municipalities to appoint local inspectors. In fact, it is necessary that the principal municipalities at least should do so, otherwise we should have to have a corps of Dominion inspectors wtih a consequent unfair charge against the Federal exchequer. The local municipalities must take an interest in the enforcement of this law; therefore every encouragement is given to them to appoint their own inspectors, to initiate their own prosecutions and to get the benefit of the fines. The inspector has no right to give the certificate. He goes about, inspects and makes seizures, but his functions are quite different from that of the analyst.

Mr. PEDLOW: Will the local inspectors have the same duties as the Dominion inspectors?

Mr. ROWELL: The local inspectors can only exercise the authority that is expressly given them. They may take the sample, but they must submit it to the Dominion analyst, and on the basis of the decision of the Dominion analyst as to the quality of the product a prosecution may be instituted.

Mr. McMASTER: I think it inadvisable to have in a Federal Act a statement which makes it appear that this Parliament is giving to a municipality the right to do such and such a thing. Consequently, it seems to me that the phrase, "The council of any city, town, county or village or other municipality may appoint," and so on, is unfortunate. I do not challenge the object which the clause seeks to attain, but it seems to me that it might better be worded: "Inspectors appointed by the council of any city, town, county or village," and so on. I would not in a Federal Act grant the right to municipal councils to do such and such a thing. This Parliament has no right to direct municipal councils to do or not to do such and such things, because municipal councils derive their power, not from the Dominion, but from the provinces.

Mr. ROWELL: I appreciate the point raised by my hon. friend. But this section has been in the law for over thirty years; we are only re-enacting what has been in the statute for a very long time. Frankly, when the Bill first came up, I was under the impression that all we were doing was recognizing the authority of inspectors appointed by the municipalities, but the Act itself goes further. I do not think any difficulty can arise from this. We are giving these inspectors, after they are appointed by the municipalities, certain powers. It is our function to give them those powers.

Mr. McMASTER: Once they are appointed, I agree with the minister that it is quite right for us to give them the powers, but the legislation goes further than that; it says in so many words: "The council of any city, town or village may appoint." I say that we have no right to say to a municipal council: "You may appoint an inspector." The only power that has the right to say that is the power vested in the province. I am inclined to think the minister will agree with me on that constitutional point.

Mr. ROWELL: I think under certain conditions we have power over municipalities just as we have power over individuals; but I do not think it is necessary to enter into a discussion of that constitutional question at present. The fact is that this has been in the law for thirty years, and the Department of Justice has approved this legislation in its present form. Therefore, I should say we are quite safe in leaving it as it is in that respect.

[Mr. Rowell.]

Mr. McKENZIE: Under this measure will a municipal council have power to dismiss an officer?

Mr. ROWELL: These officers are wholly under the control of the municipalities. I have no hesitation in saying that had I drafted the law originally I should have provided that where the municipalities appointed these officials, these officials should have certain powers. But I do not think any harm can come from leaving this as it is.

Mr. FIELDING: This has been in the Act for thirty years, but does the word "payment" in sub-clause 2 convey clearly what is meant? The clause reads:

> Such Dominion Analyst shall, on payment of the prescribed fee.

That, of course, means on payment to him, the receipt of money by him. As the sub-clause is worded, there is almost a suggestion that it is on payment by him of money. As, however, this has been in the law for thirty years, I suppose that is good authority.

Mr. ROWELL: This is not exactly the form in the original Act, but the difference is not in the point which my hon. friend has mentioned. The Act as it originally stood reads:

> Such analyst shall, upon tender of the fees fixed for the analysis of such class of articles by the Governor in Council, forthwith analyse the same and give the inspector a certificate of the said analysis.

I should think a little more than tendering is required; payment is what is required.

Mr. FIELDING: Payment by the party applying. There is here almost the implication that the analyst has to make the payment. The fact, however, that this has been the law for thirty years, is good authority.

Mr. ROWELL: I should have thought that the fact that this was on payment by the party applying was clearly implied from the clause, quite apart from its antiquity, and that it did not require its age to justify it. The clause reads:

> Such Dominion Analyst shall, on payment of the prescribed fee.

That must be on payment of the fee for the analysis referred to in the preceding sub-clause, sub-clause (1) which says that the inspector may require a Dominion Analyst to analyse any samples of food or drugs procured by him. I have no objec-

tion to inserting the words " to him," if my hon. friend thinks that is necessary, but I do not think it is necessary.

Section agreed to.

On section 12—seizure.

Mr. NESBITT: Is the word " description " in the fifth line of sub-clause (1) a good word. The sub-clause reads:

All other articles of the same description.

Should not the sub-clause read:

All other articles of the same kind.

Mr. ROWELL: All other articles of the same character?

Mr. NESBITT: That would do.

Mr. ROWELL: I have no objection to substituting the word "character" for the word "description."

Mr. McMASTER: I do not think that is any improvement. I think the word "description" keeps the matter closer to what is being seized. For instance, one sort of meat might be of the same character as another.

Mr. NESBITT: Articles might be of the same description; that is to say, the labels and all that sort of thing might be of the same description, and yet they would not be of the same character at all. I absolutely disagree with my hon. friend (Mr. McMaster) when he says that the word "description" is better than the word "character."

Mr. ROWELL: I find that in the old Act—and I confess I am not aware why in drafting this Bill a change was made—the words are "the same kind and quality."

Mr. NESBITT: The words "the same kind" would suit me.

Mr. ROWELL: We had better adopt the description in the original Act. I am informed by the officers of the department that the reason for the change was in order to leave out the word "quality," because there might be difficulty arising therefrom. I move that the word "description" in the fifth line of sub-clause (1) of clause 12 be stricken out and the word "kind" substituted therefor.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 13—reports of Chief Analyst.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: In the fifth line of this clause would not the word "thereon" be better than the word "therein" in regard to misbranding?

Mr. ROWELL: Yes, I should think it would. That is probably a clerical error. I move that the word "thereon" be substituted for the word "therein" in the fifth line of this clause.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 14—regulations by Governor in Council.

Mr. NESBITT: I should like to draw the minister's attention to sub-clause (c). Those of us who are in business in this country have troubles enough without having any more thrown in our way. Why are such obstacles placed in the way of doing business? What is the sense of having the department say what size and what shape of packages food shall be put in? What difference does the shape or the size make or what material packages may be made of so long as they are not made of poisonous material? That is an unnecessary interference with trade, in my judgment, and might cause a great deal of expense to a manufacturer. He is the best judge of the most suitable size, because he has to cater to the trade. No man in the House of Commons, or in the department, would be as good a judge as to the size and shape of the package as the manufacturer, because it is his business to get the trade.

Mr. ROWELL: It has been found in the actual administration of the law that where an article of food put up in a certain sized package or container has acquired a high reputation on the market because of its character and quality, other manufacturers will put up a similar article, but of inferior quality, which they can afford to sell at a lower price, in substantially the same sized container or package, and the public in looking at the two is misled. The view of the department is that in such a case the inferior article should be sold in a different kind of package so that the public will not confuse it with the better known article of superior quality.

Mr. NESBITT: This clause does not touch that at all. The whole Act provides against imitation, but this clause regulates the size of package that all commodities shall be put up in.

Mr. McMASTER: I do not think any special legislation is necessary to cover cases of the kind mentioned, because a man could

bring an action for unfair competition or passing off an article as something else.

Mr. NESBITT: I am not speaking of imitation. I say this clause gives power to prescribe the kind of package that every manufacturer shall put his stuff up in.

Mr. ROWELL: This is not a power which the minister is compelled to use. It is only power to deal by regulation with a situation where it is believed that such regulation is necessary. It is not contemplated that there should be general regulations governing all kinds of packages, but it is desired by the department that there should be power to deal with the class of cases such as I have indicated, which have already arisen in the administration of the law.

Mr. ROSS: Does the minister mean that if a manufacturer puts up a certain article in a certain kind of package the department will have power to say that another manufacturer shall not put up a similar article in a similar package?

Mr. ROWELL: No. A manufacturer puts up a certain article of a well-recognized standard or quality in a certain sized container, which becomes known to the public. When the article has become well-known on the market another manufacturer, knowing the reputation it has acquired, may produce a similar article of inferior quality which he can afford to sell at a lower price, and put it up in a container similar in general design and character to the other one, and the public are thereby misled. I am told that is the actual situation which sometimes arises in the administration of the law, and the sole object of the department is to take power to prevent the public from being misled into buying an article of inferior quality, thinking they are getting an article of better quality.

Mr. NESBITT: But the whole Act provides against imitation. This is an interference with trade. Biscuit manufacturers, for instance, from one end of the country to the other put up a three-pound package of biscuits. It is exactly the same sized package all over the country, but they do not pretend for a minute to imitate some other manufacturer. It seems to me utterly incomprehensible to suppose that people would be deceived by articles being put up in a similar package. These packages have to have their own labels on, and by this Act the manufacturer is required to say whether the article is pure or adulterated. I repeat, this clause is an absolute interference with trade.

[Mr. McMaster.]

Mr. FIELDING: I do not think this clause deals with quality, as suggested by the minister. His reasoning in the main is good, but I think it would be stronger if he dealt mainly with the question of quantity. A lady, for instance, buys a certain article by the package; the package becomes a standard article. When you buy a package of this or that you do not make an analytical examination as to the weight. The package has a standard value, and as the minister states, an old established concern may have a reputation for its goods sold in that way, and some other manufacturer may put up another article—not of inferior quality, because I do not think that is touched on by this clause—in a similar package which he can afford to sell at a lower price, and that comes in competition with the old established article. I think in such a case this clause would have a very good effect. Where an article is well known and is sold by the package, without much analysis as to the weight, I think it is right and fair that nobody else should attempt to sell the same article in a similar sized package, and the Government should have the power to regulate the size of the package in which the article shall be sold. We regulate the weight of a barrel of flour. That is just as much an interference with trade, but we do it because the barrel is standardized and no one is allowed to sell, as a barrel, a less quantity than is prescribed. I think on the question of quantity rather than on quality the minister's argument is sound.

Mr. NESBITT: Might I point out to my hon. friend that we have already by this Act provided that the weight shall be put on the package so that the public shall not be deceived. Of course we regulate the weight of a bag of potatoes or a barrel of flour and many other things which are sold by the barrel or bag, but that is a different thing entirely. This clause deals with articles sold by the package.

Mr. PEDLOW: I quite agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Nesibtt). I think that paragraph (c) should be dropped entirely from the Bill. It is absolutely unnecessary. I speak from experience in matters of this kind. If a manufacturer has established a reputation for a certain article and another manufacturer comes along with an imitation in similar package, the first manufacturer has recourse against the other at law and can restrain him from interfering with his rights. This clause means that a manufacturer who produces a new article

must come to Ottawa for instructions from the department as to the size of the package in which that article shall be put up, the colour of the label, and all such minor details which he would arrange in his own office to suit his own convenience and to secure the success of his product on the market. I think the committee would be well advised to eliminate this section entirely.

Mr. McMASTER: I would ask the minister to regard this clause exactly as it should be regarded. This is not paternal legislation; it is not even maternal legislation; it is, I think, grandmotherly legislation. It is absurd that a department of government should have the right to say to a manufacturer: "You shall not put up your product in a tin that will hold two pounds, but in one that will hold five pounds; you shall not put it up in a tin coloured red, but in one coloured blue or grey, or some neutral colour; and you shall make your label of such and such material." I would ask the minister seriously to realize that all this interferes with the principles of liberty which people should enjoy in carrying on their business in the way they should judge best so long as they do not interfere with the acquired rights of others. It is a well-known principle of law, with which the minister is no doubt much more familiar than I am, that restraint will be put upon the man who dishonestly endeavours to avail himself of the goodwill or reputation that attaches to the goods of a competitor, and we had better leave the well laid down principles of law to regulate this matter. I see no great objection to subsection "A" of the clause, but I would ask the minister to strike out subsections "B" and "C," for I cannot see that they serve any useful purpose. The explanation given by the minister just shows how unfortunate the exercise of the power in question may be. Let us suppose that there are two manufacturers making a breakfast food, and that the superior breakfast food is oatmeal, which has been put up in a certain package for many years. Some man comes forward with cream of wheat or some other fancy breakfast food and, according to the minister, if he puts it up in a package similar to that which has contained rolled oats he may be told by the department that he has no right to put up his product in this way because it is an inferior breakfast food. The public having been accustomed to buy rolled oats in a certain package, he must not attempt to put up his cream of wheat in the same way. Well, it seems to me that that is reducing legislation to an absurdity. People who realize that oatmeal is an excellent food will buy oatmeal and those who want cream of wheat should be allowed to buy this article, no matter in what package the manufacturer cares to put it up. If there is unfair competition, and an attempt is made by a manufacturer or merchant to pass off his goods as those of another, then the law will restrain him, and this is the principle which I think should apply in this matter. There is a tendency in legislation to try to meet with a special law every specific case that arises. I think this is a mistake. It cumbers our statutes, and justice between man and man is not attained by placing these meticulous enactments upon the statute book.

Mr. ROWELL: The illustration which my hon. friend has given emphasizes the importance of certain foodstuffs in which he is very much interested,——

Mr. McMASTER: Merely as a consumer.

Mr. ROWELL: —his interest being no doubt responsible for the vigour with which he discusses these questions; but it is entirely different from the illustration I gave to the House. I could not give a better illustration than that offered by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), and it is just to prevent frauds in such cases as he has mentioned, and others of a similar character, that the legislation is designed. I am quite prepared to let the clause stand if it can be modified in any way that will protect the public against being misled. There is no desire to hamper business, the sole object being to protect the public. I move that the section stand.

Section stands.

On section 15—regulations by minister:

Mr. FIELDING: The minister is taking large powers to himself. I agree that it is necessary that regulations should be made to carry out the purposes of the Act, but these regulations should be proposed by the minister and have the approval of the Governor in Council.

Mr. ROWELL: Probably it is wiser to put it in that form, and I therefore move to substitute for the word "minister" the words "Governor in Council."

Mr. FIELDING: "The minister, with the approval of the Governor in Council," would do.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It comes to the same thing.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Why not consolidate this with the previous section?

Mr. ROWELL: I am not sure that some of the details in connection with this section need be published in the Gazette. I prefer to leave the two sections separate. I move that "Governor in Council" be substituted for the word "minister" in the first line of section 15.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. McMASTER: What interpretation does the minister place upon these words: "or otherwise given assistance leading to conviction in the case in question"? If the minister proposes to give half the fine to a witness who testifies, I object to that, as an unfortunate provision. I can understand that the informer should get half the fine. That is an encouragement which is given to informers but which is offset by public disapproval of this brand of gentry. But persons who "otherwise have given assistence" may, under this clause, get half the fine. If that refers to the lawyer who might conduct the prosecution in such a case I would have no harsh words to say to the minister, but I should not like this provision to extend to witnesses, who should be indemnified and not rewarded.

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friend will see that this is to be covered by regulations which will define the conditions. Of course, it is not intended to give to a witness any compensation that would be improper, but it is necessary, in the adequate administration of the law, that advantage should be taken of information furnished, and where you give a portion of the fine it is an inducement in many cases for people to give information that may lead to prosecution under the Act. The information might come from more than one source. There might be different provisions in regard to the information furnished or the assistance given. That would all be covered by suitable regulations. I do not think there is any danger in that clause.

Mr. McMASTER: With the explanation of the minister before us I do not see any necessity for the words "or otherwise given assistance." The minister takes power with the consent of the Governor in Council to make regulations prescribing that a portion of the fine may go to the informer or to the person who has given information. I have no objection to that, but I cannot see how any one else but the witness and the lawyers would give assistance to obtain a conviction.

Mr. ROWELL: I have no objection to limiting it to "any person who has given information leading to conviction in the case in question," striking out the words "or otherwise given assistance." I therefore beg to move to strike out the words "or otherwise given assistance."

Mr. McKENZIE: I have never come across any criminal proceedings or law cases like this. The minister can find abundant cases where half the fine goes to the informer, but I never saw any legislation going farther than that. That in itself is going as far as it should. We do not want any more informers. I think that provision should be struck out altogether. The question has to be determined by the magistrate who tries the case. If the Act says that half the fines shall go to the informer, it must mean the man who lays the information. There is no difficulty about that, but there may be three or four other people who come before the court and say that they are the people who gave the information that led to the conviction. There are only two halves, and if the court says that half of the fine shall go to the informer there will be no half to go to these other people. This sort of legislation is not very commendable, but when it says that half of the fine shall go to any person who gives information that leads to securing a conviction, it is going to cause a great deal of trouble.

Mr. ROWELL: I have already intimated that I shall be content to move that the words "or otherwise given assistance" shall be stricken out. They were put in for the reason that it was thought they would be of benefit, but I am not going to press the point. Let me give an illustration which has just been given to me from the officer administering the Act. Information comes to the department that a person professing to manufacture a certain commodity is in receipt of large quantities of another material which may be used as an adulterant. That is information upon which an investigation may be proceeded with. It may be that all the informant knows is that the commodity has been shipped in. That does lend assistance to the department in securing a conviction. That is what was in the mind of the officials of the department in suggesting these words. It is not direct information; it is only

information with regard to a fact that puts the department in a position to make inquiry; they follow it up and subsequently discover the main offence for which the man is prosecuted.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is that not ususally provided for by some sort of a secret service fund? It should not be provided for by the court. Whether the minister knows it or not, there is such a fund, and moneys of that kind are being paid out from time to time for the enforcement of Acts.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It would furnish a great fund of criticism for an Opposition.

Mr. McKENZIE: We furnish a great fund of information to the Government, and it is information which they seem to require. If there is any division of the fine to be made, that division must be made by the magistrate. It cannot be made by anybody else. It cannot be divided afterwards by the officer of the department; he has no jurisdiction. The magistrate must say in his conviction where the fine should go and this legislation must be such that the court enforcing it must know what is intended and what disposition shall be made of the fine.

Mr. ROWELL: These words "or otherwise given assistance" are to be stricken out.

Mr. PEDLOW: Before the section is passed, there is another point that I would like some information on. Section 15, says: "Provided that no portion of any fine shall be paid to any Dominion analyst or to any inspector." Does that include inspectors appointed by the council of a city or other municipality? Do they come under that rule as well as the inspectors of the department in Ottawa?

Mr. ROWELL: Yes; they do not get the benefit of that division of the fine. Section 11 provides in case of municipal inspectors that the fine in every case goes to the municipality to be used as the municipality may direct. Subsection 4 says:

> All penalties imposed and recovered at the suit of any such inspector, shall be paid into the revenue of the city, county, town or village by the council of which such inspector was appointed, and may be used in such manner as the council of such city, county, town or village may direct.

They may themselves provide that a portion may go to their own employee, but in so far as this legislation is concerned we provide that the fine imposed as the result of a prosecution by a municipal inspector shall be paid to the municipality to be disbursed by themselves as they see fit.

Mr. HAROLD: I have a letter from a condensing company and they have the impression that it will not be legal for them to sell skim milk even if they mark the packages as skim milk. I would like to have that question cleared up if it is possible at this juncture.

Mr. ROWELL: I do not know of anything in the Act which would prevent selling skim milk as skim milk.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: They must describe it as such.

Mr. ROWELL: They must describe it as skim milk. If they sold it as milk without describing it as skim milk they would be guilty of violating the law.

Mr. HAROLD: Would they be permitted to sell it in the event of their describing it as skim milk?

Mr. ROWELL: I do not know of anything in the law that would prevent them.

Section as amended agreed to.

At six o'clock the House resumed and then took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed in Committee consideration of Bill No. 27 respecting Food and Drugs.

On section 16—sale of adulterated or misbranded article, penalty.

Mr. CAHILL: Will the minister explain the provisions to this clause?

Mr. ROWELL: The clause does not differ in any material respect, from the provisions in the existing law, as I now recall them, except that it makes a difference in the penalty for an adulteration injurious to health—adulteration in which some poisonous substance or some substance deleterious to health is introduced into the food product—and for other violations of the law. Hon. members will see that the penalty is increased. The penalty is a fine not exceeding $500 and costs, and not less than $50 and costs, or imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months, or both fine and imprisonment, if the adulteration is injurious to health. If the adulteration is not injurious to health but still an adulteration

within the meaning of the Act, or if the article is misbranded, then the penalty for the first offence is a fine not exceeding $100 and costs and not less than $25 and costs, or imprisonment for a term not exceeding three months. Then, for each subsequent offence the penalty is made the same as in case of an adulteration injurious to health.

Mr. PARENT: Who is going to benefit by the fine?

Mr. ROWELL: If the fine is the result of a prosecution instituted by the Government inspectors themselves, it goes to the revenue of Canada, unless in the cases expressly provided for, where it is as a result of information given that a conviction is secured. Then provision may be made for one-half of the fine going to the party who gives the information. If the conviction is the result of a prosecution instituted by a municipal inspector—an inspector appointed by a municipality in connection with the administration of the Act—then the whole fine goes to the municipality to be disposed of as it may direct.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would like to point out to the minister that the clause as drafted seems to be very far-reaching indeed. Under it, if I am right, a merchant would be liable to a fine of $250 and costs, or imprisonment, simply for exposing in his window an article that happened to be adulterated whether he knew it to be such or not. There may be a provision elsewhere in the Bill which modifies the clause but as it stands it looks frightfully drastic.

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friend will see that clause 17 modifies the one we are discussing. The former reads as follows:

> If the person accused proves to the magistrate before whom any prosecution is brought for selling, offering or exposing for sale any article of food or drug that is adulterated or misbranded, that he purchased the article in question for and as an article of the same nature, substance and quality as that demanded of him by the purchaser or inspector, with a written warranty to that effect, and produces the said warranty, or other evidence satisfactory to the magistrate, at the trial, and also prove that he sold it in the same state as that in which he purchased it and that he could not with reasonable diligence have obtained knowledge of its adulteration or misbranding, he shall be discharged from such prosecution—

And so on. So far as the point raised by my hon. friend is concerned, the provision is the same as it has been for many years. In fact, section 17 is designed to make it a little easier for the innocent party than is the case under the existing law. I should think that in practice very few would secure a warranty with the article when they bought it; under the provision as it stands the person accused must not only secure the warranty but must produce it to the justice trying the case. I should think it would be quite sufficient if he established to the satisfaction of the justice that he bought it as of the kind and quality described in the section; and that he should not be required to have procured a warranty at the time he actually purchased it. When we come to section 17, I intend to propose an amendment to this effect.

Mr. BOYS: When is the notice referred to in subsection 1 of section 17 given? If it is given on the day of the hearing, it would then be too late to obviate the expense of prosecution, and I assume that that is the purpose of that part of the section. It seems to me that if a man is absolutely innocent he should not be called upon to pay any costs. There should be a provision in the section that if the person accused establishes his innocence at the first sitting of the court he should not be held responsible for the payment of costs incurred by the prosecutor.

Mr. ROWELL: The section contemplates not only that the person accused shall give notice of intention to rely upon the defence referred to, but, in subsection 2, that he shall bring before the court the party from whom he purchased the article. The object is that the person who is really responsible shall pay the penalty.

Section agreed to.

On section 17—want of knowledge:

Mr. ROWELL: I move to amend section 17 by striking out the following words:

> With a written warranty to that effect, and produces the said warranty, or other evidence satisfactory to the magistrate, at the trial.

Then the only obligation resting upon the accused will be to satisfy the magistrate that he purchased the article bona fide in the manner provided in the section and that he could not with reasonable diligence have obtained knowledge of its adulteration, or misbranding; and that he must bring before the court the party from whom he purchased it.

Mr. PARENT: If prosecutions are taken without good reason, it is only fair that the costs should be borne, not by the accused, but by the prosecutor. If the person accused proves to the satisfaction of the magistrate that he has not been guilty of negligence he should not be liable to the payment of costs.

Mr. BOYS: The first day of the hearing is the first opportunity that the defendant has of giving the notice required; and if he does not give it then and proves his innocence, under this clause he is liable for the payment of costs. That should not be so. It should be provided that if the accused brings the matter to the attention of the court at the first hearing and establishes his innocence, he should not be responsible for costs. Of course, if he fails to bring it to the attention of the court at the first hearing, I agree, he should be responsible for the costs, even if the case against him is dismissed.

Mr. ROWELL: Reading the latter part of subsection 1 with subsection 2, the net result is that he may give the notice at any time before the case is disposed of and the third party is brought in. My interpretation of it is that he would not be liable to the costs if he gave the notice and brought in the third party at any time before the court disposed of the case.

Mr. PARENT: In view of what the minister has said. I assume that he would not object to adding to the section a provision that the magistrate shall decide also the question of costs. The minister's interpretation may be all right, but the interpretation of the judge might be quite different.

Mr. ROWELL: I have not the least objection to inserting the words " including the question of costs " after the words "merits of the case," in subsection 2.

Mr. BOYS: As it stands now the provision might lead to serious injustice, although not involving a very large sum. Let us assume that the defendant is in the police court on this first hearing and that, by his own evidence and by that of his vendor, he establishes to the satisfaction of the magistrate that he is not guilty. The case should then and there be dismissed, but as he has given no previous notice whatever, according to the words in lines 29 and 30, he is liable to pay the costs incurred by the prosecutor. If the case then stood adjourned, not as to him, or even as to him, and came up another day, counsel might well argue that he had given notice on a previous occasion that he would rely on the clause, and the defendant should not be held responsible for the costs. But cases which are as clear as that will be disposed of at the first hearing and the costs should not be imposed on the defendant. I do not see how subsection 2 affects the matter in any degree whatever. It gives power to bring in the third party, but the third party is brought in only when it is perfectly manifest that the defendant is not responsible and the case as regards the defendant is at an end. Therefore, something should be inserted to make it clear that if the defendant gives that notice at the first hearing at which he appears he should not have to pay costs, or at all events, there should be a provision that the magistrate should be enabled, even at a later date than the first hearing, to relieve him of costs if he is innocent.

Mr. ROWELL: One of the objects of this clause is undoubtedly to offer some inducement to the man who is being proceeded against to bring in the party really responsible for the wrong, so that the defendant does not become relieved of the costs if he has actually violated the laws unless he does two things; first, unless he gives notice that he intends relying on this defence; second, unless he brings, or takes proceedings to bring before the court the party primarily responsible for committing the wrong. If any accused claims the benefit of this section and applies to have a summons issued to bring before the court the party who, he says, is really responsible for the wrong, the magistrate could not then dispose of the case in the first instance, but would adjourn the hearing until he had all parties before the court and would then deal with it under subsection 2. That would seem to be the logical method of dealing with the case.

Mr. BOYS: That is undesirable, because it simply means bringing all the witnesses back to another sitting of the court and piling on more expense. If an innocent party appears before the court and establishes his innocence, he should not be brought back except as a witness for the prosecution.

Mr. ROWELL: Under section 34 of the old Act, which corresponds with subsection 1, the defendant must procure at the time he purchases a certificate as to the quality in the form prescribed in the schedule. My hon. friend will see that the clause as now proposed is a greater protection to the innocent man, that is, innocent in the sense that he acted without knowledge.

Mr. BOYS: I would suggest that the words:

> Unless he gives notice in court that he will rely on the above defence and calls—

Be substituted for the words:

Unless he has given due notice to him that he will rely on the above defence and has called—

Then, when he is in the court room, his counsel will intimate to the court that he is claiming the provisions of this section and that he has with him or undertakes to call the party from whom he purchased. In that event everybody is protected, and an innocent person cannot be called upon to pay costs or to submit to a second appearance in court with the consequent expense.

Mr. ROWELL: I move that the clause be amended to read:

Unless he has given notice to him or gives notice to the court that he will rely on the above defence and has called or calls the party from whom he purchased the said article into the case as hereinafter provided.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is there any procedure provided in the Bill for the bringing in of the third party? Third party procedure is well known to the Supreme and County Courts, but it is entirely new, at least I never heard of it, in a magistrate's court.

Mr. ROWELL: That is provided in subsection (2). So far as the third party is concerned we are not changing the law in any respect from what it has been for many years. It is quite true, as my hon. friend says, that bringing in a third party is not a common practice in proceedings of this kind, although it is quite common in civil proceedings, but just to meet the class of case we have been discussing this afternoon and evening provision has been made in the Act respecting the adulteration of food and in this Bill for bringing in the person whom the accused declares to be the party from whom he purchased the goods, so that the magistrate may hear all the parties and determine who is responsible. Subsection (2) provides that a summons may issue to bring the third party before a court.

Mr. McKENZIE: But a magistrate has no power to issue a summons except upon a duly laid information. Who is going to lay the information in this case? A magistrate has no jurisdiction to institute criminal proceedings except upon a duly laid information, and if proceedings are not instituted in that way they will not stand at all.

Mr. ROWELL: I appreciate the importance of what my hon. friend has in mind, but if he will look at subsection (2) he will see that the process as against the third party is initiated upon the sworn declaration of the vendor; that is, the man who is charged with the violation of the law must first make a sworn declaration before the magistrate that he purchased the article in good faith and as provided in subsection (1). Upon that sworn declaration the magistrate issues a summons to a third party calling him into the case. When the summons issues and the third party is brought in subsection (2) provides the magistrate shall "at the same time hear all the parties and decide upon the entire merits of the case not only as regards the person originally accused, but also as regards the third party so brought into the case." I do not think that so far any trouble has arisen as to the magistrate's jurisdiction under this section, and it has been the law for a great many years.

Mr. McKENZIE: Does the minister say that the Act provides that upon the sworn declaration of the accused the magistrate shall have jurisdiction to issue the summons?

Mr. ROWELL: That is what I understand the Act to mean. It is not set out in so many words.

Mr. McKENZIE: But the magistrate must have jurisdiction.

Mr. ROWELL: I think this gives him jurisdiction. So far as I am aware, his jurisdiction has never been questioned under this clause and it has been in force a great many years. There is nobody else who can issue the summons except the magistrate.

Mr. McKENZIE: But at common law, and by all the decisions of courts—the books are full of it—the magistrate can only issue a process upon a duly laid information. That is the basis of his jurisdiction. He cannot of his own motion institute proceedings. Suppose a man refused to come to court and that a warrant issues and he is put in gaol. He is brought up under habeas corpus or certiorari and the court would hold that the magistrate had no jurisdiction unless an information of a criminal character has been laid against the man, and the whole thing would go up in smoke.

Mr. BOYS: I think the point raised by my hon. friend is well worthy of the minister's consideration. It seems to me that this is in direct contrast to the practice of the criminal courts. You will observe that the declaration is not in the nature of an

information, but it is the sworn statement of the defendant in the case, given on his own behalf, to clear himself from the charge made against him. Upon that a summons is issued. What would the summons be for? Not to answer a distinct charge laid against the third party. It would be issued in the only case pending, namely, against the defendant who gives this evidence and makes the declaration. It is true that this third party might attend and be put in the witness box, not as a defendant or as a witness in a case against himself, but as a witness in the case against the original defendant, and he might claim the protection of the law and refuse to answer on the ground of incrimination. It seems to me that as against the third party the procedure should be very much the same as in liquor cases. A man charged with being drunk is called upon to state where he got his liquor. He gives that evidence, and then a fresh information is immediately laid against the party from whom he got the liquor, and a fresh case is commenced. I think my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) is quite right: There should be another information laid against the third party, who should be called, not as a witness, but as a defendant in a case against himself. I do not know what the practice has been in the past so far as this is concerned, but I have had some little experience in criminal law and I never heard of such a thing before. It seems to me it requires careful consideration before such a far-reaching change is made in the existing criminal law .

Mr. ROWELL: I confess I am not quite able to follow the view of my hon. friend on this section. I should think it is quite clear that the third party is not called there as a witness, but as a third party in the case, and that he becomes a party to the proceedings. The procedure is not dissimilar, if one may so state it, to the procedure in civil cases where a third party comes in. In a civil case, if a third party is brought in, he is brought in at the instance of the defendant, who must file his claim over as against the third party. This section provides that he must file a sworn declaration. That declaration must set out that he purchased the goods from this third party, that he purchased them in good faith, that he purchased them as an article of the same nature, substance and quality as that demanded of him by the informant, and that he sold the article in the same state as that in which he purchased it. Therefore, he sets out in the sworn declaration the facts which constitute an offence under the Act. That declaration, I would submit, would be in substance an information of an offence committed under the terms of the Act. Upon that the magistrate issues a summons, not to bring the third party there as a witness, but, as the section provides, to call such third party into the case." He thereby becomes a party to the proceedings. Then the magistrate "shall at the same time hear all the parties and decide upon the entire merits of the case, not only as regards the person originally accused, but also as regards the third party so brought into the case." It would be an adjudication just as we have under the third party procedure in civil cases. I shall discuss the matter further with the Department of Justice, and in the meantime let the matter stand.

Mr. ROSS: If a manufacturer in Quebec sold foodstuffs to a retailer in Ontario and the retailer were prosecuted, how could an order of a magistrate in Ontario be enforced against the manufacturer in Quebec?

Mr. ROWELL: He could be brought before the magistrate in Ontario upon a warrant backed by a magistrate in his own province, as in the case of information laid under the criminal code.

Mr. ROSS: This is not under the criminal code.

Mr. ROWELL: This is a Dominion statute applicable to all provinces. However, I am prepared to discuss the matter further with the department. I agree that there should be no uncertainty regarding the law in dealing with matters that are criminal or quasi-criminal in character, and if there is ambiguity it should be cleared up.

Mr. BOYS: As I read the section, the sworn declaration is really in the nature of an information, and it becomes the duty of the defendant to lay that information. If this "sworn declaration" were made "information," the magistrate on the strength of the information could issue a summons and the same end would be attained.

Mr. McKENZIE: My hon. friend will find laid down in part 15 of the criminal code the provision that before any magistrate can make any criminal motion against a person there must be information.

Mr. ROWELL: I move that section 17 stand.

Motion agreed to: section 17 stands.

On section 18—no certiorari.

Mr. McKENZIE: I hope the minister will withdraw this section.

Mr. BOYS: Does the minister not think it proper to give the appeal in this case to the divisional courts? In most summary conviction cases there is an appeal, in Ontario at least, to a divisional court. The appeal is heard within two or three weeks of the sitting of the police court, and at a very trifling expense. In view of the fact that the fines imposed in this Act run up to as high as $500 it seems to me that there should be some protection against conviction by a justice of the peace in the country, who very often has not very much experience in matters of this kind.

Mr. McKENZIE: This seems to be a crude way of getting clear of the defects contained in section 17. The minister provides an absolutely bad procedure in section 17, and then says you cannot review it.

Mr. ROWELL: I move that section 18 stand.

Motion agreed to: section 18 stands.

On section 19—voluntary payments.

Mr. PARENT: Will any part of the amount voluntarily paid under this section be given to the prosecutor?

Mr. ROWELL: The amount voluntarily paid to the minister will be dealt with "as if lawfully recovered upon prosecution," and that I think would permit of a portion of it being paid to the informant. This does not go as far as the old Act, which provided that, upon examination being made, and the sample being found to be adulterated, the minister might exercise his discretion and simply require the party to pay the cost of procuring and analysing the sample, and not proceed further. We have not continued that provision, but have provided for voluntary payment of the fine which would be imposed, the expense of prosecution in court being obviated.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Is there any section of the Bill which pre-supposes a payment of that kind or makes provision for it?

Mr. ROWELL: The old clause provided, as the present Act does, for taking a sample for analysis, the result of such analysis to be communicated to the party. It then goes on to say:

> The Minister may at his discretion cause the result of the analysis to be communicated to the vendor and require him to pay the party specified in the second schedule of this Act for the cost of procuring and analysing said sample. And should such vendor refuse or neglect to do so, the minister may then cause legal proceedings to be taken against him as hereinafter provided.

[Mr. McKenzie.]

The only penalty you might impose at the discretion of the minister would be the penalty of paying the cost of procuring and analysing the sample. If he did not choose to pay that voluntarily a prosecution might be instituted under the Act. It appeared to the officers administering the department that that was not a very satisfactory provision. If a person is to be let off without a prosecution he should pay the penalty which the law provides, but if the party comes forward and is prepared to pay the fine the minister should not be compelled to prosecute him before the court in order to recover it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The old law, under which cases had to come before the courts in the first instance, would give greater protection to the accused than this law, would it not?

Mr. ROWELL: No, the old law did not require them to proceed in the manner I have mentioned. An offender might be prosecuted in the first instance, but it gave discretion to the minister to make him pay the cost of procuring and analysing a sample. Under the present Bill the minister may permit him to pay the fine voluntarily without going through any procedure in court.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If the offender pays the penalty under this clause is he still liable to prosecution in court?

Mr. ROWELL: No.

Mr. McKENZIE: This is a new departure and I think it is a discretion that the officers of the department would do well to avoid altogether. A man comes to court and pleads guilty; a fine is imposed upon him; and that is the end of it. An officer of the Government can state in court the degree of leniency they want to extend to the offender. But it is rather objectionable that the minister should exercise this power in place of the magistrate.

Mr. ROWELL: I am quite prepared to admit that there is a good deal in what my hon. friend has said. I hesitated about the section for the very reason that he has mentioned, but in a case of adulteration the party pays the penalty which the law imposes, and this simply gives power to receive it and deal with it as in a case of conviction. It is for the House to say. I am not disposed to press it. I understand that this is done under the Customs law and is not a new departure. A similar law was administered by the Department of Inland Revenue be-

9 p.m.

fore, and I am not aware that any difficulty has arisen under it.

Mr. McKENZIE: There is provision here for a second offence, but if a fine of this kind has been paid to the minister it cannot be regarded as a first conviction and there cannot be a second offence. A second offence means that a man has been convicted, that he is brought up a second time for the same offence, and the record of the court shows that he has already been convicted. The fact that a man had paid a fine would not constitute a record of conviction and a man could never be convicted of a second offence under a procedure of this kind.

Mr. ROWELL: It is quite true that it would not constitute an offence which would lay the basis for a proceeding in a second offence. The three penalty sections might stand and I will give them further consideration.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 20—refusal of access:

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Is that similar to the old law?

Mr. ROWELL: Yes, it is practically the same.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The clause is very far-reaching. It would make liable to this penalty any person who had some food or drug in his possession and did not happen to show it when the inspector came. He might have his store full of these commodities, and if he omitted to show every one of them he would be liable.

Mr. ROWELL: It is necessary to make it pretty broad to afford full opportunity for inspection.

Mr. FOURNIER: Why should this clause pass? With all the inspectors that we shall have in cities, towns and municipalities, a retailer would require to have a man whose special duty it would be to show the inspector around. All that the inspector requires to do is to procure a sample and have it analysed to see whether the article is adulterated or not. I do not see why an inspector should be shown around and given access to everything in the store. It is practically impossible. This is an imposition; it is not legislation.

Mr. ROWELL: It is the law as it stands on the statute book now.

Mr. McKENZIE: Why should not the words "or omits" be left out? I understand the purport of the section is that a man is guilty of an offence if he in any way obstructs the officer or keeps him from seeing anything that is in the shop. If the inspector is given full access to the shop, why should it be made criminal if the shopkeeper omits to call his attention to something that he has not specially asked to see? Why not leave out the words "or omits"? Those words in the section, which throw the burden upon the shopkeeper to take the inspector around, should be left out. If the shopkeeper affords full opportunity to the inspector to examine everything in the store that is all that should be asked.

Mr. ROWELL: The clause in that respect is exactly the same as the law that has been in existence for a very long time. No difficulty has arisen in connection with its administration, no charge of any unfairness has been made, and the law having so far worked satisfactorily, I submit we would not be well advised to change it at the present time.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Would it not be well to amend the clause so as to make it apply to any person who "knowingly or intentionally omits," etc. That would be a protection and yet would not deprive the provision of any value that it has.

Section agreed to.

On section 21—possession of materials by manufacturer usable for adulteration.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Is this the same provision as in the old Act?

Mr. ROWELL: The principle is the same but the proposed section is somewhat broader. In the case of intoxicating liquors the present section provides that if any ingredients for adulteration are found in the case then the results mentioned follow. The new section makes the application general both as to food and drink covered by the Act. I will give the committee a concrete illustration of why this section has been broadened. On one occasion the officers of the department went to a certain establishment where, it was suspected, adulteration was taking place. They found a large amount of butter on one side of the room and a large amount of oleomargarine on the other with a mixer in between. What was intended was quite obvious, but not finding the actual adulteration there was no offence under the law. If parties have adulterants on the premises for which they cannot satisfactorily account then they will be held to be in the business of producing adulterated products. That is the object of the section.

Section agreed to.

On section 22—false label or neglect to label.

Mr. JACOBS: I would like to know whether the provision in the first part of the section applies to the owner or to the servant or to both.

Mr. ROWELL: If the employee knowingly attaches a misleading label or mark to any article or package of food or drugs, and thus is a party to deceiving the public, he, as well as the owner, is guilty of the offence.

Mr. JACOBS: A twelve or thirteen-year old boy, in receipt of three or four dollars a week, who is ordered to do this work, would come under this provision of the section.

Mr. ROWELL: I should think that in such a case the boy would not be prosecuted but the owner would. It is not possible to provide for all possible exceptions without weakening the general effect of the law.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: This clause contains the word "knowingly" which I suggested might be inserted in the previous clause. My hon. friend from Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) then asked the minister how he would prove "knowingly." I would like to pass the question on to the minister.

Mr. ROWELL: Let me give an actual case that occurred in the administration of the law, because it shows the purpose of the section. A man was selling a syrup not made of maple syrup but with a device attached showing maple trees with the spiles in them, with the object of making the purchaser think he was buying maple syrup when such was not the case.

Mr. McMASTER: Such a case as that should be severely dealt with.

Mr. ROWELL: In such a case as mentioned no one could doubt that the device was knowingly attached to the container.

Section agreed to.

On section 23—expenses, counsel fees.

Mr. McKENZIE: The subsection as to fees in this clause should be omitted.

Mr. ROWELL: The section in that respect is exactly the same as the existing law. I am free to say that I was surprised when I came across that provision in the law, but it has been the law for a long time. Then, section 47 of the existing law provides for the expenses of prosecution, including the usual counsel fee, in the discretion of the judge. It is also a provision of the present law that if a prosecution is dismissed as being instituted without reasonable and proper cause, the costs of the defence shall be taxed against the prosecutor. If we include the provision regarding counsel fee, I think we should include also this provision for the payment of costs by the prosecutor who is held to have had no just ground for believing that there had been a violation of the law. I therefore move that the following be added to section 23 as subsection (3):

(3) In the case of a private prosecutor, if the prosecution is dismissed as being instituted without reasonable and probable cause, the costs of defence shall be taxed against the prosecutor.

Mr. McKENZIE: Ninety-five per cent of the magistrates in this country have not the slightest conception of what a counsel fee is; yet they are asked to say what shall be a reasonable counsel fee. If the Government engages counsel to prosecute these cases, they themselves ought to pay counsel; that has been the practice all along in every branch of the administration of justice, customs and inland revenue. I certainly did not know that there was such a provision anywhere as this. I hope that the minister will leave counsel fees, briefs and all such things as these to the Superior Courts, where there are competent authorities to deal with them.

Mr. ROWELL: If we strike out that provision we add so much more to the expense of enforcing the law. My information is that the counsel fee is almost invariably included by the magistrate, though in some few cases the magistrate may refuse to fix or to include the fee. Generally speaking, a fee of about $20 is what is usually fixed by the magistrate in these contested cases. Most of the parties who are found guilty under the Adulteration Act have substantial means and can afford to pay this cost of administration; we are anxious not to add to the burdens of the public treasury in enforcing the law.

Mr. JACOBS: Why not state that the fee shall be $20, no more and no less? "Reasonable fee" is a somewhat equivocal term.

Mr. ROWELL: No complaints have been received against the provisions of the old law, and no difficulties have so far arisen in its administration. Perhaps it would be wiser to leave it as it is.

Mr. BOYS: There are too many of these enactments which enable a magistrate to award costs against the defendant when the prosecution is unsuccessful. I have never

yet seen the case where a defendant who has had to employ counsel and pay his own witness fees has been able to get any costs awarded against those who brought him there without proper cause. My idea would be to leave the question of counsel fees and costs, except ordinary police court costs, entirely out. But if you make provision concerning them, then if the prosecution is successful let them get costs, and if the defendant is successful let him get costs. Let the costs on both sides be taxable on the same scale.

Amendment agreed to, and section as amended agreed to.

On section 24—other remedies:

Mr. McKENZIE: Where is an offence under this Act made a criminal offence?

Mr. ROWELL: This section simply provides that if a party is liable to a prosecution by way of indictment, proceedings under this Act do not prevent prosecution by way of indictment being taken. One can imagine that several provisions of the Code might be violated by parties violating the provisions of this measure, although I have not any in mind at present. In other words, acts on their part that are offences under this legislation might also be offences under the Code. This clause is simply the re-enactment of the existing section 21 of the present Act.

Mr. JACOBS: I assume that when a party has been proceeded against under this legislation, he cannot afterwards be indicted for the same offence, but clause 24 seems to make that possible.

Mr. ROWELL: I should have thought if a man were proceeded against under this legislation and paid the penalty, he would not be liable to prosecution under the Code for the same offence. We are providing a special procedure for dealing with a certain class of offences, and but for this provision it might be argued that having made express provision for dealing with a certain class of offences, we have thereby taken them out of the purview of the Code. I take it that this clause is intended to make clear that such is not the case and that a man may be proceeded against under the Code notwithstanding the provisions of this legislation. I should think, however, that on the general principles of criminal jurisprudence, you could not prosecute a man twice for the same offence.

Section agreed to.

On section 26—repeal.

Mr. McKENZIE: I notice that in several parts of this measure provision is made for a second offence, but I find no procedure established for obtaining a conviction for a second offence. I think I am safe in saying that in the ordinary proceedings before a magistrate's court there is no provision for obtaining a conviction for a second offence. There is such in temperance legislation. The minister might consult with the Department of Justice as to how he purposes proceeding in proving a second offence.

Mr. ROWELL: I shall take that into consideration.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The minister referred to one or two clauses in the old Act which have not been incorporated in this new legislation. Have any other material clauses in the old Act been omitted from this, and, if so, what is their nature?

Mr. ROWELL: I think I explained to my hon. friend that clauses relating to agricultural fertilizers, proprietary and patent medicines, honey, maple products, commercial feeding stuffs and normal animal feed such as bran, shorts and middlings, have been dealt with in separate Acts. There are certain commodities referred to in the Act, the use of turpentine in paint, white lead for paints, white lead in oil for paint, Paris green as an insecticide, and arsenate of lead as an insecticide, which are dealt with only in a very meagre way, and we are now giving consideration to the question whether it is necessary to introduce a Bill dealing with these or whether we shall suggest that the legislation relating to them is no longer required. I shall be glad to make a statement as to that when the Bill comes back into committee again.

Progress reported.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. C. C. Ballantyne (Minister of Marine and Fisheries), Bill No. 21, to amend the Canada Shipping Act (Certificates of Service), was read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—requirements for certificates of service as masters and mates:

Mr. McKENZIE: How many schools for the training of masters and mates are there in Canada, where are they located, and

how many masters and mates passed the requisite examination within the last year? I should like the minister to give us some idea of what is being done in this connection. Is an effort being made to get properly qualified masters and mates without taking extreme measures?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: We have a number of schools throughout Canada, but, I am sorry I cannot give the exact number at the moment, nor can I say how many masters and mates have been granted certificates within the past year. I can only repeat what I stated when the resolution was under discussion, that a real shortage of masters and mates for sailing vessels not over 750 tons does exist, and that during the war I had to take the necessary authority under the War Measures Act to remedy the situation. The shortage still exists.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is it not a fact that in connection with the School of Technology at Halifax there is a branch for the training of masters, mates, engineers and so forth? Has the minister any record of what is being done at that school in this respect?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The hon. member is quite right, there is a school at Halifax; there are others at Quebec, Kingston, and different centres throughout the country. I have not with me the figures as to the number of masters and mates who have qualified, but the object of this Bill is to supply the shortage.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is it the intention of the minister that the test or examination shall be conducted by a shipmaster, or by some proper authority apart from the minister himself? If so, what machinery is provided for the proper examination of masters and mates so that they can obtain the certificate provided for under this proposed legislation?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The man who wishes to become master or mate of a sailing vessel must have served on a sailing ship for twelve months at some time during the past ten years. He has to appear before the examiners of masters and mates, and pass an oral examination on the rules of the road. He must be able to take observations, read signals, and must know all that is required of any one desiring to become certificated either as master or mate. The only difference between this examination and the one for a competency certificate is that in the latter case the man takes a written examination, and in this case the examination is oral. I think my hon. friend will agree that many excellent men who could not pass a written examination have the necessary training and technical knowledge to pass an oral examination. We are not lowering the standard at all, inasmuch as this is limited to sailing vessels not over 750 tons.

Mr. McKENZIE: The minister says that among the qualifications required is ability to take observations and ascertain his position at sea, his latitude and longitude, and the amount of leeway his vessel may have made during the night, or in a storm, or from currents. I can find no such provision in the Bill. It does not provide that he shall be able to work out chronometer time for instance, or be able to work the sextants and locate the position of the ship. If an examination of that kind must be passed, much of my objection to the Bill will vanish, but I can find no such provision here. I think it would be an extraordinary thing for this House solemnly to legislate that a man can take charge of a 750-ton ship with a crew and valuable cargo, who, if he struck a storm or a spell of bad weather, would be absolutely unable to ascertain where he was. If that is the kind of men we are willing to see take charge of our ships, the House must take the responsibility. If the minister says that they must possess this necessary knowledge I should like to see it clearly stated in the Bill.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Section 85 provides that the man must produce "satisfactory evidence of his sobriety, experience, ability and general good conduct on board ship; and (c) passes the sight-test and the prescribed examination in signalling." He must also understand signalling and be able to find his position. He must know the rules of the road and everything that a mate or captain would need to know. The examination is along the usual lines. I am only asking that the Shipping Act be brought, not up to date, but from 1870 up to ten years prior to 1920. I can assure my hon. friend that no master or mate will be certificated unless he possesses the necessary navigation knowledge and technical skill.

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not think that any person who has a fair knowledge of the working of a ship and of nautical matters can complain that the requirements to-day are too strict. It is not a very difficult matter to pass the examination prescribed. If it is not the purpose of this Bill to make it still easier, and to open the door to men to take charge of ships who could

not take charge of them under the present law, it seems to me it has no purpose at all. I take it for granted that the purpose of this legislation is to lower the qualifications required, and to open the door wide to almost any person to take charge of a ship. A ship of 750 tons is quite a craft, and will have quite a number of men on board. It is not necessarily a schooner, rigged vessel; it may be a square-rigged vessel. The minister will readily understand that there is quite a difference in the working of the two. The handling of a square-rigged vessel, a barque, a barquantine, a brig or brigantine, requires very different handling from a schooner-rigged vessel. The man must know how to set the yards and sails, and send his men aloft on the yards. So far as I can see, this Bill makes no provision for requiring that knowledge before a man can obtain a certificate. Perhaps the minister has in his mind some examination, but I think it is always best and safest for the public to have these things in the Bill when the legislation is being put through the House.

I regret that the minister should take the view that he is bringing this Act up to date by making it possible for a man who served a year on board a vessel ten years ago to obtain a certificate. I have already explained as well as I could why this provision was in the old Act. Formerly a large number of men made their living by going to sea when we had no examinations; and when the Act was passed it was thought hard that such men, although they had no technical education nor book learning, should be thrown out of employment. Provision was therefore made that if they could show that they had done the work and were able to do it they would be given an opportunity to obtain service certificates. It must be remembered that a service certificate is different from the certificate which a man gets by virtue of examination, and now that the law has been in force for a number of years any man who contemplates being a captain should be prepared to comply with that law and give adequate proof of his knowledge. The same justification for service certificates does not exist to-day as existed when the law was first introduced thirty or forty years ago. I protest against this proposal, and I have shown the minister that I am not alone in my opposition to it. The Association of Shipmasters of British Columbia, as well as the Association of the Maritime Provinces, through their president at Halifax, have sent me telegrams protesting against this matter, which I have communicated to the minister. I regret that I do not seem to receive much sympathy in this House in this respect. The shipmaster's profession has always been regarded as an excellent one, but now that profession is to be degraded, and hardly any qualification will be required of a man who wants to take charge of a ship. Any person may command a vessel who has been for a year on board of any sort of craft, no matter of what description; he can come before the minister and obtain a certificate to be the master of a ship of 750 tons. I have already brought to the notice of the minister the fact that certain requirements in our own Act provide for the approval of the Board of Trade in England before our certificates are of any value. This very question has been before Canadian conferences in England, and if the minister will consult an ex-minister who is now a Judge of the Supreme Court he will learn that that gentleman had this question under consideration and endeavoured to obtain from the home authorities full power for this Parliament to abrogate the jurisdiction which the British Parliament has over our legislation in regard to shipping, but that power has never been obtained. Nevertheless we are ignoring the jurisdiction of the British Parliament and taking the whole business into our own hands. There is nothing in the British North America Act giving us control over shipping. We started out in Confederation with the Shipping Act of 1854, and we also had the British Shipping Act of 1894 with its amendments practically all of which applies to this country. However, the minister chooses to go on in his own way and send men across the Atlantic with certificates of the kind to which I have raised such strong objection, and under the British Shipping Act I rather think that these men will get themselves into trouble. Many years ago I discussed this matter with Hon. Mr. Brodeur, who was then Minister of Marine and Fisheries and is now a Judge of the Supreme Court, and on his authority I can inform the House that he had this very question under consideration with the British Government. The question is not settled. If the minister elects to ignore this fact and all the other circumstances to which I have alluded he does so on his own responsibility.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I think my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) is putting the case a little too strongly when he says that any man who goes to sea for a year is allowed,

under this Act, to take charge of a ship. I do not understand the Act in this way. The Act provides that any man who has acted as master of a ship for a year will be qualified, which is very different from the interpretation of my hon. friend. He must have become a master by some means or other, possibly by permission of the department; but it is necessary that he shall have had one year's experience as a master before he can be qualified. This is a certain amount of experience and ought to weigh with the department. I have not much sympathy with the idea that we should be controlled in our shipping laws by the dictates of Downing street. This is purely a domestic matter. We are discussing the qualifications of captains on Canadian ships belonging to Canadian citizens and registered in Canadian ports, and I do not thnk that the home government should have anything at all to do with such an exclusively Canadian matter. There are certain questions in regard to shipping that refer to the trade of the Empire, matters in which the Board of Trade in England is interested. One case that occurs to my mind just now is the deckload law. I was in the House some years ago when an attempt was made to change the law in regard to deckloads in the lumber trade. The old law permitted a ship to load with, I think, three feet of deckload. The ships after this law was passed were built to contain two decks, and the construction of the law was that this three feet was on the lower deck, so that the shipowner had to leave the rest of the lower deck empty. It was a hardship for Canadian shipowners and merchants shipping lumber, and it took some years to get the matter adjusted. The Board of Trade in England claimed that they had some interest in the matter and that it conflicted with the terms of the Merchants Shipping Act, but then finally gave their consent to an amendment of the law, so that the three feet of deckload could be put on the top deck and not on the second. I do not think we ought to ask the British Government anything about a question of this kind. This is a Canadian question pure and simple. I quite agree with my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) that men ought to be encouraged to pass examinations.

I would like to see a captain carrying his regular certificate issued by a Canadian board or by the Minister of Marine. That would be an ideal system. But captains are very scarce at the present time on the coasts of Canada and it is with great difficulty that captains are found to man the ships we have. Ships have increased largely during the war but the same increase did not take place in the number of certificated men. No later than this morning I received a telegram from a gentleman who has built a ship of 300 or 400 tons in my constituency and who is in trouble about a captain; it is impossible for him to get a captain to take that ship to sea. The ship is ready. He has a competent man who has had twenty years experience as the master of a small vessel —a vessel so small that he did not need under our laws to take out a certificate; consequently he has not the necessary certificate to take charge of this larger vessel. Yet, he is a good enough man, the owner knows he is good enough, and the people who are insuring the ship are quite satisfied with him. Why should he not be allowed to take that vessel to sea? The owner ought to be the best judge as to his competency. I do not think that the danger to the crew amounts to very much in the case of a man who has had that much experience and who is a careful seaman.

My hon. friend knows as well as I do that for many years we did not have certificates at all in Nova Scotia, yet we built up a great mercantile fleet prior to Confederation and something was done in that direction after Confederation. It was experience we trusted and it worked out very well. There is a great deal to be said in favour of that system. The United States came to that conclusion many years ago. They had the same experience and the same development as we have had here. A large number of coasting vessels were built on the coasts of the United States. Seamen were scarce and the Government of the United States, a good many years ago, made a law similar to the one which my hon. friend is now trying to pass providing that ships of less than 700 tons did not require to have certificated captains. That is the law at present in the United States, and it is with the United States that we are competing. There is much to be said in favour of the Bill. I feel inclined to vote for it. I do not see the same danger from it that my hon. friend from North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) seems to see. I think the Bill will be found to be very useful to the trade on the coasts of eastern Canada at all events and I do not think there is very much danger in taking this step, especially as it has already been taken in the United States and our ships in business in South America and the West Indies have to compete with the United States.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: In answer to the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie), I would say again that no master or mate can get a certificate simply by reason of having served twelve months on a sailing ship during the last ten years. All have to serve for twelve months and if a man wishes to become the master of a sailing ship not larger than 750 tons he has to appear before an examining board of masters and mates and pass an examination which is much more rigid than that prior to 1870. Prior to 1870, they did not call upon a man who desired to be a master or mate to go through the eye or signalling test. A man can only obtain a service certificate as a captain or a mate if he passes the rigid examination which is prescribed. I find in the memorandum which is before me now that the Masters and Mates Act has always provided for the issuing of service certificates to masters and mates. Under sections 95, 96 and 97 of the Canada Shipping Act a master or mate is properly certificated if he holds a service certificate. Under this Act upwards of 4,800 masters' and mates' certificates have been issued. With all due deference to one of my predecessors, Hon. Mr. Brodeur, I am sorry that I cannot agree with him. With regard to a man holding a masters certificate and going to a United Kingdom port on a vessel not over 750 tons, the master of a Canadian registered vessel is granted clearance from a port of the United Kingdom if he holds a service certificate just the same as if he held a competency certificate. There will be no trouble about a Canadian captain holding a service certificate clearing from any United Kingdom port. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) has pointed out quite truly that our American friends do not ask for any certificates whatever for a master or mate on a sailing ship up to 750 tons. We have to compete with our neighbours to the south and as we are much more careful than they are, for our men have to pass the examination that I have referred to besides sailing for twelve months on a sailing ship; whereas, across the line a man can go abroad one of these vessels as master without any service at all. The British Board of Trade issue masters service certificates without examination to certain officers of the Royal Navy. I think that this House is quite within its rights in granting these certificates to men who have the necessary knowledge and pass the necessary oral examination.

Mr. McKENZIE: If the minister is right that we can branch out for ourselves entirely and make our own navigation laws without any reference to the rules of the road or to British jurisdiction, why not do it? Why not introduce an Act and dispense entirely with any knowledge of the rules

10 p.m. of the road? We cannot, and why not? We cannot do it because of the conference of the maritime countries of the world which have agreed to the rules of the road. These rules of the road are binding on the British Empire of which we are a part and we cannot change them. That is the law that guides us and we cannot change one letter of it. The minister says in one breath that we are absolutely independent of the British marine law and in the next that we must comply with it. He puts in here a provision with reference to the rules of the road. What rules of the road? We have no rules. If we do not come within the British rules of the road and within the British Act we cannot sail ships. We have only one flag. The Canadian flag is not recognized as a shipping flag. Every Canadian ship, no matter where it goes, must have the British flag, there is no other flag of ours that is recognized.

I have received from Vancouver a telegram which it is my duty to read. It is dated 22nd March, is addressed to myself, and is as follows:

> We strongly endorse your stand and support statements attributed to you on Bill proposing inferior certificates Canadian masters and mates.
>
> Canadian Merchant Service Guild.

I have also received a message from Halifax to the following effect:

> Representing the certificated masters and mates of Maritime Provinces strongly protest against Bill granting certificates master and mate sail ships seven hundred fifty tons without duly qualifying. Canadian seagoing certificates recognized in all British ships and possessions. Therefore must equal standard British Board of Trade. Coastwise and lower grades accessible to any man capable of having charge of life and property and standard low enough. Bill gross injustice and should be thrown out or hoisted. If passed will ruin the profession. Shortage of masters exaggerated, and if any primarily due to acting present Government granting permits.
>
> A. W. INNIS, President,
> Shipmasters' Association.

We have only two ocean fronts in this country, one on the Pacific and the other on the Atlantic. On both ocean fronts they have a Masters' Association, and both of these associations protest against this legislation as degrading their profession. All I can do is to bring these communications to the attention of the minister; but if he hap-

pens to have some influence brought to bear upon him by people who have ships and who care nothing for the crew of the vessels, care nothing for anything except to make dollars for themselves, and care not whether their masters are qualified or not—if he is influenced by such men, the responsibility is his. That is not my language, that is the language of the Halifax Board, who say that if any person wants to look properly for a qualified master and will give him a proper wage, they can get him, but they cannot secure a first-class master for second-rate pay. The minister seems to be very strong in his conception of the law. I would like him, however, to explain to the Committee and to the country generally the meaning of section 95 of our present Shipping Act, which is chapter 13 of the Revised Statutes, volume 3. As I read that Act, it requires that our legislation shall be approved by the home Government. If that is correct, I still stand by my position that the certificate which we grant—unless the King in Council of Great Britain approves it under the terms of the Shipping Act of 1894—has no effect at all. If this section of our own Act means anything else, I would like the minister to explain it.

Mr. DUFF: I do not wish to discuss with the hon. gentleman (Mr. McKenzie) any point of law, but I notice that in the telegram which he read from Captain Innis that officer does not agree with the hon. gentleman's interpretation of Clause 95 of the Canada Shipping Act. You may have noticed, Sir, that part of that telegram said that Canadian certificates were acknowledged all over the world, practically admitting they were as good as any other certificate. Therefore, the hon. gentleman and the President of the Ship Masters' Association of Nova Scotia are not in agreement as to the meaning of Clause 95 of the Canadian Shipping Act.

My reading of the law is that there are three kinds of certificates which can be issued under Clause 95. For example paragraph (a):

> Of competency or service for seagoing ships appropriate to their several stations in such ship, or of a higher grade from the minister;

That is to say, if I read the subsection correctly, that the Minister of Marine can issue a certificate of competency of service without any reference whatever to the British Board of Trade or the British Government.

Now paragraph (b):

[Mr. McKenzie.]

> Of competency or service for seagoing ships, appropriate to their several stations in such ship, or of a higher grade, from the Board of Trade in the United Kingdom.

That is to say, if I understand the wording of the paragraph, that the Minister of Marine can issue a certificate of competency and it is sent to the Board of Trade in England for confirmation or approval. Therefore, I think, under this Act the minister is perfectly within his rights in issuing certificates of competency with respect to seagoing ships in this country without consulting the Board of Trade or the Government in England.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. McKenzie) also said that at a conference held some time ago of the different nations, rules of the road were agreed on, and consequently we can have nothing to do with the matter. The reason rules of the road were agreed upon by the different nations was, for example, this: A French ship coming into the St. Lawrence river might meet a British or a German ship going out, and it would be necessary for the two ships to know the rules of the road. That is the reason why the rules of the road are international. It has nothing at all to do with the issuance of certificates to masters and mates, and does not affect our position as to whether we can issue the certificates in Canada or not.

I might also say that the British Board of Trade are not as particular as they were a few years ago. They are waking up to to the fact that it is not necessary for a man to have a certificate to sail a ship. A few years ago when Canadian ships, or ships from any other nation, went to Great Britain, the British customs officer would not clear them unless they had a certificated master. I have known a number of cases where a ship from the British Dominions that went into Liverpool or Cardiff, or other ports, had to get an English master to clear the ship, and they put him ashore when the pilot went off the boat.

Last summer a number of masters who were not certificated had charge of Canadian ships which cleared from Canadian ports, and in my opinion these masters were just as good as the certificated men. They took the ships to England, and the British authorities cleared the ships back with the same men on board without even asking them if they had a certificate. The British Board of Trade, therefore, realize that it is not necessary in all cases that these men have certificates. I am just as anxious as the member for North Cape Breton and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) that masters and

mates who have charge of our ships should have certificates. I should be the last to suggest that we should not endeavour whereever possible to make our men get certificates. But I do say that under present regulations it is practically impossible for an ordinary man to pass the examination. I was pleased to hear the member for North Cape Breton refer to the calling of the seamen as a "profession." I will certainly pass that word around when I get home; I will tell my seafaring friends that they are now in a class with lawyers, doctors, clergymen and men of other professions; and they will be proud indeed to hear it.

Mr. McMASTER: How about the officers?

Mr. DUFF: Well, with them it is not a profession; it is a response to the call of the sea. It would require not only a Philadelphia lawyer but a sea lawyer to pass the examination which is prescribed. I cannot take time to read the regulations; they are contained in a book of seventy-four pages. But under the present Act a master has to write a paper on navigation and nautical astronomy, the time occupied in writing the paper to be three hours. If you can imagine an ordinary sea captain or a man who has been going to sea in the forecastle, the second mate or boatswain of a ship, sitting down and writing a paper on navigation and nautical astronomy for three hours, I cannot. The thing cannot be done, except in a very few cases. Then, he has to write a paper on nautical astronomy and trigonometry in two hours; on chart work in three hours; on compass deviation in an hour and a half, and on naval architecture in an hour and a half; and he has to write an essay in two hours. Imagine an old salt, with his hands full of rheumatism, perhaps, sitting down with a pen in his hand and writing an essay for two hours! I say that this examination is altogether too heavy and that only one man in a hundred can pass it. I know that because I have encouraged a number of men to go to Halifax under Captain Simmons, or to Yarmouth under Captain Murphy, and try the examinations, and in a number of cases the men were plucked; they were unable to pass.

As to the matter of safety, not only is the master capable who, without a certificate takes charge of a three or four hundred ton vessel; I have known a number of cases where the mate, who had no certificate, took charge of the vessel in the case of the master's illness or death or absence from some other cause. Practically every man who goes to sea can bring a ship to port if necessary. We have read of cases where the captain and mate have been murdered or lost overboard and a common sailor has taken charge of the ship and brought her to port. It is not hard to learn navigation and to be able to take the sun or a chronometer sight. The member for North Cape Breton talks about risking men's lives. Really I cannot understand why he speaks in that way, because there is nothing in it.

With regard to wages, these men are the best paid men in the country. They get far better wages than are paid on the Government Merchant Marine or than are paid in the Marine Department or the Naval Department. So that it is not because we want to get uncertificated men at a smaller wage that we are trying to get this Bill through. If the Marine Department were to shut down to-morrow and not allow a ship to clear from a Canadian port unless there was a certificated master or mate on board, eighty per cent of the ships sailing out of Canadian ports to-day would be tied up at the dock or lying at anchor.

The member for North Cape Breton quoted telegrams from some guild in Vancouver and also from a gentleman who signs himself as president of the Shipmasters' Association at Halifax. I do not know anything about the Vancouver end of it, but I do know something about the Halifax end. This gentleman who signs himself as "President of the Shipmasters' Association" is a bit of a poet; he has given up responding to the call of the sea and possibly thinks that he will be the poet laureate of Canada. I hold in my hand a book of poems which this gentleman wrote during the war, and I am going to read one just to show that he is an experienced and capable man.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. May I ask the hon. member whether the poem which he proposes to read has any reference to the Bill under consideration?

Mr. DUFF: I think it has.

Mr. FIELDING: Is it a poem of the sea?

Mr. DUFF: Yes.

Mr. FIELDING: Then it has reference to this Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: I am very sorry, but I have to rule that the hon. member may not read the poem.

Mr. DUFF: It is worth reading, Mr. Chairman. I would like you to hear it.

The CHAIRMAN: This is not the time or the place to read it. Shall the clause carry?

Mr. DUFF: Well, if I may not read the poetry I shall have to proceed in prose. My idea is that these gentlemen who compose the Halifax Shipmasters' Association need not stay ashore and send telegrams to Ottawa. If they are capable men and want ships, the owners in Nova Scotia will give them ships. If they stay ashore, it is their own fault.

Mr. PELLETIER: The member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) read telegrams from British Columbia, Halifax and Prince Edward Island. It seems strange that these people should send these telegrams; they are well organized and are affiliated with national and international organizations. While in the province of Quebec during the Easter recess I met quite a few masters and mates who are also members of said organization, and they expressed themselves as willing to submit to the examination. If the masters and mates from other districts were opposed to this measure, I should think that the masters and mates from Quebec would also be opposed to it, but they are not. It seems to me that instead of lessening the efficiency of navigation, this measure would increase it. On the last day of the last session I opposed a Bill which had been introduced dealing with this subject on the ground that a man who was not certificated could take charge of a ship, even if he did not know the rules of the road. This Bill is quite different, it calls for efficiency; and I fail to see why it should not pass. In 1906, the Quebec pilots willingly submitted to an examination, and they are submitting to an annual examination for eyesight, hearing and so forth. If the masters and mates are not competent; if they are not holding certificates, what has happened in years past will happen in years to come. When an accident happens, an inquest is held, and, as has happened on different occasions, the captain or master in charge of the vessel who is responsible for the accident, will not be blamed because nothing can be done to him as he does not hold a certificate, but the pilot who is certificated will have to bear the burden. Therefore, I fail to see why this Bill is not a good one, and I believe it will assist in the securing of competent service. Sub-clause (c) states:

> Passes the sight test and the prescribed examination in signalling.

I would suggest that after the word "signalling" the words "and the rules of the road" be added. I believe these men should know the rules of the road as well as be able to pass the other tests.

[The Chairman.]

Mr. FIELDING: Was not exception taken at a previous stage to the words in sub-clause (b) of clause 85?—

> Produces satisfactory evidence of his sobriety, experience, ability and general good conduct on board ship.

I think some hon. member suggested that that implied that a man was perfectly at liberty to get drunk on shore so long as he behaved himself on board ship. There is justification for that criticism. The justification for this Bill must be found in the scarcity of certificated ship masters. All will agree that if we can get men fully qualified under the strictest provisions of the law, we should be glad to have them. If I were asked to state what is the chief product of my constituency, I would say shipmasters and seamen. At least that was the case in the palmy days of wooden shipbuilding in Nova Scotia when we built up that magnificent fleet of which my hon. friend (Mr. J. H. Sinclair) has often spoken in this House. Wherever you had a shipyard in full operation, you had a maritime spirit extending out into the country and the young men looking forward to engaging in the work of mariners, and there grew up in Nova Scotia a great race of people devoted to the maritime industry. No other community in Canada, and I doubt if any other community in any part of the British Empire has produced more seamen and shipmasters, in proportion to its population, than the constituency of Shelburne and Queen's. That was the chief business of the people. There came a time when shipbuilding practically ceased for many years. We have discussed the cause of that change in this House. I do not want to enter upon that aspect of the question; but there was a change; wooden shipbuilding ceased, and naturally enough there was a lack of employment and our young people no longer devoted themselves to the study of navigation. The consequence has been that of late years we have not produced the race of seamen that we did in former times. We have supplied shipmasters to a large part of the United States; many of the men to-day who command American vessels are Canadian shipmasters, Nova Scotians largely. In the progress of time our men have grown old. I believe if there were a supply of competent shipmasters available, I would hear that from my constituency, because that is the place where they breed them. We have many elderly gentlemen who have now re-

tired and who would willingly take up some other occupation on land; but I do not know of any considerable number of young men along that shore who have the qualifications necessary to command vessels, and it is because I believe there is a scarcity of such men that I am going to support the minister in passing this Bill. Every hon. member will at once admit that if we have an abundance of men fully qualified under the severe laws that my hon. friend (Mr. Duff) has quoted, by all means we should use them; but if we have not these men, why do we not do the next best thing and get men who have certificates? My hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) has pictured the evils that may come from sending out our ships with freight and even with passengers, although I do not believe these are passenger ships, without competent shipmasters. The shipowner is as anxious as anybody else for the protection of his ship, and so is the underwriter; under the existing laws, if there is no such scarcity as is alleged, then without doubt the shipowner and the underwriter will get the competent men and will not take the other men.

Mr. McKENZIE: I have repeatedly asked the minister to give the committee some explanation as to what is meant by the clause in our old law. I can understand the minister and his supporters ignoring the British law and saying: We have nothing to do with the British law and it has nothing to do with us; the shipping law in Great Britain is no good; we shall turn and have truck and trade with the Yankees. That is what we are going to do; we are going to accept their laws; we are going to lower the standard of the good old Mother Country who has been the pride of the sea for a thousand years. We are going to wipe that out and take the regulations under which a few old craft are sent out from Caplin and Gloucester as the standard of our shipping in Canada henceforth. Crystallized, that is the sum and substance of the logic of hon. gentlemen who are supporting this Bill. The minister refuses to give me any explanation of his understanding of sections 95 and 96. It is quite true that he changes two sections of the law which qualify his men; he makes it simple and easy for them to become masters. Has the minister ever come across a man to whom he would offer a certificate of competency in any walk of life and the man would say: I will not take it; I am going to school in order to qualify myself, and I will get the certificate according to law? I would think the man would be likely to take the certificate at once and take chances on making good. That is the doctrine the minister has established and is supporting here. He is saying to the men of this country: You need not go to school; you need not know anything about navigation; you need not qualify yourself as a first-class seaman. the pride of the British Empire; I will give you a parchment which is good enough. I should like the minister to explain whence the call for this change came. Did the Board of Trade of Quebec, or of Montreal, or of Halifax, or of Sydney, or of Vancouver, petition the Government asking for this change in the law? If there are such petitions, they should be laid on the Table or put upon Hansard so that we would have that information. So far the minister has not given one word of testimony from any of those institutions which I have mentioned, nor from any other body of men interested in navigation and trade in this country. If there are such demands, I should be disposed to think I am wrong in taking the position I take. The minister may provide a man with a certificate, but when he comes to sending him to sea he will find that section 95 of the Canada Shipping Act stands in the way. That section provides that:

> No ship registered in Canada, over one hundred tons registered tonnage, shall go to sea from any port or place in Canada on any voyage not being a coasting voyage, unless the master and first mate or only mate thereof have obtained and possess valid certificates either,—
>
> (a) of competency or service for sea-going ships, appropriate to their several stations in such ship, or of a higher grade, from the minister; or,
>
> (b) of competency or service for sea-going ships, appropriate to their several stations in such ship, or of a higher grade, from the Board of Trade in the United Kingdom; or
>
> (c) of competency appropriate to their several stations in such ship, or of a higher grade, granted in any British possession—

Here is the part of the Act which the distinguished marine lawyer who now happens to be at the head of the department ignores entirely. He thinks no attention should be paid to the opinion of a Supreme Court judge who says this law is absolutely wrong; he knows better. It is simply an extension of his doctrine about shipmasters; it is not necessary for them to know anything, he thinks, and so why should it be necessary for a lawyer to have any training? He says: I never had any training as a lawyer but I put my opinion above that of even a Supreme Court judge. A knowledge of the law is all nonsense—that is the position he takes. Section 95 provides that, in addition

to the qualifications I have just quoted, there must be added a certificate:

(c) of competency appropriate to their several stations in such ship, or of a higher grade, granted in any British possession, and declared by order of His Majesty in Council, published in the London Gazette, under the provisions of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, or of any Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom containing such provisions, to be of the same force as certificates of competency for foreign sea-going ships granted under the Acts of the Parliament of the United Kingdom relating to merchant shipping.

To get a certificate in the United Kingdom certain requirements have to be met, certain knowledge must be possessed by the candidate, and an examination must be passed. The minister says: I will issue certificates which do not come up to the British standard at all; my requirements will be lower, but at the same time I shall expect the Board of Trade and His Majesty in Council to say that they are of just as high a standard as the certificates issued in Great Britain. If the minister can get His Majesty in Council to do so, that is another matter, but from my knowledge of how things are done in Great Britain I would think that the first thing His Majesty's advisers would do would be to ascertain what are the qualifications required under this new Act and compare them with the qualifications required under the British Act, and then they would advise His Majesty not to give his assent to a proposal that would be a deception upon the face of it. The qualifications required would not be the same.

That is all I care to say about the matter. I still stand by the position I took before, that in education as well as in other matters, we should be advancing not retrograding in this country. The minister will find when he puts his policy before the people and they see that he is undermining ambition and is taking away from young men the desire to qualify for positions in this walk of life, and that in this he has made a mistake. We have a navigation school in my own town, and I know of no one who tried examinations from that school who did not pass; but what encouragement have they to try and qualify themselves now when masters and mates are to be turned out by the minister by the yard, just as if he was measuring off pieces of cloth, without any educational requirements at all?

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

[Mr. McKenzie.]

AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT AND THE CORPORATION OF OTTAWA.

On motion of Hon. J. D. Reid, Bill No. 22, to confirm an Agreement between His Majesty the King and the Corporation of the City of Ottawa was read a second time and the House went into Committee thereon. Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—agreement confirmed:

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The minister in speaking to the resolution went pretty fully, I think, into the main features of the agreement, but there was some information he was to give, when the Bill got into committee, relating to the extent of the increased service the city was rendering the Government.

Mr. J. D. REID: The Government have been taking over a lot of property in Ottawa during the last few years, and that means that the city has lost the taxes on those properties. That is one reason why we think there should be an increase in the amount paid to the city. Furthermore, the city are sprinkling water along Wellington street and in front of the Government buildings, and they furnish fire protection to any buildings owned or occupied by the Government. The city also sprinkles the parks and driveways that are maintained by the Ottawa Improvement Commission. All these things represent increased service. The $15,000 that was formerly paid was simply for fire protection alone. The city's claim, I think, is a very good one, because in the last few years we have been taking over a great deal of property on which the city have been collecting taxes. It is not really an increase that we are giving the city in view of the increased service they are rendering.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: Is it the intention of the Government, when they take over property belonging to other cities, Montreal, for instance, to compensate the city for the taxes they lost?

Mr. J. D. REID: No, we have not been doing that. Ottawa is the seat of Government.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: The Government does not pay any taxes on property it acquires in the city of Montreal.

Mr. J. D. REID: This is the seat of Government, and the buildings taken over are controlled by the Government.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: If this principle applies in Ottawa, should it not apply in other cities?

Mr. J. D. REID: In that case we should have to adopt a general policy.

Mr. McKENZIE: What part of this agreement provides for the payment by the Dominion of Canada of taxes, or their equivalent, to the city of Ottawa?

Mr. J. D. REID: The Government does not pay taxes.

Mr. McKENZIE: The minister says that the Government pays something in lieu of taxes.

Mr. J. D. REID: The city in urging its claim for an increase put up the argument that the fire protection which it afforded the buildings of the Government necessitated a larger equipment.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is there anything to show that the Government recognized that as a sound reason for increasing the allowance to the city? It must be recognized as a good argument if the Government is increasing the amount paid to the city.

Mr. J. D. REID: The city claims that they are losing a lot of money by reason of our taking over certain properties. They say that the taxes on the Government property in the city of Ottawa would amount to $483,887. We are not settling for that, but we are allowing for fire protection, sprinkling of the streets and the use of sewerage, which is an important item. The city also estimated that the tax on civil servants would amount to about $60,000. Taking everything into consideration, the sub-committee that discussed the matter with the city council felt that the amount we are now allowing was reasonable.

Mr. McKENZIE: We are to pay more now than before the civil servants became assessable?

Mr. J. D. REID: We paid $15,000 a year, and the civil servants were exempt from income taxation by the city. Now we are paying $75,000, and the civil servants, like any other citizens, will be assessable.

Mr. McKENZIE: Now that the civil servants are being subjected to assessment it must mean a large income to the city of Ottawa. I am not objecting to this at all because a civil servant should pay his way like any other citizen. But we got along with a payment of $15,000 formerly, when civil servants were not contributing anything, and now that they are going to contribute to the income of the city we are raising the city's allowance to $75,000. I do not understand such business, nor can I see any reason whatever for it. We must have been robbing the city to a large extent in former years if it now appears to be necessary that we should increase their allowances by such a large amount. I think the committee requires the fullest possible explanation for this increase from $15,000 to $75,000.

Mr. J. D. REID: The city claimed that $15,000 was not by any means commensurate with the value of the services they rendered the Government, and I think myself that the Government were not paying adequately for those services. The fact of the Government having the use of the sewers was a matter of great consideration. We would have had to build sewers for all Government property, and the interest on that would amount to a large sum; and we would of course have to have our own fire protection equipment, with men to look after that property and be ready in case of fire, which would be an annual charge. Again, we would have to keep the streets in front of our own property properly watered. Taking everything into consideration we considered that the city was certainly losing a large amount of money annually, when it was paid only $15,000. As regards the civil servants, it was arranged many years ago that they should be exempt from income taxation, but we could see no reason why the Government should assume that liability in the city of Ottawa and not elsewhere. Civil servants in Ottawa should be put on the same basis as those in any other part of the Dominion so far as income taxation is concerned. I admit that the increase is a large one, but for many months the city refused to accept even it, and it was only latterly that they came to the conclusion that they would accept it for a term of five years. We thought that it should be for a term of ten years, but eventually we compromised and decided on five years. I do not know that in the increased amount the Government will be paying too much for the services which are rendered by the city.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think the minister should point out that the Government is also increasing the grant to the Improvement Commission from $60,000 to $150,000.

Mr. J. D. REID: It was $100,000 and we are increasing it to $150,000.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: The Government are getting into the habit of wobbling on this question of the taxation of Dominion Government property. There are two positions to take. One is that we will pay taxes on our property throughout the Dominion and the other is that we will not pay any taxes on Dominion Government property to municipalities. We must live up to one or other of these positions. If we are going to pay the city of Ottawa something in lieu of taxation because it furnishes water and provides sewers, that must also apply to the town in which I live where the public buildings are also provided with drainage, fire protection, and other services. The same principle will apply to every town in Canada. The minister made a big mistake when he capitulated to some of the towns in Ontario in regard to the Grand Trunk. It has brought him trouble already. It has brought him an application from Halifax for a similar concession, and it will bring him applications from all over the Dominion. The country has always proceeded upon the basis that no taxation would be paid and it was so understood whenever a town or city got an expenditure made upon a public building. These public buildings are erected at vast expense to the Dominion, the people are glad to get them, and they have always been glad, until a very recent time, to free them from taxation. Now we are drifting in the wrong direction unless we intend to take the question up boldly and pay taxes all over the Dominion. I do not like to hear the minister say that he is giving this money in lieu of taxes because there are services such as fire protection and sewers provided by the city of Ottawa.

Mr. McKENZIE: There is an advance in one direction of $60,000 and in another of $50,000, making $110,000 of a jump in one year. I hope we will not ratify this contract because it is absolutely unreasonable. For years the city was satisfied with the bargains that we were making. They were getting a little more and a little more every year and things were going along very nicely. We found that there was a payment of $15,000 for one branch of the service. For sixteen years or more, while I was a member of this House, I never heard anybody in behalf of the city saying the thing was unreasonable or that they were not getting enough; it was rather we who were complaining that we were paying too much. Now we find that at one fell swoop when money is scarce we pay an additional lump sum for nothing except what we were getting before for much less. There seems to be no justification whatever for a position of that kind. What would the city of Ottawa be were it not for the public buildings and the Civil Service? They say they are not getting enough taxation out of the sites of public buildings. Take the Hunter building at the corner of Queen and O'Connor streets; that is a magnificent structure. It is full of civil servants who pay taxes. I am sure they would get more taxes from the civil servants, the ministers and their officers who are occupying that building than they could possibly get from the site upon which it stands. You have that magnificent structure full of officers, of excellent citizens, who are paying taxes, a source of revenue that they would not have if it were not for the fact that this is the seat of government. And yet the Government is told that it must pay a fine, or a license for the privilege of remaining in the city of Ottawa. I cannot get it in my mind that there is any logic or reason for the argument at all, and I have as yet heard none from the minister.

11 p.m.

Mr. J. D. REID: I understood the hon. gentleman to say that there is an advance of $100,000 and that we get nothing for it.

Mr. McKENZIE: Nothing but what we had before.

Mr. J. D. REID: Before, we were paying $100,000 to the Improvement Commission, and that amount was expended in beautifying and improving the city of Ottawa, the capital of the Dominion. Fifty thousand dollars of the amount that is being paid is for the Improvement Commission, making $150,000 to be devoted to that work; so that we are getting this increased expenditure for the purpose of beautifying the capital city. I think every hon. member will agree that the capital of the Dominion should be made as attractive as the capital of any other country. The hon. gentleman has asked: "What would the city of Ottawa be without the Parliament buildings"? The Mayor of Ottawa asks: "What would Parliament be without the city of Ottawa"? If we had not the city of Ottawa to make all these expenditures, would we not have to expend a large amount on sewers, waterworks, fire protection, hospitals for our employees, schools, street watering and police protection.

Mr. McMASTER: You have the Dominion Police?

Mr. J. D. REID: That is around our own buildings. There are large expenditures that the Government would otherwise have to make. Taking all these things into consideration I do not think the amount is unreasonable. When the discussion commenced, they wanted $80,000 and that did not take into consideration the Improvement Commission at all. We have cut that down to $75,000 and we are allowing $150,000 for improving the city which, I think hon. members will agree, is a good expenditure to be made in the capital.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Has the minister a statement of the assessed value of the Government property and the tax rate in the city of Ottawa?

Mr. J. D. REID: The taxable real estate in Ottawa was assessed in 1918, for taxation 1919, at $98,983,599.

Mr. FIELDING: Is that Government property?

Mr. REID: That is the assessment on the whole of the property in the city of Ottawa. The Government occupies real estate in Ottawa valued, after deducting the value of local Government institutions, at $21,158,190. The Government leases and occupies in addition premises assessed at $4,025,749, and therefore owns, or occupies on lease, about one-fifth of the real estate of the city.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Did the minister mention the amount the city estimates it lost through the exemption of civil servants from taxation on their incomes?

Mr. J. D. REID: I mentioned an amount in the neighbourhood of $60,000. When the City Council made their claim they estimated the amount at $57,175.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That makes a total increase of about $170,000 over what was formerly given.

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE: Very valuable property in the city is rented by the Government, and I presume the owners of the property pay the taxes. The few buildings that the country owns in Ottawa should be exempt from taxation. In Halifax, which is not nearly as large as this city, there is far more Government property than there is in Ottawa. The amount of Government-owned property in Halifax, comprising the Fortifications and all the military works in the harbour, is immense, but not a cent of taxes is being paid on that property either to the city of Halifax or to the province of Nova Scotia. Taxes are being paid to the municipality of Ottawa upon Government property, but nobody from Halifax is asking for the payment of any taxes as far as I know.

Mr. FIELDING: There was a deputation here lately asking for the payment of taxes, and they are hoping that their demands will be met.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am not making any argument with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) about what may take place; the Lord only knows what may transpire with this Government, but so far no taxes have been paid to the city of Halifax although there are thousands of dollars' worth of Government property in that city to every thousand dollars' worth of Government-owned property in Ottawa. How can the Government reconcile its payment of taxes to the city of Ottawa when it has not paid a dollar to the city of Halifax? The Government have given out to the world that they are going to pay taxes on the Grand Trunk and Canadian National railway properties, and I suppose when the news went down to Halifax the municipal corporation there said: If the Government are getting so generous as to undertake to pay taxes everywhere, why should they not do so here? I really do not know how the Government can answer the city of Halifax and decline to pay taxes upon the millions of dollars' worth of property they own there while at the same time quite willing to pay taxes in Ottawa and also upon the Grand Trunk and other railway property. I think the principle should be adhered to that Crown property is not taxable.

Mr. J. D. REID: We are not giving this grant in the way of taxes. In the capitals of other countries, notably the United States, grants are made almost equivalent to what the Government's taxes would be in return for the benefits they enjoy, as well as towards improving the city. We get the benefits from the municipal corporation I have mentioned and the amount that we are paying, $75,000, certainly is not any too much. I would not like it to go out to the country that what we are paying is by way of taxes. The hon. gentleman has mentioned the Grand Trunk and the Canadian National railways. These lines have been operated by private companies and should continue to pay taxes when they are operated in competition with companies of that class.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There is no date mentioned in the schedule, it is left blank. What is the reason of that?

Mr. J. D. REID: I was going to move to amend the agreement so that the date should be the 30th day of March, 1920, and adopt the same date in the schedule.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Are we to understand that the minister has already signed this agreement? If this is a concluded contract, what is the object of submitting the matter to Parliament?

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes, I have signed the agreement, but I cannot pay out the money until it is voted by Parliament.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There appears to be no clause in the contract which recognizes Parliment one way or the other. The minister should have inserted some provision making the agreement subject to approval by Parliament.

Mr. J. D. REID: The deputy minister tells me there is such a provision in the agreement. Yes, I notice it reads that payment is to be made quarterly when due "as soon as may be after the passing of the Act confirming this agreement."

The CHAIRMAN: It is in the first clause of the agreement.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That has reference to the payment of the $75,000.

Mr. FIELDING: Does not the department pay for water supplied to public buildings in other places?

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes, in accordance with local rates.

Mr. FIELDING: But not taxes?

Mr. J. D. REID: No.

Schedule agreed to.

Bill reported.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 40, respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway—Mr. Davis.

Bill No. 41, respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway—Mr. Nesbitt.

Bill No. 42, respecting the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company—Mr. Clements.

Bill No. 43, respecting the Kettle Valley Railway Company—Mr. Green.

Bill No. 44, respecting the Montreal Joliette and Transcontinental Junction Railway Company—Mr. Denis.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Rowell, the House adjourned at 11.16 p.m.

Wednesday, April 7, 1920.

The House met at Two o'clock.

REPORTS TABLED.

Annual report of the Editorial Committee on Government Publications, dated 1st March, 1920.—Rt. Hon. Sir George Foster.

Report of total costs and general expenses of the Victory Loan.—Rt. Hon. Mr. Sifton.

BANK ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. MARIE JOSEPH DEMERS (St. Johns and Iberville) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 47, to amend the Bank Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. DEMERS: The purport of this Bill is to fix a minimum rate of interest of four per cent to be paid by the banks on money deposited with them, there being a further provision that in computing the interest they shall take into account the whole time during which the money is on deposit.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

FRENCH PUBLICATION OF BLUE BOOKS.

Mr. DEMERS:

1. Have instructions been given to limit the French publication of public documents and blue books pertaining to the Dominion Government?
2. What blue books were published in 1919?
3. What public documents were published in both languages in 1919?
4. What public documents were published in one language only, and in what language were they published?

Rt. Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1. No instructions have been given to limit the French publication of public documents and blue books pertaining to the Dominion Government. The Editorial Committee exercises a supervision as to what and what numbers of books or documents, either French or English, should be published.

2, 3 and 4. These stand as an order for return.

NATURALIZATION — BELGIANS, FRENCH, TURKS, GERMANS.

Mr. DESLAURIERS:

1. Is it a fact that the Government has refused naturalization papers and the granting

of title deeds of property to certain French and Belgians in Canada who, at the commencement of hostilities in the last Great War, had not completed the required five years of residential qualifications, but nevertheless proceeded overseas to join regiments of allied countries in the defense of the flag?

2. If so, to how many of such citizens of Canada have naturalization papers and property deeds been refused during the period extending from the 11th of November, 1918, to this date?

3. Is it a fact that on presentation of a certificate issued by the Secretary of State for Canada certain Turks, Germans and other subjects of enemy countries have been granted property rights and the rights of the franchise since the signing of the Armistice?

Rt. Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

1. A despatch from the Colonial Office, dated the 21st April, 1915, forwarded a note from the French Ambassador in London requesting that French citizens should not be naturalized during the war. By an Order in Council, dated the 3rd June, 1915, it was directed that in so far as the issue of certificates under the Naturalization Act, 1914, was concerned, the request of the French Ambassador would be acceded to. Similar requests were received from the Russian and Italian Governments. In these circumstances the Secretary of State, in his discretion, decided not to issue certificates of naturalization to allies during the war. However, since the ratification of the Treaty of Peace with Germany certificates of naturalization have been issued to all applicants who have complied with the conditions laid down by the Naturalization Act, 1919.

As to the granting of patent to homesteaders on Dominion lands who left Canada to serve in the forces of allied nations before they had completed the five years required for naturalization, it has been decided in such cases to allow patent to issue without demanding a certificate of naturalization, and in any case where a demand has been made for such certificate of naturalization steps are being taken to proceed with the issue of patent, provided the performance of duties in other respects have been proven in the usual way.

2. In so far as naturalization is concerned, the request of the Allied Powers was complied with.

As to refusal of property deeds, the Department of the Interior is able to trace one case only. It has now been ruled in this case that the issue of patent will not be withheld, provided proof is submitted that the settlement conditions have been fulfilled.

3. Certificates of naturalization have been granted to Turks of Syrian and Armenian origin since the Armistice, but no such certificates have been issued to persons of German origin.

As regards the issue of patents for homesteads, it may be stated that 10 George V, chapter 13, provides a means whereby alien homesteaders, who have completed their settlement duties, but who are debarred from naturalization for a period of ten years from the close of the war, may secure patents by showing that they are qualified for naturalization in all other respects.

BONAVENTURE COUNTY PENSIONERS.

Hon. Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure):

1. How many residents of Bonaventure County are receiving pensions and allowances?

2. What are the names, place of residence and respective amounts received by said persons?

Rt. Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER: With reference to this and kindred questions, the Board of Pension Commissioners are constituted according to an Act; they present their reports to Parliament and such information as they bring down will be given then. It would cause an infinity of trouble and expense to get this information now as to the names, place of residence and respective amount of pensions received by persons in all the different localities.

Question dropped.

MR. ELZEAR PICARD.

Mr. MARCILE (Bagot):

1. Has any demand been made to the Government by Elzear Picard, of St. Theodore d'Acton, on account of the death of his son, Prudent, during the month of October, 1918, while in military service?

2. If so, what is the amount?

Rt. Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

1. No information.

2. Answered by No. 1.

HEARST PUBLICATIONS.

*Mr. EDWARDS:

1. What are the names of the papers and magazines known as the Hearst Publications, which are allowed to circulate in Canada?

2. Is it the intention of the Government to exclude any or all of the Hearst publications from Canada? If so, when will such action be taken and in regard to what papers and magazines?

Rt. Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Government has no record of the names of papers and magazines known as the Hearst publications which circulate in Canada. At the present time the Government has no legislative power sufficient to enable it to exclude the Hearst publications and maga-

zines. The matter is now and has been engaging the attention of the Government.

ST. JOHN ARMOURY BUILDING.

Mr. LEGER:

1. How much did the Armoury Building at St. John, N.B., cost?
2. How much has it cost yearly for heat, light and upkeep of said building?
3. Is this large and expensive building occupied permanently? If so, by whom?
4. How much rent does the Government pay for the Jones Castle, so-called, Headquarters of Military District No. 7, at 132 Sydney street, St. John?
5. Is heating and lighting included in said rental?
6. If not, how much does heating and lighting for the said building cost the Department?
7. How much does rent, heating and lighting cost the Government each year for the following offices, the Returned Soldiers' Aid Commission, 49 Canterbury street, St. John, N.B., the Discharged Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Employment Bureau, 49 Canterbury street, St. John, N.B., the Discharged Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, No. 94 Prince William street, the Discharged Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 76 Prince William street, and the Soldiers' Settlement Board, 160 Prince William street?

Rt. Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

1. $353,630.75.

2. The average yearly cost is as follows: Heat, $6,444.04; light, $1,606.10; water, $3,244.56.

3. (a) Yes. (b) Militia units—62nd Regiment; 3rd Regiment, C.G.A.; 7th Machine Gun Brigade; No. 7 Canadian Army Service Corps Company; Permanent Force Royal Canadian Army Service Corps Office and Stores; Royal Canadian Engineers Stores and Workshop; Permanent Force Recruiting Office. Miscellaneous—Casualty Company; District Medical Stores; District Stationery Depot; District Dental Clinic Offices and Stores; Caretaker's quarters.

4. $1,000 per annum.

5. No.

6. The average yearly cost for heating and lighting and heating is as follows: Heat. $878.26; light, $175.08.

7. (a) 49 Canterbury street:—An amount of $16.66 was paid by the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment for rent of these premises for the month of May, 1919. It was only temporary accommodation occupied by the Information and Service Branch for this month. This branch took up their quarters in 160 Prince William street on June 1. (b) 94 Prince William street:—Rent, $175 per annum; heating and lighting, $108.30. (c) 76 Prince William street:—Rent, $900 per annum; heating, included in lease; lighting, $42. (d) 160 Prince William street:—Rent, $350 per annum; heating, no expenditure; lighting, $65.

[Sir George Foster.]

MR. J. L. McNICHOL.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Has Mr. J. L. McNichol been dismissed by the Board of Commerce?
2 If so, for what reason?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: In reference to this and kindred questions,—the Board of Commerce is constituted under an Act in which its authorities and duties are laid down. It is in effect a court of law, and the Government has no records of its particular proceedings. It makes a report according to law; that report is in course of preparation and will be before the House in about two weeks when, I imagine, most of the information that is asked for will be found therein.

Question dropped.

NEWSPRINT PAPER.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. When and why was an embargo placed upon the importation of newsprint paper manufactured by some of the mills?
2. Has the Government received any communication, written or oral, from the State Department at Washington or from the Foreign Office in London in regard thereto?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I imagine this question is wrongly put and that the word "importation" should be "exportation." Perhaps, with the consent of the House, the question may be amended by substituting the word "exportation" for the word "importation," and the information will then be brought down.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will see that the change is made accordingly. I believe it is a clerical error.

Question stands.

CHARLEVOIX-MONTMORENCY COUNTY PENSIONERS.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. How many residents of the County of Charlevoix-Montmorency are receiving pensions and allowances from the Government?
2. What are the names, place of residence and respective amounts received by said persons?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The same answer holds good for tnis question as the one I gave to a previous question of like import.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: When will the report be brought down?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am not certain, but I will make inquiry.

Question dropped.

CANADIAN MILITARY EXPEDITION TO RUSSIA.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. What has been the total cost of the Canadian Military Expedition to Russia?
2. How many officers and men were sent from Canada?
3. When did they leave and when did they return?
4. Were there any casualties?
5. If so, how many were killed and how many wounded?
6. How many died of disease?
7. How many are entitled to pensions?
8. What is the total amount of annual pensions?
9. How far from Vladivostok did the Canadian army penetrate into Russia?
10. By what authority was this expedition sent?
11. What became of the balance of supplies, ammunition, etc.?
12. Were these articles sold by auction or private sale?
13. Who were the purchasers?
14. What amount was realized by said sale and how was it paid?

Rt. Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

1. The total cost to Canada has been $2,823,960.98.

2. 4,214.

3. (a) Date and number embarking—11-10-18, 680; 17-11-18, 429; 27-11-18, 19; 21-12-18, 880; 26-12-18, 1,805; 10-1-19, 23; 30-1-19, 57; 12-2-19, 314; 27-3-19, 7; total 4,214.

(b) Date and number returning—9-4-19, 88; 5-5-19, 1,077; 21-5-19, 642; 29-5-19, 1,485; 21-6-19, 694; total 3,986; subsequent sailings, 61.

Remained in Siberia—Discharged in Siberia, 72; Imperial instructors, 33; British Military Mission, 26; resigned, 11; deserters, 4; deaths, 19; returned 16-11-19, 1; not accounted for, 1; total 4,214.

4. 19.

5. Accidentally killed, 3; wounded, none.

6. Died of disease, 16.

7. No information is available at present.

8. $3,036 payable to dependents of deceased soldiers. In this connection it should be noted that as there were no "wounded" casualties reported from the Canadian Expeditionary Force to Russia none of the personnel of that force would be entitled to pensions awarded by the Board of Pension Commissioners. It is, however, impossible to state at present whether pensions are being paid for other disabilities which members of that force might have incurred during their military service. Under the Board's present classification of disability pensions a distinction has been made between "theatre of war" and "non theatre" pensioners only, and "Russian" cases would come under the first mentioned category. To segregate the Russian pensionable disability cases (assuming that there are such) would involve the examination of some one hundred thousand files, which would require a considerable length of time to complete.

9. They did not leave Vladivostok district.

10. By Order in Council No. P.C. 1983, dated the 12th August, 1918.

11, 12, 13 and 14. The cost of all supplies, ammunition, etc., (except the initial issue of personal equipment and clothing for the Canadian personnel) was borne by the Imperial Government, which assumed responsibility for same upon shipment from Vancouver, and any balance remained in their hands.

ELECTION PLEDGES.

Mr. CAMPBELL:

1. Did the Prime Minister prior to the election of 1911 make a promise or pledge that if his party were successful in that election that he would have transferred to the provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba the natural resources of these provinces?
2. If so, did this promise or pledge contain any stipulation or condition regarding terms under which such transfer should be made?
3. Has such promise or pledge been carried out?
4. If not, why not?
5. To carry out such promise or pledge, is parliamentary action necessary?
6. If so, will parliamentary action be taken at this session?
7. Is this promise or pledge being fulfilled "as soon as possible"?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The present Acting Prime Minister is not aware of what statements were made by the Prime Minister prior to the election of 1911, as asked for by this question. I think the question might be dropped, and if my hon. friend is very desirous of the information the question could again be put on the Order Paper when the Prime Minister is present.

Mr. McMASTER: At the Greek Kalends.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Oh no. Not quite so favourable as that to my hon. friend.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question might stand perhaps till the Prime Minister returns.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It would get very old.

Question dropped.

BOARD OF COMMERCE PROSECUTIONS.

Mr. PREVOST:

1. Has the Board of Commerce taken charge of the accusations which were the object of criminal suits?
2. If so, what are those accusations, and what has happened to such suits?
3. Has the Board of Commerce taken charge of cases in which excess profits had to be given back?
4. If so, what are these cases, and has restitution been made?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Government has no record in this matter. The same remarks also apply which I made in answer to the preceding question.

THE GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY COMPANY OF CANADA—ASSETS AND LIABILITIES OF SUBSIDIARY COMPANIES.

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. What are the assets and liabilities of the Bay City Terminal Railway Company, one of the companies directly controlled by the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada?
2. What were the costs of operation and maintenance of said railway for the last year?
3. What is the yearly revenue of said railway?
4. Where is the Bay City Terminal Railway situated?
5. What is the length of this railway?

Hon. Mr. REID: The information asked for by this question and those immediately following up to and including No. 122 on to-days Order Paper will be the subject of investigation by the Board of Arbitration to be appointed under the Grand Trunk Acquisition Act of last session, and it is therefore not in the public interest that it be disclosed at the present time.

LEAF TOBACCO.

Mr. SEGUIN:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to change the law so as to prevent absolutely the sale of leaf tobacco to consumers, or to impose on leaf tobacco the same duties as on manufactured tobacco?
2. If so, before making such change is it the intention of the Government to call a convention of tobacco producers in order to take their advice in the matter?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. and 2. Any change to be made in duties on leaf or manufactured tobacco, will, in the ordinary course, be announced in the Budget speech of the Minister of Finance.

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT STEAMSHIPS.

Mr. DUFF:

1. For what steel cargo steamships built under the Dominion Governments programme have settlements been made with the builders?
2. What was the finally ascertained deadweight capacity of each of such ships?
3. What was the contract price per deadweight ton for each of such ships?
4. What was the total amount paid for each of said ships?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. Canadian Voyageur, Canadian Pioneer, Canadian Warrior, Canadian Recruit, Canadian Trader, Canadian Sailor, Canadian Ranger, Canadian Seigneur, Canadian Adventurer, Canadian Spinner, Canadian Sower.

	D.W. Tons
2. Canadian Voyageur	4.575
Canadian Pioneer	8,408
Canadian Warrior	3,995
Canadian Recruit	3,964
Canadian Trader	3,341
Canadian Sailor	3,357
Canadian Ranger	8,382
Canadian Seigneur	8,391
Canadian Adventurer	3,408
Canadian Spinner	8,393
Canadian Sower	3,405

	Per Ton
3. Canadian Voyageur	$207.00
Canadian Pioneer	180.00
Canadian Warrior	205.00
Canadian Recruit	205.00
Canadian Trader	205.00
Canadian Sailor	205.00
Canadian Ranger	188.00
Canadian Seigneur	188.00
Canadian Adventurer	210.00
Canadian Spinner	188.00
Canadian Sower	210.00

4. Canadian Voyageur	$ 948,660.75
Canadian Pioneer	1,519,459.99
Canadian Warrior	819,385.58
Canadian Recruit	812,897.62
Canadian Trader	686,762.88
Canadian Sailor	690,409.84
Canadian Ranger	1,575,816.00
Canadian Seigneur	1,587,643.15
Canadian Adventurer	715,652.49
Canadian Spinner	1,589,700.00
Canadian Sower	715,649.13

NATURALIZATION.

IMPERIAL CITIZENSHIP.

Mr. EULER:

1. Do those citizens who obtained naturalization under authority of laws enacted prior to 1919, automatically obtain Imperial citizenship by virtue of the naturalization law of 1919?
2. If not, may the naturalization certificates issued prior to 1919 be exchanged by the holders for certificates issued under the Naturalization Act of 1919?
3. If so, is this right of exchange open to all citizens naturalized prior to 1919, without exception?
4. If there are exceptions, what are they?
5. Why are the exceptions made?

Right Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

1. No.

2. Persons naturalized prior to July 7, 1919, may be granted certificates of naturalization under section 6 of the Naturalization Act, 1919.

3. No.

4. Persons of a nationality prohibited from receiving certificates of naturalization under paragraph (b) subsection 4, section 8 of the Naturalization Act, 1919, are not granted certificates of naturalization under section 6 of the Naturalization Act, 1919.

5. These exceptions are within the discretion of the Secretary of State.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION STAFF.

Mr. FAFARD:

1. How many employees are there in the Civil Service Commission?
2. How many receive more than $2,000 yearly, and what are their names?
3. How much has this commission cost since its creation?
4. How much has it cost in 1919?
5. Does the Government intend to put into force the new classification? If so, when?
6. Is the Government satisfied with this classification?

Right Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

1. 145.

2. Six—William Foran, Charles H. Bland, Elsie E. Saunders, J. R. A. Baril, J. J. McCann, C. V. Putman.

3.

	Contingencies.	Civil Govt. Service.	
1908-09 / 1909-10	$ 14,027 65	$ 16,647 77	
1910-11	13,495 32	17,850 00	
1911-12	14,223 70	22,062 28	
1912-13	12,568 65	22,964 93	
1913-14	14,613 32	24,225 00	
1914-15	15,359 07	26,362 50	
1915-16	15,323 65	26,646 40	
1916-17	12,974 31	26,447 20	
1917-18	13,552 79	30,372 65	
1918-19	66,673 26	41,983 84	
1919-20	116,594 68	60,015 42	
	$309,406 40	$315,577 99	$624,984 39

4. $ 83,455 95 Contingencies.
54,638 55 Civil Govt. salaries.

$138,094 50 (Calendar Year, 1919.)

5. The Civil Service Amendment Act which authorized the classification became law November 10, 1919. It was put into operation forthwith.

6. So far as the classification has been completed it has been approved by the Government.

PAYMENTS TO MORRISON'S LIMITED.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

How much money has been paid by the Government to D. A. Morrison, or Morrison's Limited, Amherst, Nova Scotia, for the supply of goods to the military barracks and to the alien enemy internment or detention camp at Amherst?

Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

Justice Department.

Amount paid for supplies to internment camp at Amherst to Morrison's Limited, $64,098.26.

Militia and Defence Department.

The sum of $63,329.69 has been paid by the Department of Militia and Defence to Morrison's Limited, Amherst, and Morrison and Company, Amherst, for the supply of groceries and provisions.

Since the 4th May, 1915, all purchases have been made through War Purchasing Commission.

CANADIAN FREIGHT CARS IN THE UNITED STATES.

*Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

In an answer from the Minister of Railways and Canals, given at page 331 of the Debates, it is said that on the first of March 1920, there were 59,716 Canadian cars in the United States: Of this total, how many belong (a) to the National Railways, (b) to the Canadian Pacific Railway, (c) to the Grand Trunk Railway, (d) to other Canadian Railways?

Hon. Mr. REID: (a) 10,840; (b) 15,482; (c) 21,028; (d) 12,366.

MONASTERY STATION FREIGHT TRAFFIC.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

What has been the amount of freight business done at the Railway Station of Monastery, Nova Scotia, in dollars and tons for each year during the last five years?

Hon. Mr. REID:

	Tons	Earnings
1915	1,333	$2,008.36
1916	2,252	3,056.39
1917	4,376	6,269.11
1918	5,730	9,675.00
1919	4,127	8,816.00
Total	11,818	$29,824.86

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY SERVICE.

Mr. CANNON:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to discontinue the service of the Intercolonial from River Ouelle station, on the main line, to the Wharf station? If so, why?

2. How many passengers were carried last year by the Intercolonial on this branch line?

3. What are the receipts on said line, those of Steamer Champlain included, during last year?

4. What quantity of freight was carried on said line last year?

Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

1. This line was previously operated to make connection with the steamer crossing the St. Lawrence river from Murray Bay, but was discontinued when boat was unable to make regular trips on account of ice conditions. Service was formerly required for people, living north of river, requiring to travel to and from Quebec, but these people now have direct train service with Quebec since operation of the Quebec and Saguenay Railway was commenced.

2. 8,230 passengers.

3. $14,006.51.

4. 3,936 tons.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—GATEKEEPERS' WAGES.

Mr. LEDUC:

1. What are the wages paid by the Canadian National Railway to the gatekeepers at the level crossings of the Grand Trunk Railway system in the Westmount St. Henry Division?

2. How much time are said men supposed to give for the wages paid to them?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. The men are in the employ of the Grand Trunk Railway and they advise that they are paid at the rate of 38c. per hour, and they work eight hours a day. The men work three shifts and are relieved one day per week.

2. Answered by No. 1.

FEDERAL EMERGENCY FUND FOR RETURNED SOLDIERS.

Mr. CHISHOLM:

1. What was the cost of administration of the Federal Emergency Fund for the re-establishment of the returned soldier up to March 1, 1920?

2. What was the cost per month?

3. What was the cost in each province?

Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

1. $81,084.16.

2. December, 1919, to January, 1920—$36,-032. The fund was in operation one week in December, 1919. February, 1920—$45,-052.16.

3. Prince Edward Island, $25.22, (incomplete); Nova Scotia, $1,120.10; New Brunswick, $1,239.42; Ontario, $20,163; Quebec, $20,009.67; Saskatchewan, $1,631.22, (incomplete); Manitoba, $4,454.35; Alberta, $16,-849.83; British Columbia, $15,418.99; Yukon, $172.25.

[Mr. Cannon.]

DOMINION'S ANNUAL FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS.

*Mr. TOBIN:

1. Is the Government in a position to state when it considers that it will be possible to pay the annual obligations of the Dominion upon all accounts out of the annual revenues of the Government without borrowing any further amounts by domestic or foreign loans?

2. If so, when?

3. If not, when will the Government be able to give this information?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. For the past fiscal year our revenue exceeds our annual obligations for usual purposes. The revenue for the twelve months ended March 31, 1920, that has reached the books of the Finance Department amounts to $380,832,507.75, while the expenditure for the same period (not including Capital and War) amounted to $340,880,668.25. This expenditure, however, includes war pensions, interest on war debt and expenditures on account of Soldiers' Land Settlement and Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment. The total thus included amounts to approximately $188,000,000 and the liabilities thus discharged are attributable entirely to the war.

2 and 3. As to the future the subject will be dealt with in the Budget speech to the fullest possible extent.

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS—UNITED STATES IMPORTATIONS.

Mr. COPP:

1. How much has been paid by the Canadian Government railways for goods, wares, merchandise and machinery imported from the United States and used in the operation of said railway between the 31st day of March, 1918, and the 31st of March, 1919?

2. How much coal has been purchased from the United States during the said period and how much was paid for same?

3. How much has been paid for material mentioned in questions one and two imported from the United States and used in operation of said railway since 31st of March, 1919, to the 1st of March, 1920?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. The total amount of purchases made in the United States for Canadian Government railways during the year commencing April 1, and ending March 31, 1919, was as follows:

537,707 tons of coal, $3,069,561.54; equipment, $401,510; rails, $1,208,791; miscellaneous, $663,268.95.

The above, on account of war conditions, were purchased in the United States as same could not be obtained in Canada,

on account of Canadian manufacturers being engaged on munition work.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. Answered by No. 1.

MACKENZIE AVENUE, OTTAWA.

Mr. CHABOT:

1. Is Mackenzie avenue,, city of Ottawa, owned by the Dominion Government?

2. If so, is it controlled by the Department of Public Works or by the Ottawa Improvement Commission?

3. Who is responsible for the present disgraceful condition of the roadway?

4. Does not the Government think that the time has arrived when Mackenzie avenue should be re-paved by whoever is responsible?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON.

1, 2, 3 and 4. Mackenzie avenue, city of Ottawa, was transferred to corporation of the city of Ottawa by Order in Council of May 21, 1897. The Ottawa Improvement Commission have, however, included this avenue in their driveway scheme and have asked the city for co-operation in the improvements that must necessarily be made. It will be necessary in the first instance to obtain from the city a transfer of the avenue to the commission by lease or otherwise so that the commission may be in a position to enforce their traffic regulations. Owing to the erection by the Government of "Connaught Building," the street was closed until late last year and the commission were unable to effect any improvements. The Improvement Commission, if the means at their disposal will permit, intend commencing work on the avenue during the present fiscal year.

QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSION STEAM DREDGE.

Mr. BOURASSA:

1. Has the Government permitted the Harbour Commission of Quebec to lend or rent their steam dredge to Price Brothers for certain works to be done on their private property at Chicoutimi?

2. Has any demand been made to the Government to this effect?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. No.

2. No.

TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY LUMBER SHIPMENTS.

*Mr. CAHILL:

1. Is the Minister of Railways aware that between Nottaway and LeReine stations, on the Transcontinental railway, there are sixty thousand cords of pulpwood along the railway track awaiting shipment, and that there are in the same district some twenty million feet of lumber also awaiting shipment by rail, and that during the course of the summer it is estimated that sixty million feet will be added to this quantity?

2. Is the minister aware that it will require 6,500 cars to carry this lumber to market, that fifty cars only were supplied during the month of February for the purpose of transporting this pulpwood and lumber?

3. If so, is it the intention of the minister to have the matter investigated and to order additional cars to be sent to those particular places to relieve the situation?

4. If so, when?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. The Canadian Government railways are aware that there is a considerable quantity of pulpwood and lumber to be shipped from stations between Nottaway and LeReine.

2. The records show that 238 cars were loaded between these points during the month of February.

3. The matter is being watched and everything possible is being done to supply the cars required, but a large portion of this material is for points in the United States for which American cars are required, and the railways cannot allow more of their equipment to go there with shipments of this kind and be held there indefinitely, in view of the number of cars that have been previously sent to the other side of the line. Orders have been placed for all the American cars required to take care of this business, through the Railway Association of Canada, with the Car Service Commission of the American Railroad Association at Washington, which is at present handling car distribution for American lines, and have been pressing them to hurry equipment forward. Additional cars have recently been ordered to that territory both from the Canadian Government line and another railway which participates in the haul and should supply cars.

4. Answered by No. 3.

SOULANGES CANAL ROAD.

*Mr. BOYER:

1. Has the Government taken the necessary steps to macadamize the road along the Soulanges canal during the coming season?

2. Were tenders called for last year in this respect? If so, what are the names of the tenderers and the amount of each?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. No.

2. Yes.

Name of Tenderer	Lower Section with asphalt binder.	Lower Section with tar binder.
J. A. Pharand, Montreal..	$ 87,418	$ 88,822
Quinlan & Robertson, Montreal..	93,918	96,024
Leger & Charlton, Montreal	123,110	123,110
The Elder Ebana Co., Ltd., Montreal..	107,892	
Harry L. St. George, Montreal,.	127,156	122,242
J. Kert & Son, Montreal..	251,770	234,220
Phileas Dore, Valleyfield..	119,760	119,760
Theodore Belanger, Valleyfield..	137,040	137,040

SAGUENAY RIVER BUOY LAYING.

Mr. SAVARD:

1. Who is in charge of buoy laying in the Saguenay river?
2. Is the contractor obliged to repair said buoys without extra remuneration?
3. If so, has this always been the custom?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. Epiphan Gagnon, of Tremblay.
2. The contractor must renew or repair at his own expense all wooden buoys in the contract.
3. While the service has been maintained by formal contract the contractor has had to repair or renew at his own charges all wooden buoys, the Department of Marine and Fisheries renewing or repairing the iron or steel buoys belonging to the service.

H. R. ABEY, R.F.C.

Mr. TURGEON:

1. Did H. R. Abey, R.F.C., formerly a prisoner of war in Germany, make application to the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment at Nelson, B.C., for tuition at public expense at McGill University?
2. Was he informed that he was entitled to a year's tuition at $60 per month from the said department?
3. Was his transportation paid from Nelson, B.C., to Montreal?
4. Is it a fact that on his making application to the Montreal office of the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment he was informed that the amount promised him could not be paid?
5. If so, why?
6. If so, is it the Government's intention to investigate this matter in order to establish the responsibility for the mistake made with reference to this soldier?

Mr. HUGH CLARK (Parliamentary Secretary):

1. Yes.
2. Yes. It being represented to the department that he had enlisted under the age of 18 years.
3. Yes, inasmuch as he desired to attend the opening of the term at McGill University and there being insufficient time to obtain his birth certificate from the provincial registry office, he was furnished transportation on the understanding that he enlisted at or under the age of 18 years.
4. Yes.
5. The department is authorized only to provide training for: (a) Ex-members of the forces who, as a result of a war disability, are unable to return to their pre-war occupations; (b) Ex-members of the forces who enlisted under the age of 18 years. Mr. Abey, who is not disabled, made application for training as a "minor," but the birth certificate subsequently produced by him and forwarded to the Montreal office of the department indicated that he had enlisted at the age of 18 years and 9 months. The department therefore, has not the authority to provide training.
6. The matter has already been investigated.

HEBERTVILLE AND ST. JOSEPH D'ALMA MAIL SERVICE.

*Mr. SAVARD:

1. What is the cost of mail carrying between Hébertville and St. Joseph d'Alma?
2. Who is the carrier?
3. When did he sign his contract?
4. How many tenderers were there?
5. What was the amount of the lowest tender?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. $1,017.14 per annum for a frequency of 16 trips per week.
2. L. N. Asselin.
3. 9th March, 1915.
4. 12.
5. The lowest tender received was from M. Jean Cote, at the rate of $365 per annum for a frequency of 7 trips per week. Inquiry elicited the fact that this tenderer was blind and not, therefore, likely to effect the service satisfactorily. The contract was accordingly awarded to L. N. Asselin, whose offer was $445 per annum, was the next lowest received.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INFORMATION.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR:

1. Is there still a Department of Public Information?
2. What has been the total cost of this department from its inception to date?
3. How many employees are at present in this department?
4. What is the total current cost of this department per month?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. The Department of Public Information was discontinued on December 31, last.
2. $200,986.54, which amount includes the costs of the Department in connection with the publishing of the Canadian Daily Re-

cord, and the Canadian Official Record, together with all pamphlets, booklets and other publications printed by the department.

3 and 4. Answered by No. 1.

SALE OF AUTOMOBILE TO Mr. E. RUSSELL.

Mr. PREVOST:

1. Has the automobile (Oldsmobile No. 37), seized for having been smuggled into Canada, and which was to be sold in Montreal on or after the 4th of January, 1920, been sold?
2. If so, by what method was it sold, at what price, and to whom?
3. If not, have certain offers been made, what was the highest, and when will this automobile be sold?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. Yes.

2. By obtaining of tenders which were submitted to department before acceptance $1,500, the highest tender. Mr. E. Russell, Montreal, P.Q.

3. Answered by No. 2.

WAR TAXES.

Mr. PREVOST:

1. What were, during the fiscal year ending March 31, 1919, the different war taxes collected by the Customs under the 7½ per cent special tax?
2. How much did the Department of Inland Revenue collect as aforesaid in stamps on commercial paper, patent medicines, liquor and tobacco?
3. How much did the Postal Department collect as aforesaid in special stamps?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. Customs war tax at 7½ per cent, $40,580,316.12.

2. (a) War Taxes collected in stamps on commercial paper and patent medicines, $1,327,163.33. As the tax may be paid by means of postage stamps as well as Inland Revenue war tax stamps, it is impossible to state with accuracy the amount of tax collected on patent medicines and commercial papers respectively; (b) Liquor duties, $8,461,289.72; (c) Tobacco duties, $21,510,249.45.

3. No special stamps were issued by the Post Office Department but it is estimated that about $6,838,000 revenue was derived from the war tax of one cent each on letters and post cards.

DOMINION REVENUES FROM ALL SOURCES.

Mr. PREVOST:

1. During the fiscal year ending March 31, 1919, what were the State revenues from all sources?
2. From Customs taxation?
3. From the income tax?
4. From the war profits tax?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. $312,946,747.18.

2. $147,169,187.98.

3 and 4. Total War Tax Revenue $56,177,508.33 as follows:

Banks	$1,099,764.44
Trust and Loan Companies	323,340.02
Insurance Companies	546,113.86
Business Profits	32,970,061.81
Income Tax	9,349,719.80
Inland Revenue Department	11,888,508.40

MR. K. H. PALMER.

*Mr. McMASTER:

1. Has the attention of the Government been directed to the March number of English Speaking World, published at New York, in which an advertisement appears for The Society for American and British Friendship, with the following address: "Box 168, The House of Commons, Ottawa. Canadian Commissioner, K. H. Palmer"?
2. Is the K. H. Palmer mentioned in the above advertisement a member of Parliament, or an employee of the House of Commons?
3. If not, by what right does he use Box 168 in the House of Commons, and publicly advertises that as the Canadian address of a business enterprise?
4. Who gave the said K. H. Palmer permission to use the said Box 168 in the House of Commons?
5. Is the said K. H. Palmer the individual who pressed for the investigation of the Jesuit Novitiate at Guelph?
6. Does the said Palmer occupy a room in the House of Commons?
7. If so, by what right?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1. The attention of the Government had not been drawn to this advertisement until, through the courtesy of my hon. friend (Mr. McMaster) it was brought to the attention of the Government in this particular way.

2. K. H. Palmer is neither a member nor employee of the House of Commons.

3. Box 168 is the private box of the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Which one?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes).

4. No permission has been given by the Speaker for the use of the said box to K. H. Palmer.

5. The Government has no certain information as to whether Mr. Palmer is the individual characterized in that question.

6. Mr. Palmer does not occupy a room in the House of Commons.

7. Answered by No. 6.

CHARTERED BANKS—ACTS 1912, C. 3, S. 4, SUB-SEC. 5.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR:

How much has been received by the Government from the Chartered Banks under the pro-

visions of Subsection 5, Section 4, of Chapter 3, of the Acts of 1912?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

(Subsection 5, section 4 of Chapter 5, Acts of 1912.)

Fiscal Year.	
1912-13	$ 45,479 21
1913-14	26,669 80
1914-15	31,132 23
1915-16	40,285 65
1916-17	58,101 03
1917-18	115,220 95
1918-19	81,712 32

IMPERIAL MUNITIONS BOARD—SHIPS.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR:

1. Does the Imperial Munitions Board own any ships?
2. If so, how many, what is the total tonnage and on whose account?
3. Is the Munitions Board still engaged in the building of ships?
4. How many ships have they built and what is the tonnage?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Government has no records of the information asked for in question 141. This is work of the board which was operated by and for the British Government.

NEW FISHERIES TREATY WITH UNITED STATES.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR:

1. Is the announcement to the press, that a new fishing treaty between Canada and the United States is in course of preparation, correct?
2. If so, will Parliament have an opportunity of considering the terms before it is adopted?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. A new treaty resulting from the recommendation of the Canadian-American Fisheries Conference is at present under consideration by the governments of these countries.

2. The usual course will be followed. If a treaty is agreed to it will be submitted to Parliament for approval.

NEW PUBLIC BUILDING, OTTAWA.

Mr. DEMERS:

1. Is it the intention of the Government soon to proceed with the erection of a new building on Wellington street, Ottawa?
2. Have the plans been prepared?
3. If so, by whom?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Not at present.

2 and 3. No.

[Mr. J. H. Sinclair.]

CONSERVATION COMMISSION—PAYMENTS TO MR. A. V. WHITE.

Mr. DEMERS:

1. What remuneration, and what expenses, have been paid to Mr. A. V. White, of Toronto, as consulting engineer to the Conservation Commission?
2. What are the details of such payments?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1. Salary, $6,000 per annum; expenses, about $1,150 per annum.

2. Travel expenses, about $1,000; sundry expenses, about $150.

CONSERVATION COMMISSION — MR. THOMAS ADAMS.

Mr. DEMERS:

1. Is Mr. Thomas Adams at present employed by the Conservation Commission as an engineer?
2. Is he an architect or a town-planner?
3. Is he recognized by any technical organization in Canada?
4. What technical position did he hold before his present appointment?
5. What salary does he receive from the Government, and in what capacity is he employed?
6. Has he been authorized to indulge in private practice, concurrently with his official duties?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1. Yes.

2. He is an expert town planning engineer.

3. Yes.

4. Senior Town Planning Adviser to the British Government.

5. $625 a month during eight months of the current year. Expert town planning adviser.

6. Mr. Adams has not been authorized to engage in private practice during the eight months for which he will receive a salary, but he is at liberty to engage in private practice during the other four months of the year.

AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL POPULATION.

Mr. MANION:

1. How many employees are there in the boot and shoe industry in Canada?
2. How many employees are there in all the manufacturing plants of Canada?
3. What percentage of the population of Canada are dependent upon manufacturing for a living?
4. What proportion of the population of Canada is made up of farmers?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1. There were 13,013 employees in the boot and shoe industry in Canada in 1917

of whom 1,675 were salaried employees and 11,338 wage earners.

2. The total number of employees in the manufacturing plants of Canada in 1917 as at December 15 was 706,456.

3. No information.

4. The census of 1911 showed 933,735, out of a total of 2,723,634 persons gainfully employed, to have been engaged in agriculture. The number of farms in operation in 1911 was 714,646.

Note—In neither case are the families of farmers included excepting farmers' sons giving whole time on farms.

MEDALS FOR WAR SERVICE.

Mr. MANION:

1. Has the Government any information to give to the House as to the medals which are to be given in the late war?
2. If so, what is the intention?
3. Does the Government intend giving any recognition in the form of a medal for service in Canada to those men who did not get overseas?
4. When will a complete announcement be made?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1, 2, 3 and 4. The following medals are awarded for Naval Service during the late war: The 1914 Star granted to those who took part in the operations in France and Belgium between the 5th August, 1914, and midnight 22-23 November, 1914. A clasp to this decoration is awarded to those who have been awarded this Star and who actually served under the fire of the enemy in France and Belgium between the above dates. The 1914 15 Star awarded for service at sea, or on a battle front, between the 4th August, 1914, and 31st December, 1915. Any officers and men eligible for the 1914 Star are not eligible for the 1914-15 Star. The British War Medal for which a minimum of 28 day's mobilized service is required between the 4th August, 1914, and 11th November, 1918, irrespective of where that service was carried out. The Victory Medal or Allies Medal awarded for service at sea or on a battle front between the 4th August, 1914 and 11th November, 1918.

DOMINION QUARANTINE STATION, GROSSE ISLE.

Mr. POWER:

1. How many men are employed at the Dominion Quarantine Station, Grosse Isle, Quebec?
2. Are they supplied with clothing and uniforms by the Government?
3. Have contracts been given out for the supply of uniforms and boots?
4. Were tenders called for in each case?
5. If so, to which tenderer was the contract awarded?
6. What are the names of the other tenderers?
7. At what price was the contract awarded in each case?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. 57 men, 5 women.
2. Yes.
3. Yes.
4. Yes.
5. Cie Paquet, Ltee, Quebec, for uniforms and boots, and Jules Gauvin, Quebec, for uniforms.
6. For uniforms—Fugere, 180 Dorchester street, Quebec; Gardner Clothing Co., 645 St. Valier street, Quebec; Maurice Pollock, 85 St. Joseph street, Quebec; St. Lawrence Clothing Mfg., Co., D. Morgan, Place d'Armes; E. A. Anctil Co., 53 Buade street; Jules Gauvin, Montmagny, Quebec; F. Simard & Cie, Quebec; Syndicat de Quebec, Quebec.

For boots—L'Incroyable, Quebec; P. Turcotte, Quebec; Falardeau & Cie, Quebec; Syndicat de Quebec, Quebec; Au Quincy (Regd), Quebec; Louis Beaubien, Ltd., Quebec; Bertrand & Thibault, Quebec; Onesime Goulet, Quebec; J. B. Drolet, Ltd., Quebec; J. H. Larochelle & Fils, Quebec.

7. For uniforms from Paquet—Officers' uniforms, $50 each; employees' uniforms, $30 each; employees' peajackets, $20 each; white coats, $3.50 each.

For uniforms from Gauvin—Officers' frockcoat uniform, $52.50 each; officers' overcoats, $40 each; flannel shirts, $2.50 each; neckties, $5 a dozen.

For boots from Paquet—Men's leather boots per pair, $8.90; women's, $6.

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT STEAMERS — UNIFORMS.

Mr. POWER:

1. During the year 1919 were the men employed on the Canadian Government steamers "Montcalm" and "Lady Grey" in receipt of uniforms and clothing from the Government?
2. Have contracts been given for the supply of said uniforms and boots?
3. Were tenders called for in each case?
4. If so, to what tenderers were the contracts awarded?
5. What are the names of the other tenderers?
6. At what price was the contract awarded in each case?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. Yes.

2. For uniforms, yes. Boots are not issued by the Department to men employed on Government steamers operated by the Marine Department.

3. Tenders were called for the summer uniforms for the "Montcalm." The winter

uniforms for the "Montcalm" and all the uniforms for the "Lady Grey" were ordered after satisfactory prices were arranged for a suitable quality of material.

4. The summer uniform suits for the "Montcalm" were ordered from Faguy, Lepinay & Frere, Quebec. The summer trousers from H. B. Simard, Quebec, and all the other uniforms from The Christie Clothing Company, Montreal.

5. A. Donati, Faguy, Lepinay & Frere, H. B. Simard, P. E. Gaulin, Syndicat de Quebec, F. A. Anctil & Cie, Theodore Godbout, J. F. Bellevance, Jules Gauvin, F. Simard & Cie, Napoleon Jacques.

6. Summer uniforms for the "Montcalm": Suits, $27.50; trousers, $6.75. Summer uniforms for the "Lady Grey": Chief Officer's suits, $35.00; Petty, $32.00; trousers, $5.00. Winter uniforms for both ships: Suits, $45.00; long overcoats, $44.00; reefer overcoats, $42.00; peajackets, $39.00; trousers, $6.00.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS — TORONTO EASTERN.

Mr. DECHENE:

1. Was the Toronto Eastern railway electric line taken over by the Canadian Government Railway system? If so, when?
2. Under what authority was this line taken over?
3. What are the conditions of its acquisition?
4. What is the revenue, and what are the liabilities of the line?
5. What are its gross revenue, net revenue, and the length of its line?
6. What amount will have to be expended for its completion?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. The Toronto Eastern railway was acquired by the Canadian Northern Railway Company on September 27, 1918.

2. By Order in Council dated September 23, 1918.

3. The conditions were that the Canadian Northern Railway Company would take over the railway at actual cost.

4. This line is not yet in operation. The cost of line was $706,474.04.

5. The length of the line is approximately 30 miles, which has been surveyed and the right of way largely acquired. There are 19.6 miles actually under construction of which 14.5 miles track completed and 5.1 miles graded.

6. It is estimated it will cost $301,240.20 to complete the mileage under construction, including electrification.

[Mr. Ballantyne.]

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS — TORONTO SUBURBAN.

Mr. DECHENE:

1. Did the Canadian Government Railway system acquire the electric line of the Toronto Suburban railway? If so, when?
2. By what authority was this line acquired?
3. What were the conditions of its acquisition?
4. What are the revenue and liabilities of said line?
5. What are its gross and net revenue?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. The Toronto Suburban railway was acquired by the Canadian Northern Railway Company on September 27, 1918.

2. By Order in Council dated September 23, 1918.

3. The conditions were that the Canadian Northern Railway Company would take over the railway at actual cost, which was $3,352,391.90.

4. The gross earnings for 1919 were $394,514; operating expenses, $352,472.29; net earnings, $42,041.71.

5. Answered by No. 4.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. DEMERS:

1. What blue books were published is 1919?
2. What public documents were published in both languages in 1919?
3. What public documents were published in both languages in 1919?
4. What public documents were published in one language only, and in what language were they published?

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR:

What are the details of the expenditure of $1,372,079.82 made in the area covered by both the Antigonish and North Sydney branches of the Department of Public Works during the five years subsequent to January 1, 1912?

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. SAVARD:

For a copy of all correspondence, letters and petitions received from the citizens of the Saguenay district and all others in connection with a subsidy from the Department of Trade and Commerce in order to obtain the services of a steamboat ferry between Ste. Catherine and Tadoussac.

Mr. SAVARD:

For a copy of all correspondence, letters and telegrams in connection with the granting of an allowance by the Post Office Department for a regular ferry service by motor yacht between Ste. Catherine and Tadoussac.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

For a copy of all correspondence, documents and records, including the evidence and judgments in connection with the trials held by Field General Court Martial of the 259th, of

the Canadian Expeditionary Force in Siberia, on the following riflemen, sentenced on the 28th of January, 1919; Alfred Laplante, O. Boisvert, Edmond Leroux, Joseph Guenard, E. Pauze and Arthur Roy.

EXPERIMENTAL FARM SYSTEM.

MOTION BY MR. SUTHERLAND THAT THE SYSTEM BE EXTENDED IN ONTARIO.

Mr. DONALD SUTHERLAND (South Oxford) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient that a more general, equitable and uniform system of Experimental Farms and sub-stations should be established throughout Canada, and that the wholly inadequate and disproportionate number given the Province of Ontario in the system shall be dealt with and provided for at the present Session of Parliament.

He said: Mr. Speaker,, in asking the House to approve of this resolution it is only right that some evidence should be advanced in support of it and, in that respect, I would like to touch upon some features connected with agricultural experimental work in Canada that may not be new to the House. There is nothing indefinite or ambiguous about the resolution. If the allegations contained therein are correct then I think the request is so reasonable that this House will have no hesitation in granting it.

I do not want to be understood as disapproving of the experimental farm system. On the contrary, I believe that there never was a time in the history of this country when research work was so necessary as at present in connection with the agricultural industry, as well as the application of that research work, in order to overcome some of the difficulties with which we now have to contend. This resolution points to what I consider to be a very great injustice to one of the old provinces which entered the Confederation now forming the Dominion of Canada.

It needs no argument to convince the House that a great deal of work must be done in new provinces which the provinces themselves are not in a position to do; and those who were responsible for the consummation of the Confederation of Canada, realizing this important fact, very wisely made due allowance for educational work along agricultural lines both by the provincial and by the federal governments. This matter was taken up on numerous occasions before a final and definite understanding was arrived at, by which both federal and provincial governments have the right to carry on educational work of an educational and experimental nature. In 1886 the first system of experimental farms was established in Canada, and the central farm at Ottawa was intended to serve the purposes of the whole of Canada as well as the provinces of Quebec and Ontario, with the director of the system located there. There were four other farms in addition to this, namely, one at Nappan, in Nova Scotia, for that province and the province of New Brunswick; one at Brandon for the province of Manitoba; one at Indian Head, which is now in Saskatchewan; and one at Agassiz, in British Columbia. These have from time to time been added to by other farms and sub-stations, until at the present time there are twenty-four farms, six sub-stations and forty demonstration stations throughout the Dominion of Canada. The work in the newer provinces has spread very rapidly, and there have undoubtedly been good results from the operation of the system. I have taken this matter up at almost every session since I have been a member of the House of Commons, and to show that the question, so far as the apparent injustice to Ontario of the matter is concerned, is not by any means a new one, I may quote a few paragraphs from Hansard of previous years. In 1912, when the agricultural estimates were before the House, I asked this question of the minister:

Are there any experimental farms being established in Ontario?

The minister replied:

We have not been doing any experimental farm work there for the reason that the Ontario Government have been covering that field themselves. What may be done in future I cannot say, but we hope to go into that matter with the various provinces.

I may say, in passing, that at that time the province of Ontario was compelled to build its own colonization railways without any subsidy from the Dominion Government, and the matter was before Parliament at that session. I referred to the subject, and the question of experimental farms, in these terms:

It is another instance, I presume, of Ontario being compelled to do work of this nature themselves without assistance from the Federal Government, and at the same time assist in maintaining a similar status in the other provinces. I would like the Government to consider the advisability of establishing experimental stations in Northern Ontario, also one in Western Ontario.

Nothing was done. In the session of 1914 when the estimate for the experimental farms were being passed, I said:

When you consider the large amount compared with former years that is being spent for experimental purposes and realize that

there are only forty acres and a very trifling expenditure devoted to experimental purposes in the province of Ontario you will come to the conclusion that some change must be made in this respect, and made in the near future.

Nothing, however, was done. In the following year I again brought the matter up on the Estimates:

Session after session I have taken this matter up and have urged upon the Government the necessity of doing justice to the province of Ontario in this respect. I am glad to say that since the last session the Minister of Agriculture has made arrangements to establish a demonstration farm in northern Ontario.

The minister made the following reply:

I desire to say just a word in answer to the remarks of my hon. friend from Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) and the remark of my hon. friend from Muskoka as to these farms in the work of the Agricultural Department generally. I hope that the hon. members understand that there is no east or no west in what we are doing. I happen to be a western man myself, my home being much further west than that of my hon. friend from Moosejaw or the other hon. gentlemen who have spoken. I was also an Ontario man. I think that everybody in this House will agree that what has been done for agriculture should be done so far as possible equitably throughout the country. It is true we are making this initial step in demonstration work in southern Saskatchewan and southern Alberta, but that does not mean that northern Alberta, northern Saskatchewan, Ontario and other parts will be left out. As the work develops and when the opportunities warrant, I shall be glad to keep in mind what my hon. friends have said.

The method I have adopted this session is somewhat different from that which I have pursued in the past. I have moved a resolution which, in view of the situation that confronts the country to-day, obviously proves the urgent necessity for immediate action on the part of the Government in this matter. Let me point out that there were at the outset five farms in the system and while the central farm at Ottawa was supposed to take care of the two provinces of Quebec and Ontario, the work has been extended considerably since that time. As I have said, there are now twenty-four farms and six sub-stations in the system, and forty demonstration stations, and not one of these stations are in the province of Ontario. The work of the central farm at Ottawa is just as much applicable to the province of Quebec as it is to Ontario; for that matter, it applies to all the other provinces. We have in western Ontario, it is true, a small demonstration station, comprising an area of forty-nine acres devoted to the growing of tobacco; and six hundred miles to the north of that farm there is another demonstration farm where the interned prisoners have been employed in clearing land during the past two or three years. This farm will serve a very useful purpose in that northern country, but it by no means represents the agricultural industry of the old settled portion of southern Ontario. The farm at Harrow in the county of Essex is five hundred miles southwest of the farm at Ottawa, and I mention this distance to show the great difference that must exist between that part of the province and eastern Ontario. I may call the attention of hon. members to the products of the province of Ontario and the place which that province occupies in supplying the necessaries of life.

According to the last census of Canada, the population of the Dominion was 7,206,643, of which the province of Ontario had 2,523,274, or a little over 35 per cent of the total. The Bureau of Statistics for the year 1918, the latest available, gives the field crop of Canada for that year as $1,367,909,970, of which Ontario produced $384,013,900, or a little over 28 per cent of the total field crop of Canada. The livestock of Canada were valued at very nearly the same amount as the field crop for that year, being $1,326,766,000, of which Ontario had $369,111,000, or 28.80 per cent of the total for Canada.

With respect to some of the tender fruits —fruits not grown on any large scale at any of the experimental farms, although they are to a small extent on some of the farms in British Columbia—in which certain sections of Ontario specialize in and produce immense quantities of, I would like to point out that according to the census statistics 99.7 per cent of the total grape crop of Canada is grown in the province of Ontario. Without any assistance whatever from the federal experimental farms, but with the aid of the Provincial Government, this production has been developed by the people of the province of Ontario. Then, too, over 90 per cent of the total crop of peaches grown in Canada is produced in the province of Ontario. Of strawberries 70 per cent, of apples 60 per cent; and 99.8 per cent of the total crop of red clover seed grown in the Dominion is yielded by the province of Ontario. This production of clover seed in itself would justify something being done in view of the fact that at the present time the farmers are paying from $46 to $48 per bushel for seed with which to seed their land this spring, a condition of affairs that demands the attention of the Government and of those who are conducting the experimental farms of Canada, because it is a fact well known to every one

engaged in agriculture that without growing clover you cannot carry on agricultural operations for any considerable length of time except at an enormous expenditure for fertilizers. There is nothing to equal, and certainly there is nothing as cheap, as clover for maintaining fertility of soil and enriching impoverished land. Yet with respect to that production of 99.8 per cent of clover seed in Ontario, apparently the work is not being developed in Western Ontario by the aid of experimental farms. Again 42½ per cent of the tobacco grown in Canada and 85 per cent of the corn produced comes from the province of Ontario. Now, some one may say that that province is doing this work itself, and that the Provincial Government has been helping greatly along those lines. I grant that, but while it is the case, as far as Ontario is concerned I have never yet heard of any one from that province who took the slightest exception to a generous expenditure for experimental work in the newer provinces of Canada. There is not, nor has there been, any desire on the part of the people of Ontario to in any way curtail such expenditure as would assist in developing and opening up the newer parts of the country. I do not like to make comparisons, but some times it is necessary in order to illustrate the point that one may have in view. The provinces of Ontario and Quebec are contiguous to each other. They contain immense areas of rich and fertile agricultural lands and the conditions in that respect are so similar that it is no wonder that when the Central Experimental Farm was established here in 1886 that farm was deemed sufficient to meet the requirements of both provinces. It is quite true that previous to that time some experimental work had been done in the province of Ontario. The Hon. John Carling, afterwards Sir John Carling, who was Commissioner of Agriculture in the Government of Ontario, in 1874 established the present Agricultural College and Experimental Farm at the city of Guelph. Later on he was Minister of Agriculture in the Federal Government, when the original system of experimental farms were established in Canada. But while we now have these farms, and practically all the provinces have their own agricultural colleges, and experimental farms in connection therewith, the situation at present is so entirely different from what it was at that time that I think I am justified in calling your attention to the fact that Ontario does more than meet the demands of the other provinces for assistance by the Department of Agriculture in that practically one-half of the customs revenue of Canada is paid by the people of Ontario, or 48.92 per cent. Yet she has to undertake and pay for the experimental work done in the province, besides bearing one-half the expense of the work of the other provinces. I have already pointed out that in addition to the Central Experimental Farm at Ottawa a tobacco growing station has been established in the county of Essex, and there is also a demonstration station at Kapuskasing, where alien prisoners were interned during the war and towards whose maintenance and payment a considerable portion of the expenditure for Ontario is attributed. But the two stations referred to do not in any sense meet the needs of the great agricultural industry in old Ontario, because tobacco can hardly be considered as one of the necessaries so essential towards answering the requirements of the people under the high cost of living at the present time. Let me point out that in the province of Quebec, in addition to thirteen demonstration farms, there are six experimental farms. In Manitoba there are two, in Saskatchewan three, in Alberta two, in British Columbia four, in Nova Scotia two, in New Brunswick one, in Prince Edward Island one, and finally there is the Central Experimental Farm in this city, which contributes to the demands of the Dominion as a whole.

I might remind the House that a very generous amount has been voted from year to year for the upkeep of these farms. According to the last public accounts I find that the total cost of our Experimental Farms for the year 1918-19 was $1,024,319. The cost of farms in the province of Ontario, excluding the Central at Ottawa, including the clearing of the land at Kapuskasing, was $47,968. In the adjoining province of Quebec, where conditions are very similar the cost was $177,624. I would like the House to note the difference in respect to the amounts spent in those two old provinces where it is fair to make a comparison.

An Experimental Farm system to be effective must be able to demonstrate that agriculture can be carried on at a profit; if it cannot there must be something radically wrong. I do not contend for a moment that a farm system conducted for purely experimental purposes should be expected to show a profit; but I do contend that where you have large farms, such as we have in connection with this system, run-

ning from 400 to 1,000 acres, that they should be considered as being conducted on a commercial basis, and under such conditions if they cannot demonstrate what they were founded to inculcate in the minds of the people, namely, the cost of production profit or loss of the undertaking, then I say those farms have failed to function as they were intended to by those who established them.

The cost of our Experimental Farms has been increasing very rapidly during the last few years, labour being one of the principal items of increase. I want to call the attention of the House to the wages paid for labourers on these twenty-four farms—which does not include the forty demonstration stations scattered throughout the country—representing a total acreage of 11,270—quite a considerable area when we recall that food was so essential during the war years. The total amount paid out for farm labour on these farms during the year 1918 amounted to no less than $452,388.58, which does not include the remuneration of the permanent staff—the professors and foremen who were doing experimental work. The amount expended for form labour on the Central Experimental Farm here of 467 acres amounted to $120,525. I have already pointed out that $18,008 was paid out in the province of Ontario Farms for farm labour, and $71,471 in the province of Quebec in connection with the 2,397 acres devoted to experimental work in that province; in Manitoba $21,383; Saskatchewan, $36,000; Alberta, $30,000; British Columbia, $52,000; Nova Scotia, $39,000; New Brunswick, $23,000; Prince Edward Island, $39,000, or a total of $452,388. The salaries under Civil Government of the Department of Agriculture at Ottawa, including those employed on these farms represents a further sum of $598,433.

Against this expenditure I might point out that the revenue from those farms totalling 11,270 acres amounting to only $102,607.44. It may be urged that a great deal of this work was devoted to experimental purposes. I grant that is so, but there is altogether too wide a margin between the heavy expenditure for farm labour and the small revenue received during the most critical year of the war for it to be passed over lightly. 11.270 acres with a staff of workmen such as apparently was never employed even during times of peace, should certainly show a better return. In my opinion the returns were altogether inadequate compared with the amount of money expended for labour on those farms.

[Mr. Sutherland.]

I want to say with all the force of which I am capable that I believe there is something radically wrong in connection with the whole system as it is being conducted. I believe we have gotten away from the idea which animated those who established these farms, and in my opinion a frank discussion of the situation will bring about beneficial results. It is not a pleasant task for any one to criticize, but I have paid very close attention to this matter for many years and I am forced to the conclusion that the present Experimental Farm system instead of giving a lead to the farmers of this country more often are simply endeavouring to copy methods which have been initiated by our most practical and energetic farmers.

I have already pointed out that the field crop of the Dominion for the year under consideration amounted to $1,367,909,970, and that the value of our live stock industry was about the same figure. I have always believed that the people of a country that exports its raw materials are bound to be hewers of wood and drawers of water. Our exports should be the finished product, and I have not been one of those who have been lamenting the fact that Great Britain, in order to protect her home industry, has debarred the cattle of Canada from entering her markets as feeders. It is in the public interest and in the interest of agriculture that stock of that class should be finished on the hoof in this country before it is sent to the markets of the Old Country, as much as possible of our live stock should be finished at home. I, for one, was delighted to find that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne), who is not in his seat, had been so successful in adopting a system of shipbuilding in this country, by which system we would be enabled to carry and take care of the exports of Canada. On a previous occasion I pointed out that I thought it would be in the interest of Canada if we had some such system as that so that we could give a preference to shipments of flour over shipments of wheat. As wheat is a convenient ballast, it is being carried by shipping companies at a much lower rate than flour. With a Government-owned system, we could reverse the procedure in that regard, and we would not be confronted with the difficulty which we are experiencing just now, namely that the millers have on hand an abundance of flour for which they can get no sale at a price in proportion to that which they have paid for wheat, and that, consequently, it has been absolutely impossible for Canadian stock raisers to procure the mill feeds which

are so essential for the finishing of live stock, an industry the immensity of which I have shown by quoting the value of live stock in this country at the present time. This is a matter on which our experimental farms should be able to supply evidence, and they should be able to show conclusively the values of some of the by-products.

I am referring to this more particularly for the reason that some time ago the Government and Parliament turned loose on this country fully armed and equipped what might be fittingly termed as commercial highwaymen rather than by the name under which they have gone. One of the first things they did was to make an attack on those who were endeavouring to carry on in Ontario, and they confined their operations to that province. I refer to the Board of Commerce, so-called, because if there ever was a body of men who were less entitled to be called a Board of Commerce, I do not know where you could find them; they are commerce smashers in every sense of the word. Our experimental farm system has not been able to furnish evidence as to the cost of producing the articles upon which the Board of Commerce were endeavouring to fix prices, and I believe the result will be that inside of six months Government statistics will show that the bacon and pork industry of this country has been reduced by one-third, such result being largely attributable to the rulings of that board. Further, I believe that the dairying industry of this country has been crippled to an enormous extent as the result of one of the first acts of that board. Our experimental farms to which I have been referring should have been in a position to show the cost of producing milk and bacon in this country under present conditions, because we all know that conditions in connection with the feeding of live stock in Canada have not been normal for some time on account of the high cost of feed. But the situation is even worse than that. Some hon. members may have noticed certain questions which I placed on the Order Paper during the past few weeks with reference to millfeed and the by-products of wheat, one question with regard to what is called standard stock feed being answered the other day. The Government have entered into an arrangement with the elevator companies by which the Government purchase their recleaned screenings and, with the approval of those engaged in carrying on experimental work in this country, send them broadcast throughout Canada. This stuff, which has been sent broadcast, unground, is composed of over 10 per cent of the most dangerous noxious weeds of which it is possible to imagine. It is true that it has been stated in the press that the farmers should see that this stuff is ground before it is fed, on account of the danger of the spread of noxious weeds. These are some of the things in regard to which our demonstration or experimental farm system has utterly failed. There should be a stirring up, and I am sure that the present Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie), who understands so well and is so deeply interested in the live stock industry in this country, will see that steps are taken to remedy some of the abuses that have crept in. But it is quite apparent to any one and every one who drives through any of the old settled districts, yes, and unfortunately the new ones, when the weeds are in bloom, that only a comparatively very small proportion of the farms of Canada are to-day free from noxious weeds. This may seem a trifling matter to some people, and some may wonder why the farmers are leaving the farms and flocking to the cities as they have been doing. This condition is not confined to Canada or to any particular province; it has been a world-wide development of many years growth and I believe that the experimental farms can do a great deal to inform the people of Canada with regard to better methods, and assist in overcoming some of the difficulties and prejudices with which we are now confronted. It is a serious situation when you find that the descendants of the old stock which settled and developed this country are, in many instances, not to be found in the localities with which they were at one time so closely identified, there is a possible danger of our farms being occupied by people who are not of so high a standard as those who occupied them in the past, this would be a most unfortunate condition of affairs. When you allow your mind to review the situation, and when you see the numbers of young men who have been brought up to man's estate on the farms of Canada, who have gone to the towns and cities and entered into professional or business life, you can readily understand that they are a credit to the people who brought them up and to rural life. I for one would not discourage any young man from going from the farm to the city if it is in his interest to do so. I think it is one of the finest things that can possibly be imagined, that

we have in this country conditions which enable boys from the farms to go into the towns and cities and make the headway which they can do and have made there without having to go to some foreign country for the opportunities which our large cities and towns offer at the present time.

As to agricultural possibilities of the old settled portions of Ontario not served by experimental farm systems about 300 miles southwest of Ottawa you come to a district, sometimes termed an island, almost surrounded by the greates bodies of fresh water to be found in the world. Draw a line from the Georgian Bay to about Cobourg and you have west of that line a section of country that will compare favourably, I believe, with any similar stretch of country to be found in the world. For the sake of illustration take the county of Oxford, with which I am familiar, as my hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) will substantiate. Agricultural conditions there are a little different from the conditions in a good many other counties. The factory output of dairy products for the whole of Canada for the year 1918 was valued at $93,879,326. In the county of Oxford, which in area is one of the smallest counties of Ontario, comprising less than half a million acres,—489,310 acres, to be exact—the value of the factory output for that year was $4,800,000, or almost equal to the entire output of Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and British Columbia, with a combined area of 260,769,000 acres. These figures indicate what can be accomplished in a small area where scientific methods are followed. In the past year the output for Oxford County exceeded $5,000,000. A very, very large proportion of the factory output came from the constituency I have the honour to represent, because the farmers there do not go in for the finishing of beef animals to the extent that that is done in the north riding of the county. This, Mr. Speaker, is one of the industries that was so very materially affected by the Board of Commerce in its first move, namely, fixing the price of milk, which applied only to the province of Ontario.

It might be asked why it is not possible for demonstrations to be made as to cost at the provincial experimental farm and the Agricultural College. This has already been done, and it was after these authorities had brought to the notice of the Board and emphasized the fact, that milk could not be produced at the price the board fixed, that the price was very materially increased. Notwithstanding that increase I contend that there should be some uniform system in this country in connection with Dominion work covering the whole of Canada, so that no province would be discriminated against. I have several reasons for making that statement, in addition to the one to which I have referred in connection with the Board of Commerce. I must say that there have been other things done by the present Government which have reacted against some of the industries of the province of Ontario to a greater extent than some people realize. If you had seen, as I have seen, cheese factories closed by the dozens all over that part of the province where cheese making was once a flourishing industry, and where the first cheese factory in Canada was established, when you learn that in the surrounding district there is scarcely a cheese factory to be found to-day, and that many farmers are purchasing their butter, you will realize that when I took exception in this House to certain things that were done a year and two years ago, it was not the people of the constituency I represent I had in mind at all. I refer to the permission that was granted to the packing companies of this country to mix butter with oleomargarine and put it on the market in Canada. I did not object to them manufacturing oleomargarine, but I did object, and do object now, and will continue to object, to giving these companies the right to mix butter with any other product and place it on the market in this country. Yet there is no protest or evidence as to the cost of producing butter from any of the experimental farms in connection with this matter. There was also an embargo placed on the export of some products which affected the county from which I come to a very marked degree, but I am happy to say the embargo is not now in existence. I believe that if there had been a proper understanding as to the cost of production in this country, no such embargoes would have been placed on the products of the farm.

There is another question that is going to be of very great importance in the near future, and that is immigration. I believe that the prospects for immigration in this country were never brighter than at the present time, and while I would advise caution in regard to the classes of immigrants allowed to come to this country and become Canadian citizens, I would offer every inducement to good, honest, upright, industrious people to come and settle on the broad acres of Canada. Of what do the natural resources of this country consist?

In the first place we have the agricultural domain. Next we have our great forests, then our mines, and our fisheries. I doubt if ever there was a people of our numbers who had so great a heritage left to them as we have. Is it any wonder, in view of such a heritage, that our young men did not hesitate for a moment to cross the ocean in defence of our rights in order that we might be enabled to live in this country under the conditions which we experience to-day? It is true that we have an enormous debt hanging over us, but when we recall some of the dangers through which we have passed we should be cheerful at least at the prospect we have of working out our own salvation under the natural advantages this country offers. I would ask the Government in dealing with this question not to lose sight of the fact that it must be from the four resources to which I I have referred that we shall derive our greatest revenue. As we develop these resources we shall be enabled to meet the obligations which we have to discharge. I am sorry that the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) is not in his seat, because I would like him to note what I say in this connection. The Government will be inclined to pare down expenditures as closely as possible, and they are justified in doing so. I think that every department of government should be revised, and where there is any inefficiency steps should be taken to provide a proper remedy. This is an opportune time for the Government to set about reorganizing its various departments with a view to seeing that there is no overlapping and that good business methods are adopted. In this way our expenditures would be very greatly reduced. I would caution the Government against any action that might hamper or in any way retard the development of these great natural resources to which I have referred. There is something pathetic about the situation at the present time in Ontario. I happen to know conditions in that province better than elsewhere, and I can assure this House that it is absolutely impossible to secure help on the farms in that province. As a result of this unfortunate condition the farmers, though they are prepared to carry on as well as they possibly can, will not be able to produce to the maximum. They will necessarily have to let a great deal of work go by the board which they carried on during the war when they were endeavouring to meet the stringent necessities that existed at that critical time. The crisis has now passed, however, and the same urgency does not exist to-day, and you will find that conditions will be very difficult during the next year or two unless we have an enormous amount of farm labour coming into the country.

I do not intend to devote much more time to this question. I have no doubt that the need for economy will be one of the arguments that will be advanced in order to put off action at the present time, but I would suggest that the whole experimental farm system of Canada should be thoroughly revised, and where there is any inefficiency a radical remedy should be applied and capable men put in the places of those who are unable to discharge their duties satisfactorily. I would see that the commercial end of these farms receive more attention and that large tracts of land that are under the control of the experimental farms should be used to demonstrate that the methods advocated can be carried on at a profit. I think it is of the utmost importance that we should have a clear, definite statement with regard to the operation of these farms. There is no reason why one hundred or two hundred acres should not be set aside and each farm used as a means of demonstrating to the people what can be done and whether at a profit or loss. There is no one so foolish as to waste a lifetime in any business which is incapable of returning adequate profit, and there should be demonstrations to show the people exactly what can be done on these farms. I would go further than that and would change the present method of the annual reports of these farms. At present there is a small pamphlet which does not give any adequate conception of what is being done on these farms. A few years ago the volume published in connection with the experimental farm system of Canada was at least half a dozen times larger than that which is now published. I should like to call to the attention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), particularly, a monthly bulletin of agricultural statistics which has been published for a number of years past by the Department of Trade and Commerce. It will be found that the statistics are largely compiled from reports received from the different experimental farms in Canada. In some provinces you will see that there are some half a dozen experimental stations, in connection with which reports are published and sent broadcast throughout the country. Herein lies another piece of injustice to the province of Ontario, for there are no reports published in this bulle-

tin of agricultural statistics in connection with the work that is being done in that province outside of the Central Farm at Ottawa. There is another pamphlet published monthly by the Department of Agriculture, a pamphlet that will be found on the desks in practically all the banks and public places throughout Ontario, and, I presume, throughout the other provinces of the Dominion. On its face there is a map of Canada showing the location of the experimental farms and demonstration stations throughout Canada, and the only point indicated in the province of Ontario is the small tobacco station in the county of Essex, the station at Kapuskasing, 600 miles to the north, and the Central Experimental Farm in the extreme east of the province. And yet this pamphlet is headed with the names of the Minister of Agriculture and the Director of the farms. I have in my hand the issue of November, 1919, and the following statement appears on its cover:

> In the above outlined map note the location of experimental farms and stations. The superintendent of the experimental farm or station nearest to you will be pleased to give you any information in his power. Why not communicate with him?

Just imagine! I should like to know with whom the people who are growing grapes, peaches and other fruits to which I have referred, in Western Ontario, are going to communicate—with the director of the tobacco-growing station at Harrow, or the director of the experimental station six hundred miles further north at Kapuskasing where such fruits are not grown? This is a fair illustration of the injustice that is being done to the province of Ontario in this respect. When this farm was established at Kapuskasing one was also established at Spirit lake, a short distance away in the province of Quebec. One station, apparently, would not do up in that northern country where conditions were the same in both provinces. No; Quebec had to have a farm also at that point. But in addition to this, you will find that Quebec, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick are dotted with these experimental farms.

Now, we cannot close our eyes to the fact that to any prospective immigrant one of the chief considerations is the possibility of his becoming the owner of some land on which he will be able to make a home for himself and thereby have a feeling of independence which it was impossible for him to have in his native country. He will naturally go to the Canadian Government agents overseas, and to the booking agents, who will have stacks of literature supplied by the Dominion Government giving just such information with regard to our agricultural resources as persons emigrating are anxious to obtain. Well, immigrants will look at this map and will look among the Great Lakes of Western Ontario, and will inevitably come to the conclusion that in Ontario there is nothing but waste land, a veritable desert, where the only oasis is Harrow devoted to the culture of tobacco. These reports undoubtedly have a great influence on the minds of prospective immigrants, for I know the truth of this statement by actual experience. I had something to do with the supplying of literature to prospective immigrants a few years ago, and I know that the reports contained in these pamphlets and bulletins are precisely the kind of information they inquire after; and if the province of Ontario is to be precluded from any possibility of even a fair show so far as obtaining immigrants is concerned, then let us be frank and say so at once.

As to the prospective immigrant, for many years when immigrants were coming into this country Ontario was very badly handicapped, in addition to the absence of this literature to which I have referred, by reason of the fact that we had been discriminated against by the federal Government. I am referring to what took place previous to 1911. So much was this the case that Ontario had to enter into immigration work itself; it had to open an office in Great Britain, send its own agents over there, and the Government at Ottawa refused booking agents the usual bonus of $5 when booking immigrants who were sent to the Provincial Government for farm work. People ask the question: "How is it that the agricultural population of all Ontario has fallen off as it has?" It is a surprise to me, in face of what we have had to contend with, that we have there the population that we have to-day. I maintain that this matter ought to be attended to at the present session of Parliament. You may say: We will endeavour to do something a little later on. I am getting tired of being put off in that way. The Government has been altogether too procrastinating in that respect in the years that have passed. I regret that the hon. Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) is not in his place, because I am firmly convinced that there is no other source of revenue that will respond so generously to well directed

efforts along the lines to which I have referred as the province of Ontario. But give her a fair show.

Hon. S. F. TOLMIE (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of pleasure to the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) speaking on the question of experimental farms. I am very glad indeed that he has brought this important matter to the attention of the House. I quite agree with him when he says that there is no possible line along which, under present conditions, this country can expend money with such safety as agriculture.

There seems to be a great deal of misapprehension in some quarters concerning the work of the experimental farms and the great service that they are rendering to this country. In the efforts of those engaged in experimental work upon the farms, they aim to increase quantity in the productions of the soil, to improve quality, to reduce all obstructions to production, to count the cost of production, to minimize loss and increase returns by the employment of better methods. To accomplish this the work on the farms is divided into research, investigation, illustration, assistance, prevention, propaganda and administration. These various branches of course have to work interdependently, one line very much with the other, to accomplish the best results. In research work we find that our plant men at the experimental farms have been able to provide for the agriculturists of this country many new and valuable varieties of grains. They have also done a great deal in discovering diseases affecting plants. They have introduced better farming methods, all of which have resulted in enormous gains to the country.

Take the case of Marquis wheat. Sometimes we hear this laughed at, and it is said that when anybody criticizes the Experimental Farms we always point to Marquis wheat. If we do point to Marquis wheat we are pointing to something that we may well be proud of. In five years it is estimated that Marquis wheat has increased the yield at the rate of over $20,000,000 per year in the three Prairie Provinces alone. This wheat developed at our Experimental Farms is an improvement on the old varieties because it possesses a shorter and stiffer straw and yields from 4 to 6 bushels per acre more than do such varieties as Red Fife.

Mr. BURNHAM: Has the minister entered into the production of a new wheat which is going to double the quantity produced by the variety that he refers to.

Mr. TOLMIE: Is the hon. gentleman referring to Marquis wheat?

Mr. BURNHAM: No, but to a new wheat.

Mr. TOLMIE: Our Experimental Farms are investigating a number of new varieties of wheat. They are keeping in very close touch with that work and as developments occur they will give them to the public. In addition to the Marquise they have developed the Preston, Stanley, and Huron varieties of wheat. It is estimated that these have increased the yields of other provinces to the value of half a million dollars. They have also placed on the market the Daubenay, Victoria, and Banner oats. It is estimated after a careful calculation that these varieties have increased the yields by $9,000,000 per year. They have produced many varieties of new barley, flax, peas, and other grains which have increased the yields to the extent of $3,000,000 a year. Among the new varieties being investigated are Ruby wheat, and Liberty oats, which will also add many millions of dollars to the value of the yields of these crops as soon as the quantities secured are sufficient to enable these varieties to be grown in a commercial way.

The orchard and gardening sections of the Experimental Farms have also rendered very valuable service. They have produced the Melba apple, Early Malcolm corn and Alacrity tomato, all of which are now being grown for the market. They are investigating the production of hardy varities of fruit for the prairie sections of the country. In forage crops they have attained some signal successes such as the production of a perennial variety of clover. Perhaps nobody will realize to a greater extent than the hon. member for South Oxford how valuable it is to have a perennial variety of clover as distinguished from one which is only annual or biennial.

In the division of chemistry, we are carrying on a very valuable work in testing soils as to their productivity and also research work showing the value of clover, alfalfa and other leguminous crops with reference to their ability to extract nitrogen from the air and convey it to the soil. As was pointed out by the hon. member (Mr. Sutherland) it is only by the use of leguminous crops that we can hope very largely to maintain the fertility of our soil. I want to emphasize the importance of the work of

the men on the farms who are aiming to conserve the fertility of our farm lands not only for the benefit of this generation but as well for the benfit of the generations to come. We are also in the Chemical Branch carrying on investigations as to the effect of fertilizers. Cultivation, and the conservation of moisture in the soil. Hon. gentlemen know how important this particular line of investigation is, especially in Western Canada where the summers are short and dry, and where it is necessary to conserve every possible bit of moisture to produce a crop.

Live stock and plant diseases are also receiving careful attention. We have the Health of Animals Branch investigating live stock diseases; and we also have the Division of Botany and Entomological Branch. A few years ago we had in Alberta a disease amongst horses known as dourine which caused a loss of hundreds of thousands of dollars a year. Due to the efforts of Dr. Watson and the investigations which he carried on near Lethbridge, Alberta, this disease has been now practically eradicated.

It is estimated that the preventive measures used for the eradication of smut in our grains has brought to us a saving of no less than $16,000,000 per year.

The work that has been done in the control of potato diseases and also in seed selection, represents another $16,000,000 gain.

In the Seed Branch we have discovered methods for the removal of the injurious seeds in what is known as screenings, or the waste from the elevators, and this when ground finely becomes most excellent stock feed.

The annual loss to field crops in this country, due to insect pests, is estimated at no less than $125,000,000, but thanks to the efforts of the Entomological Branch this has been reduced to a very great extent. I might say that in Saskatchewan we have been investigating for a year or two the depredations of the grasshopper. Two varieties manifest themselves in that province, one that winters in the ground and the other whose eggs winter in the ground but do not hatch out until the month of May. A good deal of alarm was recently created in that province owing to the fact that some grasshoppers were appearing but this proved to be the harmless variety that is carried over during the winter. The other variety will be hatched in May and our men are on the ground prepared to combat these pests to the very best of their ability. In this particular, the experimental farms have carried on a very valuable work in looking up and inquiring into the use of insecticides and other remedies for combating these pests.

The experimental farms have done a great deal also in encouraging the rotation of crops in Canadian agriculture. It is estimated that the adoption of this method alone is bringing into Canada a revenue of $32,000,000 per year. The experimental farms were among the first to urge the adoption of summer-fallowing on the prairies and hon. gentlemen from that section of the West will recognize the great value of this method in the cultivation of the soil of our western plains.

Taking it on the whole, the work of our experimental farms and the information they have disseminated among the agriculturalists of this country have practically revolutionized farming in Canada. They have demonstrated the value of improved stock; the wisdom of using pure bred sires; the effect of cross breeding different breeds one with another; better housing conditions on the farm. They have also taken up experiments in connection with steer feeding, so that any one intending to take up that line of work can, either by visiting the farms, or by communicating with the officials, secure most valuable information.

The experimental farms are moreover, dealing with different methods for minimizing the high cost of labour, such as experiments with milking machines and dairy utensils of modern pattern, and they have done some very valuable work in connection with self-feeders for hogs. They have likewise stimulated the keeping of dairy records and the testing of milk. This is a most important work for the reason that very few farmers who do not keep records can tell exactly which is the best cow they have in their herd. They will pick out some nice little red cow which keeps in good flesh but when her milk is weighed and tested for butter fat she is shown to be almost the poorest cow in the herd. The work of keeping dairy records and milk testing is going on all over the country with a view to eliminating the scrubs from the herds and retaining only the very best animals.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I might say that the system of keeping a record of the production of dairy cows originated with the late E. V. Tilson, of Tilsonburg, who had a herd of some sixty-five dairy cows, mostly of Holstein grades, and who brought his average production up to somewhere in the neighbourhood of 12,000 pounds per cow. One cow alone produced about 24,000 pounds and this was such an evidence of the value of

keeping records that the system was adopted by all experimental farms and agricultural colleges. The late E. V. Tilson was the man who demonstrated most successfully the value of that work in the first instance.

Mr. TOLMIE: I wish to thank the hon. gentleman for this information. I did not know that the system had originated in Ontario. My first information with respect to the testing of cows had reference to the work carried on in Denmark and in Wisconsin and some of the other states in the South.

In regard to poultry we are carrying on some research work with very excellent results, such as different methods for incubation and different kinds of incubators for hatching eggs. We have one incubator out at the Farm now with a capacity of 10,000 eggs. Work is likewise being carried on with respect to brooding machines and the better housing of poultry. Work is in operation there that any one can benefit by, where the various kinds of poultry houses are found to be in use and their operations so explained that any one interested in poultry can derive the very fullest information. You will be surprised, Mr. Speaker, to know that poultry diseases are responsible for a loss in this country of some seven and a half million dollars per year. We have a man investigating along these lines at the present time and we are hoping to give him an assistant before very long. In addition to increasing our yield both of livestock and crops I believe it is just as important to conserve all we possibly can and stop existing leaks.

In connection with the tobacco industry we are also carrying on investigations with reference to the distribution of seed, cultivation, warehousing, and at the present time we have a representation of our department overseas to get all the information he possibly can with a view to improving the market for the Canadian tobacco producers.

We also do a little bee work out at the Farm in connection with winter feeding, housing, and the development of the honey producing industry in every possible way.

Investigations are being carried on with regard to flax but there is no need for me to dwell on that industry as the subject has been very fully discussed here recently.

We are making every possible effort to reach the people through our publications and through the press. We encourage visits to these farms where farmers can investigate for themselves and where everything is very fully explained to them. In this way I think the Experimental Farms are rendering a very valuable service to this country,—one that we hardly sufficiently realize and one that is certainly not appreciated by the man who is not an actual practical farmer. Only the other day I had a farmer from the old country out at the Experimental Farm. He was very enthusiastic indeed over the system and over the Farm and the opportunities that it afforded the farmer to secure every possible information that can be obtained in connection with this work and at no cost to himself. In such a vast country as ours where the conditions vary very much in different sections, it is necessary that a great deal of experimental work should be carried on, especially in view of the development of our agricultural resources, and I agree with the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) that money is well spent along these lines.

In regard to the resolution, I can hardly agree with the hon. member that there has been any unfairness in the treatment of Ontario. While the Central Experimental Farm here does work that is of value to all the other provinces, still it is rendering a special service to Ontario inasmuch as it is easily accessible to the great majority of the farmers of this province. In locating these experimental farms our aim is not provincial, but rather to meet the varying conditions which are found to exist throughout the Dominion. We expend on experimental farms in Ontario about $409,979 annually, and it will be found that we are expending in that province more money per head of population than in any other province.

The limits of extension of our experimental farm system have not by any means been reached; many sections still require these farms, and I have a great deal of sympathy for the suggestion of the hon. member that an experimental farm is necessary in western Ontario. He was rather a good prophet, however, when he predicted that I would make the excuse of our finances being short this year as the reason for not undertaking any further extension of our system. That is mainly the excuse which I have to offer, and I am inclined to think that if he had had my experience of the difficulties of trying to get money, he would accept my excuse without demur. I feel there is room for extension work not only in Ontario but in many of the other provinces, including northern British Columbia, the Peace River district, southwestern

Saskatchewan, and probably the provinces to the east of us.

To give you an idea, Mr. Speaker, of the wonderful variety of the conditions we have to deal with, I may say that on the farm at Sydney, a few miles from Victoria, B.C., we are growing figs and oranges in the open. After my experience of two springs in Ontario I would be very loath to recommend this climate for the culture of such fruits. The contrast is striking, and it well illustrates the necessity for experimental stations all over the country.

The hon. member referred to the very heavy expenditure for wages during the year 1918-19. It will be remembered that a very special effort was made during that year to produce as much root seed as possible, for the reason that before the war we had been depending largely on Germany for our supply, and that source being cut off it was absolutely necessary to produce our seed at home. I am glad to say that many sections took up this branch of agriculture with very good results, and we are now producing seed second to none.

My hon. friend stated that the Board of Commerce paralysed the pork industry. I think that statement needs to be qualified somewhat, because if he had watched the markets very closely he would have noticed that the prices fell in Chicago before the order of the Board of Commerce was issued. As a matter of fact the markets across the water were "plugged," and packers cannot send pork to a market that does not want it. Finding that their output was cut off, the packers promptly began to "shorten up" at this end. No doubt the condition is largely due to the financial situation overseas, where in many instances it is impossible to make arrangements to guarantee payment for what is sold. Under these conditions it was only natural that the packers in self defence and to make themselves safe should limit their purchases of pork.

I would like to say to the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, that I heartily sympathize with his plea for an experimental farm in western Ontario, and I shall be very glad to move in the matter as soon as financial conditions will permit. Therefore I hope he will consent to withdraw his resolution.

Mr. WILLIAM SMITH (Ontario South): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest and pleasure to the speeches of the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie), particularly so as I am personally very much interested in the subject under discussion. I may be excused if I say that to a certain extent I was a party to the establishment of our experimental farms many years ago, and I do not think any one will take exception to the statement that they were established on right lines and have accomplished a great deal of good.

My only object in rising, Mr. Speaker, is to state that I think the Minister of Agriculture might have gone one step further—and so might the hon. member for South Oxford—for it appears to me that while these farms have accomplished a great deal, what we want to-day is to show the farmer how he can make farming pay. To that end I would like to see the Department of Agriculture set aside in different places throughout the Dominion a certain acreage of land and put a man upon it with an understanding that he must make that farm pay. Then we will know exactly what can be accomplished. Until that is done, all these experimental farms, whilst they are accomplishing a great deal of good, and whilst I value highly their record and believe that they will do a great deal to serve agriculture in the days to come, yet it appears to me that one of the most practical methods to adopt is to prove to the farmer that his farm can be made to pay interest upon his investment.

I realize to the fullest extent that it is extremely hard to make both ends meet, and in view of our present financial conditions I sympathize with the Minister of Agriculture, but it appears to me that as soon as the finances of the country will allow, he should set aside farms of so many acres in one place and another from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and put in charge of those farms practical men, so that they may be able to demonstrate that farming can be made to pay. Then I say that his department will be doing one of the best things that it has ever accomplished for the benefit of agriculture.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: I must point out to the House that after the mover of the resolution exercises his right to reply the debate will be closed.

Mr. J. E. S. E. d'ANJOU (Rimouski) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, representing, as I do, a division which is essentially made up of farmers, I feel in duty bound to express my opinion on the question so ably submitted by the houourable member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland). I must

first congratulate my honourable friend on his persistence in dealing with this matter at every session. Surely, this resolution is one of the most reasonable which have been submitted to the House, this year. Some of the resolutions presented this session did advocate the establishment of systems which would have entailed a fabulous expenditure of money with no practical result in the public interest. The honourable minister of Agriculture concluded his speech by a statement to the effect that new experimental farms would be established in the province of Ontario whenever our financial circumstances permitted of it. I understand that this is the main object of the resolution. But Ontario is not the only province comprising rural constituencies where experimental farms would be of the utmost importance. The county of Rimouski, for instance, would be an ideal situation for an experimental farm. It is settled by farmers, as I have already said, and there are model farmers in that riding who, take the first prizes as against all other competitors, at every exhibition. Therefore, when the Government deems it proper to establish new experimental farms in Ontario, they should see to it that such a farm is also established in Rimouski, and I now rise in the name of the electors of that division to voice such a request. True it is that the present financial condition of the country is deplorable, but it seems that the Government would never be expending too much money to encourage our main industry. If Canada is to come out of the rut and to take her flight towards prosperity, it is necessary that we should encourage agriculture, a source of wealth above all, which will help us, in a large measure, to pay the accumulated debts and the expenses resulting from the war. The Government, levish as they are when about buying railways or granting contracts for millions of dollars without calling for tenders, should not hold out as a pretence that our financial condition does not now allow of increasing the number of experimental farms whether in Ontario or in any other one of the provinces. As was said by the speakers who have preceded me, it is a well known fact that experimental farms do render very great services in the localities where they are established, and such is their importance that the Government should not hesitate to establish some wherever they are needed, especially in the county which I have the honour to represent.

A resolution was moved by an honourable member, the other day, to the effect that we should organize an army in Canada. To my mind, the army which we ought to organize should include but soldiers of the soil and have nothing to do with future wars. I think the Government would be justified in adopting the resolution moved by the honourable member for South-Oxford and carrying it out through the establishment of new experimental farms in the different provinces. They would show, thereby, their desire to promote the welfare of Canada and enable her to pay her debt and to be progressive again as she was from 1896 to 1911.

Mr. CASSELMAN: I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Mr. Speaker,——

Mr. SPEAKER: This motion is not debatable.

Motion agreed to, and the debate adjourned.

DEVELOPMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES.

Mr. ROBERT JAMES MANION (Fort William and Rainy River) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is advisable that the Government should as soon as possible bring forward a policy having for its object the development of the natural resources of Canada.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I had not intended moving this resolution at this late hour of a sitting which closes at six o'clock; but owing to the uncertainty as regards private members' days in future, I felt that even if some hon. members who intended taking part in this debate were unfortunately precluded from doing so, the subject was perhaps of sufficient importance that it should not be left out altogether. Therefore, even at the risk of some hon. members who may wish to discuss this matter being crowded out, I am taking it up at so late an hour in the afternoon. I dealt with this subject at the first session in which I had the honour of sitting in this House, the spring session of 1918, I took it up again in the spring session of 1919; and I am so deeply impressed with the importance of the subject that I am taking it up again today because I am strongly of the opinion that it is important for this country as soon as possible to work out some policy

by which the natural resources of Canada may be developed in such a way as to improve our financial condition. If one may judge by the many orations which have been made by speakers of all nationalities, creeds, and political colours, in this country, in which orations those speakers have eulogised our great natural resources and spoken of the great future which is before this country because of them, one may well be led to believe that the subject is a popular one. But unless some of those orations are implemented by actions on the part of whatever Government may happen to be in power; in other words, unless some policy is worked out whereby those natural resources are developed, then the orations, volumes of them, are of no use to this country. The party which works out that policy will win not only the applause but the approval of the people of Canada. I admit that it is not an easy matter to work out a policy of that kind; but if the best brains of this country are set to the task, the result will be that some policy will be evolved whereby those natural resources will be developed.

Raw materials rule the world of commerce, and the country which possesses them has inestimable advantages over countries which do not. Canada possesses those raw materials in great abundance; and while some of them, such as agriculture, are being worked to a great extent, although not satisfactorily as has been illustrated by the discussion to which we have just listened, others, such as coal, iron, and oil are not being worked as they could be to the benefit of Canada. Iron, coal and oil are three of the great needs of any commercial country; and if you look over the commercial history of England, Germany, France, or the United States, you will find that their commercial development has been directly in proportion to their production of pig iron and steel. During the quarter of a century immediately preceding the war, Germany increased her steel production twelve times; the United States increased hers thirteen times, while Great Britain increased hers only two and one-half times, and all the members of this House know that in that quarter of a century Germany and the United States were rapidly gaining in international commerce and trade upon Great Britain. Great Britain, France, Germany and the United States were the four great leading commercial nations of the world before the war, and they were also the four great nations which were producing the greatest quantity of pig iron and steel. The same statement could be made in regard to other materials that are produced, but this is a statement which has been made by many economic writers, and I have recently read two books on economics by able economists who emphasize that fact.

Iron, coal and oil are the basic elements of commercial progress, and yet Canada, which claims that she possesses within her borders large quantities of those raw materials, imports immense amounts of them. Without going into details, I shall give to the House Canada's importations of those three materials for the fiscal years ending March 31, 1917, 1918, 1919. The figures are as follows:

	1917.	1918.	1919.
Coal, hard and soft..	$ 42,076,426	$ 74,324,941	$ 70,603,005
Iron and steel, including products and machinery.. ..	125,613,617	159,309,323	161,619,059
Oils, mineral, fish and others ...	21,619,694	35,338,137	45,767,021
Total..	$189,309,737	$268,972,401	$277,989,085

These materials have a great effect upon the exchange situation, and we all know that the exchange has been against us, particularly in relation to the United States during the past year. These materials which form such a large part of the imports into this country are the very materials of which we claim we have vast quantities lying dormant in the soil of Canada. I shall leave the question of coal and oil to be discussed by a number of speakers who are to follow me, and shall go a little into detail in regard to iron ore.

In my address to the House in 1918 I went into considerable detail in regard to iron ore, and I quoted many authorities to the effect that Canada stood very high in regard to her deposits of iron ore. One authority even went so far as to say that if a proper record were made Canada would stand very high, if not actually first, among the prospective iron producing countries of the world. In the Ottawa Evening Journal the other day I saw an article by Mr. Kidd, K.C., in which he claimed, and quoted authorities for his claim, that there was lying within a few miles of this city 250,000,000 tons of iron ore which could be de-

veloped. Despite all this ore which we have in Canada very little Canadian ore is being used in the blast furnaces and steel plants of Canada to-day. Only four per cent was used in 1917 and 1918, while in 1896 the percentage of Canadian iron ore used in the blast furnaces and steel plants of this country amounted to 67 per cent, in 1897, to 49 per cent; in 1898, 42 per cent; 1909, 17 per cent; in 1916, 11 per cent, and in 1917 and 1918 only four per cent. It may be added, in fairness, that in 1916, 1917 and 1918, in addition to what we used in our blast furnaces we exported an average of 150,000 tons. In 1918, while we used only 4 per cent of Canadian iron ore we imported 2,200,000 tons from other countries, two-fifths of which came from Wabana, Newfoundland, and three-fifths from the United States. It may reasonably be asked why, if we have so much iron ore lying dormant in this country, we import so much. Why is not our own ore used in the blast furnaces and steel plants of this country? The answer is that so far the iron deposits of Newfoundland and of the United States are of a richer grade. That statement was disputed, however, by a mining man to whom I made it, but personally I think that the United States and Newfoundland ores are richer than anything we have discovered so far in large quantities in Canada. Then the ores of the United States and Newfoundland are more easily mined, and there is the further fact that some of our Canadian iron ores contain deleterious substances, such as sulphur which has to be roasted out, which process adds very considerably to the cost. Furthermore, vast American corporations owning their own plants, their own railways and steamship lines, are working their own iron ores in the United States, and therefore it is very difficult for us to compete. It has been stated to me by authorities who have visited both sides of the line that the iron ore formations on the Canadian side are of exactly the same character as the formations on the American side, but the greater amount of exploration and development work that has been done on the American side has brought out richer grades than we have yet discovered because of that lack of exploration and development.

But suppose we admit for the sake of argument that our ore is inferior to that of Newfoundland and the United States. Must we also admit failure in the possibility of developing the ores we have? Must we at the first sign of difficulty throw up our hands and cry "Kamerad"? That was not our policy during the war, and it should not be our policy in commerce. It has been stated by authorities that 33 per cent of iron ore is workable on a paying basis. There have been hundreds of assays made from Nova Scotia at one end of the country to British Columbia at the other, showing iron ores of a very much higher grade than that. I have seen assays that have been made of coal near Ottawa showing as high as 60 per cent, and on the north shore of Lake Superior, both east and west of Fort William and Port Arthur, there have been hundreds of assays made showing very much more than 33 per cent, some of them running up to 60 per cent.

But one of two things is necessary for the development of these ores: Either the giving of assistance so as to put the men who are developing these ores on the same financial basis as the men who are developing them on the American side. Or the other proposition is that this Government should make a thorough investigation of these iron deposits to show investors that our ores possess as great possibilities financially as the ores to be found on the American side and in Newfoundland. A great deal of money has been spent by the Government in investigating the lignites of Western Canada. I believe that we are spending $200,000 this year in briquetting lignites and in investigation work. That is a very proper thing to do. Certainly, neither free traders nor protectionists in this House could object to a thorough investigation along the same lines on the iron ores of this country. Outside of the Geological Survey we have spent practically nothing along this line. Investigation is absolutely the duty of any government. I might interject here that I have not a cent tied up in iron or iron ore; I am speaking on broad Canadian national lines only. I believe that the Government should treat the Department of Mines more generously than it has done in the past. If you will look over the Estimates for the past few years you will find that a number of departments which are not more necessary or important, if as important, as the Department of Mines are getting from two to five times the appropriation of that department. I am not alluding to such large spending departments as Public Works, and Railways and Canals, but to the Departments of Immigration, Mounted Police, Dominion Lands, Indian Affairs, Fisheries, and Penitentiaries. Only a comparatively small appropriation is made for the Department of Mines despite the great mineral develop-

ment which has gone on in Canada, and despite the vast possibilities which this country has in further mineral development. I think it is false economy which permits a government to pay such meagre salaries to scientific and mining men that 50 per cent of the scientific field men of the Mines Department have resigned in the last year or so and gone to work for private companies. That is not good economy. Only the other day, on February 23, in the British Columbia House, the Hon. Mr. Sloan moved a notice of motion along these very lines, that the Government should spend more in the line of investigating British Columbia mining lands, and the same policy should be adopted in every province of this country. During the war we spent about two billion dollars on destructive processes of war, and it seems that it is but a fair request on the part of the people to ask that we now spend a certain amount of money, as large an amount as we can finance, on the constructive processes of peace. Due to the war our taxes have doubled, having risen from about $175,000,000 to about $350,000,000 or more per annum. That is due to the increases in interest from $15,000,000 to $115,000,000, an increase in pensions from nil to $35,000,000 per annum, and to other expenditures arising out of the war. The only way to lower this taxation is by increasing our population, and an increase in population can be brought about to a certain extent at least by an increase in mineral development. A hundred years ago Canada and the United States were pretty nearly equal in population. To-day Canada has between 8,000,000 and 9,000,000 people and the United States 110,000,000. That is partly due to our policy of helping them to develop their natural resources and build up their commerce rather than following the same policy with regard to our own country. It is true that without Government assistance iron ores will be developed in Canada when the depletion of American and Newfoundland ores is a little closer in sight, and it is in sight to-day. But why should we leave the development and the prosperity incident to that development to posterity. In this matter I cannot help saying with Mr. Dooley, "What has posterity done for us that we should do so much for them?" by leaving all these resources to them.

There is another reason why this is important, and that is the railway situation in this country. Due to the lack of foresight on the part of statesmen in this country for half a century of railway building, there has been no definite plan in railway construction in Canada, and the result is that to-day we have duplication and over-development in many sections. For example we have 1,300 miles of railway on three different lines from Winnipeg to Ottawa. We have three lines of railway, the Canadian Pacific railway, the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk Pacific, and any one who looks over the country must know that two lines would have been sufficient. That, however, is only an example; the same condition exists from Montreal to Toronto, and there is over-duplication in various other parts of the country. In fact, in every part of Canada there is unnecessary duplication. We have in this country 40,000 miles of railway, over half of which is in the hands of the Canadian people, and it might be worth while to compare the figures of the Canadian railway system with those of other countries. Canada has one mile of railway to every two hundred persons; the United States, one mile to every four hundred; Great Britain, one mile to every two thousand; Russia, one mile to every four thousand. Canada has four or five times the mileage of railway that Japan has with a population of 56,000,000; three times the mileage of Italy with 36,000,000. We have a greater mileage than Great Britain with 45,000,000, a greater mileage than France with 40,000,000, and an equal mileage with Germany, which has a population of 65,000,000. These figures illustrate quite plainly the over-development of our railways. In other words, we have not the population sufficient to provide the necessary railway traffic. Mineral development would help to secure this traffic, and it is stated—I think authoritatively—that in the United States forty-seven per cent of the railway traffic consists of the carrying of mineral products. The percentage is very much smaller in this country.

Another important reason why coal, oil and iron should be developed is the fact that they are all exhaustible materials. The time may not be very distant in the future when the United States may consider it sound politics and good business to put an embargo to a certain extent on the exportation of these materials from that country, and it is highly important that we should reach the stage of absolute independence of any action which the United States may feel called upon to take.

An objection has been made that our coal supplies are insufficient for the proper development of such materials as iron; yet

Canada claims to have the greatest coal deposits in the world, with the exception of the deposits of the United States. I admit that our deposits are localized in far extreme points of Canada, but the day is coming, not far in the future, when Canada's coal supplies will suffice for at least her own needs. At any rate, it is to be hoped that they will; and this condition will be brought about by improvements in transportation, particularly water transportation, as, for example, the building of a St. Lawrence canal system or a Georgian Bay system whereby the Great Lakes will be made the Mediterranean of America. When that day comes, Mr. Speaker, I foresee this happy circumstance, that between Winnipeg and Fort William the coal of Nova Scotia will say a glowing good morning to the coal of the Prairia Provinces, and that will be the time when Canadian coal will supply the necessities of the Dominion. Then we have vast quantities of potential electrical power; there are nineteen million horsepower of potential electricity in the waterfalls of Canada, only ten per cent of which is developed. Electricity and coal are our two great sources of energy, but while coal is exhaustible, electricity is not. It is one of the few materials which you can go on using indefinitely without fear of exhausting the supply, and electric smelters will help, and are helping at the present time in Toronto, to develop the mineral resources of the country.

You may wonder, Mr. Speaker, what proposition I am endeavouring to put up to the Government after these preliminary remarks. I am going to offer suggestions which have been put forward by different people, and leave them with the Government for their consideration. The first suggestion which some one has made is that the tariff be raised against raw materials; second, that the Government itself should develop these resources; third, that the Government guarantee bonds of a private corporation and allow that corporation to develop the resources of the country; fourth, that a partnership be formed between the Government and a private corporation such as the shell-oil proposition of Alberta and the Peace River district; fifth, that a bonus or bounty be paid on iron ore raised in the mines of Canada and used in Canadian steel plants; sixth, that a committee or commission be appointed to go into the question and recommend to the Government what should be done. Commissions are not very popular in this country just now, although I think sometimes that the great cries against them are partly due to the fact that there exists an adverse opinion in regard to commissions for commissions have been appointed in this country that have done good work. The seventh proposition is that a thorough investigation by competent mining men be made covering the whole question, and neither protectionists nor free-traders could object to such an investigation. I care not which one of the suggestions the Government might determine to adopt, so long as it adopts one of them. The important thing is that the Government should undertake some policy whereby the mineral development of the country will be extended, as I believe it should be extended, and whereby all the orations that have been made will be implemented by effective action; because, after all, orations are of absolutely no use unless they are properly implemented. Some policy should be adopted to insure the proper development of our natural resources from one end of the country to the other. Let some action be taken, for this is one of the possible methods by which we may increase the population, lessen the taxes, enhance our property, secure a market for our agricultural products, give employment to the unemployed, provide freight for our over-developed railway system, make ourselves commercially independent of the United States, and generally help to give the Dominion of Canada its proper place among the advancing industrial nations of the world.

Mr. W. D. COWAN (Regina): I have much pleasure in seconding the resolution moved by the hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion), who I think is quite right in saying that there has arisen an urgent demand throughout Canada for the development of our natural resources. In the part of the country from which I come there has been in the last year or two a strong demand in this respect. Our young men are of the opinion that the natural resources of the country should be developed for the benefit of the Canadian people, and they as workingmen are entitled to the opportunity that would be afforded them by the development of these resources, which would provide abundant employment. At present our working men and women find it difficult to secure employment in Western Canada, and that is one of the reasons why so many of them have left that country and gone to the United States. Now, that is one of the problems which we want to tackle, for this sort of emigration should not be permitted; we should do everything possible to prevent it. There has been in our part

of the country a very insistent demand for the development of our natural resources, and so strong has that demand become that in some quarters there is a movement on foot to get the Government to establish a Ministry of Science and Industry, with a minister who will give sufficient attention to this important phase of national work. We do not ask that the number of ministers should be increased, but we are anxious that this matter should be provided for. Wherever we go we find that our best public men are dealing with this question, and recently Professor McLaurin, of Saskatchewan University, speaking in Saskatoon to a body of business men, made statements similar to those quoted by the hon. member for Fort William. In his concluding remarks he said:

> Canada's natural resources are second only to the United States, but up to the present time is considered chiefly in terms of agriculture, but the time has come when industrial development is essential to a permanent system of agriculture and a national industrial consciousness must be created.

I fancy that a number of the wealthier men of Canada, probably manufacturers, will say: Yes, let us develop as quickly as possible a national industrial consciousness; and it is not only among our workingmen and young people that that national consciousness should be developed. It seems to me that our banks, our wealthier men and our governments should realize the importance of this viewpoint.

I am going to read just a few words from a recent interview given by Sir George Bury, upon his return from China where he had been on a business trip, dealing with this very thing. I quote Sir George Bury because I fancy he will not be accused of being an enemy of the manufacturers of Canada. Yet he speaks very plainly and, I think, very properly to them. He recognizes, as I recognize and as I think we must all recognize, that our industrial development depends to a large extent upon the development of the natural resources of Canada. He said:

> Yet, while the United States, Great Britain and all the lesser fry are busy developing trade in the Orient, Canadian manufacturers are sitting back in their revolving chairs doing nothing. I met a Canadian manufacturer in Japan, who was asked to figure on some business. His reply was that he was there for a holiday, and not for business. An energetic salesman in China secured an order for several thousand hand cultivators and tried to get them made in the East. The order was turned down because it involved the expenditure of a few thousand dollars for dies and templates. Those two incidents are characteristic of the attitude of the Canadian manufacturers to Oriental trade.

Then he goes on:

> Our wonderful national resources will be only a mockery to us unless we utilize them for the benefit of the world, and for our own advantage. The world needs the products of our soil, our forests, mines and waters, and we, as the custodians of these great resources have a trust to which we must live up, and for which we must worthily account, or be in default. It is not only a national duty to the world we owe, but a domestic obligation to our own people to provide profitable occupation for all our people.

I quote him because I know that I could not express my view better than, or as well as he has done. It seems to me that a national industrial consciousness is required among the wealthier men of Canada who are in a position to do the developing of these natural resources because our workingmen cannot be expected to do it; they have not the capital and it is only the wealthier men and the Government that can do it. For that reason I think a policy ought to be adopted by this Government not only for themselves to follow but which would induce capitalists and the wealthier men of Canada to engage in these undertakings.

The hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion) has dealt almost entirely with iron and properly so. He has a great deal of iron in his particular locality. I am not so competent to speak of these things, but when it comes down to the development of our natural resources we are more or less confined to the natural resources which are within our several provinces, because we can best speak of these.

That brings me back to the province of Saskatchewan. As soon as I get there I find myself up against an absolutely impossible condition. The condition is this: Unlike almost every other province of Canada, our province does not yet own its natural resources. They are held in trust, so to speak, by this Government. I confess to believing, and I have no hesitancy in saying, that to-day one of the first complaints our people have is over the question of lumber. Our country is experiencing a building boom such as it has never experienced before. Our building will be limited only by the supply of lumber. Our lumber, it is true, has chiefly come, in days gone by, from British Columbia. It is there yet but we cannot get it. While we are dependent to a large extent on British Columbia the fact remains that in Saskatchewan we have a great deal of lumber

which could be made of great benefit to us and which might be used if we only had the means of getting it. True it is not the kind of lumber you find in these panels around this Chamber, but it is lumber which can be used in a great many of our buildings, it is in demand by the American people and a large amount of it is sold to our American cousins across the border. What can we do? Those who have travelled through, as many of you have, on the Canadian Pacific railway, probably have come to the conclusion that as far as timber is concerned our province is a barren country. It is not so, as the following figures with regard to timber lands in the province of Saskatchewan will show:

	acres
Timber area	98,250,000
Wooded area	73,000,000
Spruce	750,000

Present available lumber supply, 7,800,000,000 board feet.

Timber berths, 85.

As far as I have been able to discover, we have only six mills in operation in that entire area. I would like to know how it comes that these 79 timber berths are held without any operations being carried on. I do not know whether they have a right to hold them without doing any work upon them or not. They should not have. But there are six mills being operated and a lot of the timber which they are producing is being sold south of the American line. While lumber is being exported from our own province, a great many people are demanding that an embargo be put upon British Columbia lumber so that they cannot export it. If the Government would hand over the timber limits in Saskatchewan to the Government of that province and let them deal with them the provincial government could, if they saw fit, make such regulations as would give to our own people the use of their own lumber, and in that way a great deal of the discontent would be allayed.

The situation is this. As long as these timber berths are controlled by the Dominion Government there is no development. The provincial government has not the right or the power to adopt a policy for the development of those resources. I saw a question on the Order Paper, which was answered by the Acting Prime Minister (Sir George Foster) about what statement was made by the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) prior to the election. There is no question about it, he promised that these natural resources would be handed over to the people of the province. I myself heard him make that statement. In view of the uncertain conditions which that promise has created, a promise which has not yet been fulfilled and which would involve an entire change in the regulations covering the control of the timber areas, can we expect that the men who own these timber berths, and wealthy men generally, are going to invest their money in the development of these resources? Most undoubtedly not, because if there is one thing more than another that money is scared of it is indefiniteness and uncertainty. The Government, in the interest of the people of Saskatchewan, should end that period of indefiniteness and uncertainty as quickly as possible and hand over to our province these timber resources so that other regulations may be formed to encourage the proper development of these areas and thus give to our people what really belongs to them.

Now there is far more timber than that. I happen to have here testimony on the point from Constable Eaman of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police, who has been all through that country and who states:

> Below Lac La Ronge is a great area of splendid timber.

Then again he states:

> In 1916 the value of the cut was $1,226,000. Many of the areas of timber are not yet within reach of a market. For example, there is an area of 13,000 acres at Montreal lake estimated to contain 120,000,000 feet that cannot be reached until communications are established.

All this timber is there, but for the lack of a few miles of railway our people are compelled to suffer and our progress is retarded in the way it is. So much, Mr. Speaker, for that.

We have more than timber in that section of the country, we have a great deal of coal. True it is not the very best, as yet, but it is being developed. The Government have very wisely, as was mentioned by the hon. member for Fort William, embarked upon the policy of demonstrating the feasibility of briquetting the lignites of southern Saskatchewan. A great many complaints have been made by our people that the work is being carried on very slowly but I am not one of those who join in that complaint. It is a demonstration plant and nothing else; and I want to say that I would sooner take a little longer time and have the demonstration made a complete success than hastily launch into something and find that it results in failure. I am glad to know that the Government are

taking their time with this demonstration plant and carrying out the experiments properly. So long as they are making substantial progress I will be very content, and I only hope that they will continue the work and get through with it as soon as they possibly can. I am satisfied that as soon as the demonstration plant, which will manufacture some thirty thousand briquettes in one year, has been established and proven to be a success, we will have dozens of these plants established all over southern Saskatchewan and southern Manitoba. But lignite coal is not the only coal we have in southern Saskatchewan;—and I am sorry the Minister of Railways (Mr. J. D. Reid) is not in his place to-day because I would like to have drawn his attention to one peculiarity which he, probably more than anybody else, ought to deal with as promptly as he possibly can. To-day we are bringing all our bituminous coal from Alberta and our anthracite coal from the United States. In the city of Regina we are about six hundred miles from the bituminous coal mines in Alberta, and the city of Winnipeg is about three hundred and sixty-six miles farther away still. It so happens, however, that within the last two years a new coal field has been discovered within two hundred miles of the city of Regina, and within two hundred and fifty miles of Winnipeg. That field is now known to contain at least twenty million tons, and some estimates run as high as sixty million tons. That coal is better coal than any bituminous coal ever yet mined in Alberta. I have a copy of the analysis that was made by the Government and I have seen samples of the coal. It differs in this one respect from the other coal—that while the lignite coal at Estevan is covered with some twenty-five to fifty feet of earth this particular deposit is covered with some two hundred feet. As hon. members can very easily see the increased weight of earth covering it has resulted in greater pressure and thereby given a better quality of coal. In addition to that this particular deposit is perhaps of greater age.

Now what are the conditions? As soon as the farmers in the locality discovered this coal they incorporated themselves into a company and fixed their capital at half a million dollars. They have already spent some $80,000 in sinking shafts and are prepared to go on with operations, but unfortunately they are about eight miles from a railway and the Canadian National railway at that. Last year the Canadian National did undertake to build a spur from Lampman to Peebles which would go directly through this area, and they graded some eight or ten miles of the line from the south. About twelve miles of railway have still to be built before we get the Canadian National railway down there, but as far as I can see there is no intention of building it this summer.

Complaint is being made that we cannot get men to do this work, that there is no labour available. In this connection I will read an extract from a letter received by me from the secretary of the recently organized mining company who, as I have already said, have spent some $80,000 in development work:

> I received your letter to-day and was pleased to get news regarding the railway. I note what you say regarding the labour situation. I have been deluged with requests to obtain work for men and teams on this line. We have been in the dry belt for the last three years and the farmers are only too anxious to get out and make some money with their teams. We can supply all teams and the men to grade this road if the Canadian National railway will lay the ties and steel and oversee the work. Don't let them bluff you on the labour situation on this line.

Now this coal field is within two hundred miles of the city of Regina, and we want to buy that fuel but cannot get it. The city of Winnipeg also would be only too glad if these mines were developed, but it can be readily understood that with the mines eight miles from a railway it is utterably impossible for the company in question to develop them. Yet the mines are right at our doors and we have no means of doing what we want to do. If these mines in Saskatchewan were under the control of the Provincial Government I am quite satisfied that that Government would quickly take the necessary action to place this coal within the reach of the people who want to buy it. Of course, I quite understand that the railway companies do not want these mines opened. They would prefer to collect rates on freight coming six hundred, seven hundred or eight hundred miles away rather than on freight coming a distance of only two or three hundred miles. The former is quite an inducement for them; and that is one of the things we have had to contend with in days gone by to a far greater extent than some of you people in the East have any idea of. I urge the Government to adopt a policy calculated to bring this coal within our reach just as soon as they possibly can.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: What is the quality of the coal that the hon. gentleman has

been speaking of? Has he an analysis of it?

Mr. COWAN: The thickness of the seam is seventeen feet but I have not the analysis before me. When this debate is over, however, I will procure and submit the analysis to the hon. gentleman. It demonstrates that this is not bituminous coal such as Alberta possesses.

Mr. MACKIE: I do not want the information personally, I want the country to get it.

Mr. COWAN: I can easily obtain it for the hon. gentleman. My view is this: There is room for the development in Western Canada of every coal mine we have got. The progress of the country has been, and will be, such that it will take everything that every coal mine there can produce to keep up with the demand for coal. If we can make our people generally satisfied and put them into a prosperous condition every mine in the province will have all that it can do.

But it is not merely coal mines that we want to see developed in our country. We want a development policy also with respect to our farm products. So much has been heard about No. 1 Hard wheat that some people think the province of Saskatchewan cannot raise anything but that cereal. There was a time probably when we did not do much more than raise No. 1 Hard wheat, but we are very quickly getting away from that type of farming. I am glad to see it because personally I am one who does not believe in putting all our eggs into one basket. A short time ago I asked the Board of Trade of Regina to give me a statement showing what they thought could be done in the way of industrial development in Western Canada. Now all Boards of Trade are generally pretty sensible bodies of men and when you come to the Board of Trade of Regina you have got something pretty good. The Board of Trade has declared:

> Another very important industry in the development of this country are cold storage and packing plants. Saskatchewan has at the present time 352,989 cows, 926,342 other cattle, 134,177 sheep, 521,240 swine and 8,000,000 chickens. The total value of livestock, including poultry, of all descriptions, is $271,377,044, and not an abattoir or packing plant of any size in the country. It is true there is a small packing plant at Moose Jaw, one at Prince Albert and one in Regina, but these are totally inadequate to take care of the needs of that industry in the province.
>
> In the year 1917, as compared with 1916, Saskatchewan more than doubled the number of cattle marketed. Of cattle, hogs and sheep Saskatchewan marketed 303,254 head, as compared with Manitoba's 229,292 and Alberta's 144,734. Manitoba's increase for the year over 1916 was 33,825, Alberta's increase was 52,361; combined increase for the provinces of Manitoba and Alberta, 85,186. Saskatchewan's increase alone was 93,545, thus, notwithstanding the splendid increase made by Manitoba and Alberta, Saskatchewan did better than either or both combined.

And not an abattoir or packing plant of any size in the whole province! I wish those words could reach a few of our wealthier men, to show them what a splendid opportunity presents itself there for the investment of some of their money. I feel satisfied they would make just as big profits out of plants established in Regina as they do out of many of the plants which they have here.

An Hon. MEMBER: What about Calgary?

Mr. COWAN: I do not care whether they establish plants in Regina or anywhere else so long as they get them in Western Canada. I want to see the whole of Western Canada prosperous by the development of our natural resources. I am sure that Calgary will not object to see Regina prosperous, and I know we are very glad to see Calgary going ahead. I believe Calgary by reason of its splendid situation and its natural advantages—water powers all around, timber within easy distance, and situated on the edge of the greatest market on the continent—I say I believe that Calgary is destined to be one of the largest industrial cities on the North American continent. Provided, of course, that the people of Calgary get busy and take advantage of the opportunities confronting them. If instead of developing those opportunities they sit around idle and apathetic, of course they will not get anywhere.

I have stated why I am supporting the resolution offered by the member for Fort William (Mr. Manion). We have unlimited natural opportunities in the West. Our clays are unquestionably the best in the world for manufacturing pottery of all kinds. If any hon. member doubts my statement, let him read the records of the Department of Agriculture. I remember, a little more than two years ago at a meeting of the city Commissioners of Regina, a bright young man came before us. He told us that he had been for the past three years representing the Dominion Government in investigating the clay deposits of the province of Saskatchewan, and he said: I thought I would come in and tell you that, in my opinion, you have the best clays that

can be found anywhere for the manufacture of pottery. I wish to draw the attention of the Government and of the investing public to the fact so that those natural resources may be developed.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to cite the opinion of a geologist in reference to our asphaltum, and I would like it to sink into the minds of hon. members. My authority is Dr. Bosworth, a British geologist, who is now chief geologist for the Imperial Oil Company. He published a brief account of his findings in Northern Alberta in the "Petroleum World" of February 1915, in which occurs the following paragraph:

> "The exposure of asphaltum visible along this river is greater than all the other known asphaltic outcrops, pitch lakes and oil seepages in the world put together."

Yet we are doing absolutely nothing with those resources! That is what I object to. Seemingly we have no policy at all so far as our natural resources are concerned. I urge upon the Government to take this matter up as quickly as they can in order that they may adopt a policy for the development of these great natural resources, or if the Government do not feel justified in developing them directly, I would suggest that they take measures to bring before the investing public the fact that these opportunities are awaiting men of capital and enterprise and will ensure them magnificent returns.

Mr. D. L. REDMAN (East Calgary): Mr. Speaker, I presume I will not be out of order in prefacing the few remarks I have to offer by approaching the subject from the viewpoints of people holding diverse political creeds. I think we can now unhesitatingly come to the conclusion that we have passed the time when individualism was the groundwork of all political policy, and when it was dogmatically said that laissez faire was the only policy for Governments. The last four years of the war unquestionably demonstrated what governments are able to do in some respects. It may be urged that governments in developing natural resources are verging on Socialism, which is the other extreme. It seems to me that such a contention would not be well founded, because the socialistic doctrine as we now have it from one end of the world to the other is based on the form of government at present in control in Russia, and although the advocates of Socialism call it by different names, they all agree on the fundamentals of the Soviet government.

[Mr. Cowan.]

But between those two extremes there is a legitimate field for governmental endeavour. We have seen in the last few years how such countries as Germany and the United States went ahead industrially a great deal faster than Great Britain. In this connection, I may say that I have no qualms of conscience in benefiting from such lessons as Germany before the war was able to give us. While references to the war are perhaps becoming somewhat obsolete, I know our soldiers never hesitated to take from the German soldiers any new fighting wrinkles they might have, whilst giving the enemy some of their own. I believe that if to-day we adopt some such middle course as government supervision or assistance in developing our natural resources, we will be taking a sound course and one which will greatly redound to the advantage of Canada.

Through accident, or it may be through policy, as one may care to view it, we have to-day control of a very extensive railway system and are rapidly completing the building of a magnificent merchant marine. Having got thus far, we must develop our natural resources and our exportable products if we are to make our railway and our fleet pay their way.

We have to-day a further incentive to action in that we have a national debt of over two billion dollars, and it seems to me in no way can we liquidate that indebtedness with greater certainty than by adopting the sound policy of developing our natural resources. I need only point out the example of Ontario, where the stumpage charges are bringing an enormous revenue into the provincial treasury.

With a policy of development, if the work is done under private ownership, the question of definite royalties and payments of that sort arises, and these should bring in substantial revenues to the State. There is no other country in which the natural resources are greater than those of Canada in proportion to population, and therefore I have no difficulty in coming to the conclusion that we stand on firm ground when we say that it is a good general policy for the Government to develop its natural resources, to give assistance possibly to private persons who go into that business, and in any event to have a strong policy, a policy which should bring this country to the financial condition to which it is entitled much earlier than would be reached under ordinary conditions. It is true that we have a policy at present; that we have done something. We have the Advisory

Council for Scientific and Industrial research, which is doing good work so far as it goes. We have the Department of Mines which is doing excellent work, the Geological Survey Branch, the Commission of Conservation and other similiar institutions; but we have never given these bodies sufficient power or scope to enable them to carry on their work properly. I believe I am correct in stating that if any private business corporation owned the resources of this country, they would not have this more or less haphazard and immature policy of development which now pertains in Canada; a private enterprise with these vast resources at their disposal would go at them in a scientific and businesslike way, because we must all realize to-day that one thing which the war has brought forward is this, that the chemists and chemistry in business have come to the front as they never have before. Therefore, the Government would be well advised in bringing forward a definite, firm and comprehensive policy. There may be those who will say that at present, when the war is just over, we should not spend large sums of money on this sort of work; but I do not think that is sound economics, because only by spending large sums can you bring about greater development and get a revenue larger than any sum you might spend. To be penny wise and pound foolish is not good policy.

Then there comes the question which has already been discussed by other speakers, that of handing over our resources to the provinces. I will say, without hesitation, that this is something which should be done. It is something which has been promised, and that promise should be implemented, but I am concerned not so much with that aspect of the question as with the fact that something should be done now. Let some decision be reached whereby either the Dominion Government or the provincial governments will realize their responsibilities and will be able to bring down now a policy for the years that are to come. The point in regard to that question is that something definite should be done now; but as nothing has been done, the responsibility to-day is the responsibility of the Dominion Government, and to that Government we, therefore, address any remarks which we may have to make. If the Dominion Government should, in the near future, hand over to the western provinces their natural resources, there still remains for the Dominion Government a great field in the way of industrial research, of standardization, of exporting the results of these developments, and to all these problems the Dominion Government could very well give considerable attention.

It is natural, in speaking of this subject, that I should refer mainly to Alberta from which I come. It is true that up to date our basic industry has been agriculture; and while I may not have all the facts in connection with this subject at my disposal, it appears to me that the Government must have a policy for exporting our wheat from that part of the country next year. I do not know where that wheat will be sold, except such portions of our high grade wheat as are required in the United States to mix with their wheat, unless it be sold on the continent of Europe, and I do not know of any country there which is able to finance its purchases, except by accepting the very great difference in exchange which now exists and which, as a rule, you will find them unwilling to accept. The Government must realize not only that they will have to handle this situation next year, but that they must take care of the export, of that equally important feature of agriculture, namely, the cattle industry. I can see no fundamental difference between the agricultural industry and the live-stock industry; we can never develop Western Canada as a wheat-growing country alone and at the same time expect that our soil will last for years to come; we must have both the cattle and the wheat. We cannot consume all the cattle which we already raise and the surplus must be exported in some way or another. Whether we shall have to revert to barter and exchange or accept long term notes of foreign governments, we must, if we wish to keep our wheat and cattle business on the basis on which we now have it and at which the extent of our land and the fertility of our soil demand that we carry it, face that difficulty now.

There is also in Southern Alberta the question of irrigation. A large tract of land is there mapped out ready for irrigation, and while I am not prepared at this moment to say what is the duty of the Dominion Government, or the duty of the provincial government in connection with that matter, the Dominion Government should at all times be ready to co-operate with the provincial government in bringing along that much needed development.

What I wish to speak of more especially to-day is the mineral potentialities and possibilities of Alberta. One, perhaps, gets the impression that Alberta and the other Western Provinces are entirely agricultural provinces, but that is far from the truth.

Last year Alberta was the third province in the Dominion of Canada as regards its mineral output, and in 1918, the output of minerals in Alberta amounted to $23,000,000.

It is true that we have had no exhaustive survey of our iron ores in that province, but iron ore indications are in evidence right from the Crow's Nest Pass up through Calgary to the far North where on the lakes large quantities of iron are to be found. It is very possible that we shall find that iron to be of a low grade, and it is for this Government to deal with the question whether low grade iron can be scientifically reduced as a commerical venture. I hope I shall not weary the House if I read just a very few lines from the report of the Honorary Advisory Committee on Scientific and Industrial research in regard to this question. The report states:

> The investigation of the reduction of iron ores by gases, under the supervision of Professor Stansfield, of McGill University, has advanced to a stage which promises important results bearing on the utilization of ores of low grades so abundant in Canada. There is but a small supply of high grade iron ore in the Dominion, which is emphasized by the fact that 96 per cent of all the iron ore smelted in Canada is imported, this importation including, of course, that obtained from Belle Isle, Newfoundland. The total quantity of high grade iron ore on the Globe available is, through its use for producing iron and steel, diminishing at a rate which makes its exhaustion a not far distant event, and in consequence it will eventually be necessary to turn to those of lower grades for the supply of ore for the industry. If the smelting could be effected on an industrial scale at a reduction in the cost which would offset the disadvantages at present attendant on the utilization of these lower grade ores it would make available, immediately or in the very near future, the immense quantities of such ores in Canada. The Research Council regards the solution of this problem as of very great importance to Canadian industry and as justifying a protracted experimental investigation carried on on a large scale.

The reason why I have read this is that I think the Government should make a most thorough survey of the possibilities of iron ore in Alberta. They should not hesitate in aiding scientific men in endeavouring to reduce those low grade ores as a commerical venture, because if that can be done, we have in Alberta coal which is practically illimitable in quantity and easy to mine, but which is now valueless because we have no use to which to put it. Possibly when these investigations proceed further, it will be found that Alberta will be an excellent place in which to put those investigations into operation first, because with coal which is practically valueless and in such abundant quantities that you can go into practically any area of the province and erect your plant, sink your shaft and get your fuel, it is possible that low grade ores can be handled economically as an industrial proposition. The House has heard many times how much coal we have in Alberta. We have in that province one-eighth of all the coal in the world. It is not all lignite; it is anthracite, bituminous and lignite in practically unlimited quantities. Those who are perhaps not familiar with our lignite coal think that it is in the nature of a new experimental substance which one can use for heat, but it is real coal after all.

It is an excellent coal for domestic use, just as good as, and in my opinion better than, any kind of anthracite or bituminous coal. In 1918 our production of coal amounted to 6,000,000 tons, the highest of any province in Canada.

Two things are required in order to increase the development of our coal in the province of Alberta. One is to extend the market area, and the other is to encourage coal using industries in that province. With regard to the extension of our market area, that brings us to the question of our railways. I am not one of those who would be continuously clamouring for reduced rates in order to please the people of this country, but I do say this: When rates can be reduced and the result from such reduction shall be the development of natural resources which will increase the commodities which the railways will haul, I think we are talking pretty sound economics when we ask that such reductions be made. It is true that the railways, requiring traffic westward, desire to bring anthracite coal to Western Canada from Fort William and have wheat as a return haul from the West. It is against that influence that it will be necesary for us to fight. The Drumheller association of coal operators have made a most reasonable request to the Railway Commission lately to this effect: That during the months of April, May, June, July and August, when no wheat is moving, and when cars and equipment are standing idle throughout Western Canada awaiting the time when they will be used for hauling the crop, some reduction be made in the coal rate from Alberta down to Port Arthur. That would serve three purposes. First, it would utilize the railway equipment; secondly, it would enable the mines to run the year round, and thirdly, it would obviate the difficulty which occurs every winter when the whole of West-

ern Canada tries to be supplied at the one time with coal from the mines, and often without success. It has been proven that our coal will stand up for six months, and it seems to me a reasonable and proper policy for the Railway Commission or the Government to reduce the rate during this period in order to get these three excellent results. Our vision perhaps soars to the day when we will supply the country further east than Fort William. If the carbonizing and briquetting experiments which are now being conducted on Saskatchewan coal are successful, they will unquestionably be successful with Alberta coal, and with those experiments a success our coal in the form of briquettes, equal in heating value and every other respect to anthracite would surely come east of Fort William and go a long way towards bridging the great central part of Canada which in 1918 imported no less than $71,000,000 worth of coal from the United States.

In connection with the briquetting process we have the by-products of distillation. We get tar, on which is built up the analine dye industry. In view of the quantity of coal we have in Alberta, if we can get that coal produced, briquetted, and sold, we will have an enormous quantity of this tar base on which to build up our analine dye industry. Ammonia sulphate is also derived in large quantities during this process of distillation, and at the rate we are tilling the soil in the West it will be only a few years before we shall need this excellent fertilizer in that country.

In Alberta we have the Alberta Industrial Congress. It is an association for the purpose of attracting industry to Western Canada. Some may think that we are a little early, but it must be remembered that we have already on the plains of Western Canada about two and a half millions of people, which is a rather good market for young industries to start on. We have coal which is practically theirs for the asking. We have every expectation that our population will not only increase, but multiply itself in the next twenty-five years. I think it should be part of the Government policy to attract attention towards the industrial possibilities of Western Canada. It is true that the Government have voted a sum towards that congress for this year. While on this point, I think we could well afford to have one on the Pacific coast, a Pacific trade commission similar to the trade commission operating on the Eastern coast. I know from personal experience what a great trade could be worked up with the Orient, and I would direct the attention of the Government to those possibilities.

We have cement, water powers, lumber and pulpwood in great quantities throughout that country, but as other hon. members have spoken of these resources I shall say nothing further about them.

Our clay products in Alberta are of the very greatest importance. In 1918 Canada imported $6,700,000 of clay products, and Alberta produced in that year $381,000 worth. I am certain there is a great future for the development of pottery, bricks, and clay products in that province.

Then we come to the question of oil. The pursuit of oil is very similar to the pursuit of gold. It is one thing which seems to stimulate the imagination and energies of mankind more than anything else, and many incidents are bound to happen in the development of an oil field. I believe it often takes from twenty to twenty-five years of prospecting and drilling before an oil field is established. In Alberta we produced in 1918 over $100,000 worth of oil, all of which has been sold. We can say that the indications from one end of the province to the other, starting from the asphaltum sands, and going almost down to the fields of Montana, show that we have enormous oil resources in that country. The Government then can come to the conclusion that they have an oil field in Alberta. What should they do to develop it? Should they endeavour to explore and drill and develop it themselves, and then turn it over to good advantage to private companies? Perhaps that would not be an unwise policy. It is a matter for the consideration of the Government. The Government have already provided that leases shall only be granted on payment of a royalty to the Government. I think the Government made a mistake in not placing a maximum on that royalty. As it is, it is to be fixed by the Governor in Council from time to time as it may determine. You go to a firm and ask them to start work in that country, and they will say to you: Until the amount of royalty is fixed we do not know where we are at. There is no easier way of losing money than by sinking it into holes from which you get nothing. Those who spend large sums of money are entitled to know what royalty the Government intends to take. I want it to be understood, however, that I am thoroughly in accord with the policy of taking a royalty.

There is another matter in regard to oil. Alberta does not participate in the bounty of one and a half cents per gallon which the more favoured oil of Ontario gets. Our oil is of such a superior quality, it is of such low specific gravity, that it does not come within the qualifications set forth in the Order in Council governing the bounty. Though it is true that our oil is worth three times as much per gallon as the oil of Ontario, we are not asking that we be given three times as much bounty, but simply that our oil be not discriminated against, and that in that area which is not yet developed, and where men are needed to go on with the enterprise, no discrimination be made against us.

Natural gas exists in Alberta in unlimited quantities. This is not so important immediately, because it can only be used as the population increases and a domestic market is built up. I might point out that it has lately been discovered that from the Calgary gas field alone a quantity of helium valued at $3,000,000 could be extracted annually. At the present moment this new gas is going up the chimney. The cost of a plant to save this product will, I understand, not exceed $200,000, and the use to which this gas can be put is becoming increasingly wide.

At this point I want to make this statement: Eastern Canada asks us from time to time to buy its produce, probably at a little higher price than the produce of the United States, in order that we may develop Canadian industries, and that the workmen of Eastern Canada may be assured of a livelihood. We may be willing to do this, but at least we ask that if people from the East request these things of us they shall in return assist us in marketing our commodities and extending our coal market, and in increasing the production of the natural resources of our western country. This strikes me as a most fair proposition, and one that is well worthy of consideration by the Government. It is also one that might well be carried out to allay, to some extent, the present feeling that they are being unfairly dealt with, which exists in Western Canada.

In conclusion, let me express the opinion that there are some definite things that could be done. A request was made that a Natural Resources Bureau should be created, a Bureau of Scientific Investigation and Scientific Standards,, similar to that which exists in the United States and largely similar to that in England. It appears to me that the evidence taken last year before the special committee is undoubtedly sufficient to convince us that our industrial development would be greatly benefited by the institution of such a bureau. Some permanent policy of development should be undertaken by the Government and, if necessary, some responsible minister of the Crown should be in charge. I think that we should have a "national consciousness" driving towards the development of our resources, and that our policy should be complete. It should not be haphazard but comprehensive. With that stimulus and inspiration from the Government, private enterprise would feel a great deal safer; and with a sound policy behind it, capital would be disposed to go in for the development of the country's natural resources. Our geological surveys of the various ores and minerals of the country should be more thorough. Our investigations into the briquetting of lignite and the reduction of low-grade iron ores should be exhaustive, and we should not be parsimonious in our expenditures in providing help to our scientists engaged in this work. I believe that if the Government would realize the industrial potentialities of Western Canada and bring down a sound and strong policy, our natural resources would be developed and you would have in Alberta not a one-sided community, not a community with one line of industry alone, but a well-balanced community which would have within itself all those varied lines of endeavour which exist in Eastern Canada. Under such circumstances, you would have a community that would think in the same terms as do the people of Eastern Canada. The day is not far distant when we shall have twenty or twenty-five million people in Western Canada. Immigrants are coming from all parts of the world. We want to be, above all else, Canadians, and the development of the natural resources of Western Canada will put an end forever, I think, to the annexationist and the secessionist, whether he carries on his propaganda under the political or under the economic guise.

Mr. F. H. KEEFER (Port Arthur and Kenora): Permit me to say a few words in support of this motion. I should like, instead of speaking on the matter generally, to confine myself to one particular resource, and that is iron, which is one of the most important basic elements of industry. Let me lay down a few facts. In the first place, we have in Canada an

enormous supply of low-grade iron ore; secondly, we have no high-grade iron ore. The last mine we found was the Helen Mine, and the high-grade ore there has been exhausted. Thirdly, of the total amount of iron ore that is used in this country, viz., over two million tons only four per cent is mined here. We might ask ourselves the question, why is it that with millions of tons of iron ore only four per cent is mined in Canada, notwithstanding that private capital and governmental enterprise have endeavoured to get it into the market? The answer is rather simple; it is because our ore is low-grade, and we must do something to raise its metallic content; in other words, we must get it into commercial use. Otherwise, that ore will lie undeveloped until high-grade ores in other parts of the world are exhausted, and in the meanwhile Canada will have to depend upon outside countries for its ores.

The question is, is that advisable? Is it worth while for us to consider the advisability of mining our own iron ore and trying to get the ninety-six per cent taken out in our own country? What are the benefits derivable from the mining of iron ore? First of all, the wages are spent in the country. Probably for every ton of ore mined, three or four dollars is spent in wages and supplies, and to-day that is all going out of this country. Of course, it goes without saying that this state of things is not advisable if it can be remedied. The railway earnings on that iron ore are also going out of the country. How much better it would be if these iron deposits which are known to exist all along the Canadian National Railway system were developed and used, and the Canadian National deficits to that extent turned into productiveness. It is well known that the iron ore railways are the most profitable railways everywhere. Between the passenger receipts and additional freight receipts, the coke and limestone, etc., that enter into smelting, a reasonable amount is always to be estimated as profit where there is an iron ore railway operating. To-day we annually provide for deficits for the railway, and surely it would be better to make these railways earn money by developing the iron in the country.

Another benefit that would be derived from such development would be the increase in population. You cannot mine one or two million tons of ore without having a large number of people engaged in connection with the work, and if we develop the industry that lies at our hand it is reasonable to assume that we could increase the population probably by fifteen or twenty thousand people, who would represent a certain national value to the treasury of Canada. Each person is known to be of some value to the state in the customs duties he pays, and the revenue which the state derives from him. It would pay to subsidize iron ore production in Canada. If we did we would also get a national benefit through increased railway revenues and the general prosperity of the country, and furthermore we would at once remove our present complete dependence on the United States. All of our iron ore in Ontario now practically comes from the United States. We are far from the Maritime Provinces. They get their ore from Newfoundland. Ontario must get hers from the United States. The time is not very far off when they may put an embargo upon iron ore as they have done upon coal, and for two or three years we will be helpless until we develop our low grade iron ore. It seems to me that we cannot be very far wrong in urging the development of our ores now.

Another benefit that would accrue from it would be that which we would derive in connection with the question of exchange. We are paying for this iron ore to come into the country from the United States. We are also paying something like $150,000,000 per annum for steel and iron products from the United States. If as a result of a little inducement, additional to what there is now, to develop our low grade ores, and perhaps thereby find some high grade ores, we get into this country three or four more iron mills operating, increasing the general prosperity in that business and producing that much in our own country, we are benefiting the country and we are not sending out all that money to buy these products.

There is another point that should not be lost sight of. There is a difference between mining iron and mining coal, in that every ton of coal that is mined and used is lost to the country at large except only that which has been used in making something else. But when a ton of iron ore is dug out of the ground and put into circulation the country is that much richer. It does not disappear. It is something which goes on from one form to another continuously until it oxidizes away, which takes a long while. The country is richer for every ton of iron ore that is dug out of the ground and which remains on top of the ground.

We are paying subsidies to almost everything—to railways, cables, zinc, lead, and oil. We are talking about subsidies to flax. We pay subsidies to agriculture in that we maintain experimental farms and spend $4,000,000 or $5,000,000 a year upon them, and rightly so. Surely we could spend a million or two in subsidizing the production of iron ore in this country. If we gave a dollar a ton by way of subsidy for every ton of iron ore that was produced and smelted in Canada we would get it back and we would simply be doing for that industry what we are doing for many others.

I do not wish to take up the time of the House further than to say that I believe that that this is a time when Canada should map out a forward policy in regard to its natural resources and particularly in regard to its low grade iron. We know we have low grade iron. We have not been able to find the high grade iron, but we have hundreds of millions of tons of low grade. The sooner we develop a forward policy (even to the extent of subsidizing), getting that iron upon the market, getting our own people working upon it in our own country and spending what we have here instead of outside, the better it will be for our country. I do sincerely trust that the Government will at this session give this matter its most careful consideration and that it will realize that for every dollar that we spend in benefiting the iron ore industry it will get more than a dollar paid back into its own treasury.

Mr. W. A. BUCHANAN (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, the hour of adjournment is near at hand, but I do not want the discussion to close without making some observations on a question which I consider as important as any that we have discussed in the House this session. Any member of the House who may have had doubts about the natural resources of this country should have had them removed as a result of the enlightening addresses which have been made by the members who have preceded me. I am going to confine my remarks to the coal resources of this country. I had intended making a few observations on some other of the resources that exist in the province of Alberta but I do not think I will have time to do so this afternoon. We have been reading in the press lately—and I presume the people who live in the province of Ontario have been reading it with a great deal of fear—about the probable cost of coal in this province next year. The coal supply of Ontario is in the state of Pennsylvania, and there is no doubt that that supply is being gradually and perhaps rapidly, depleted. Ontario and Quebec must look for a new source of supply for coal. I do not know whether the House is familiar with the fact that in the province of Alberta, which is generally known as a wheat growing and stock raising province, we have 87 per cent of the coal resources of the Dominion of Canada, and that it is estimated that that province has within the same area the largest coal resources of any place in the world. I am not advancing that as a promoter of mining schemes; I am simply quoting the facts that are given to us by the authorities in the Department of Mines of the Federal Government.

When we speak of Ontario and its need of fuel we naturally think of Alberta and its great resources. The Government here, and the provincial governments, will have to do something to bring western coal into Eastern Canada. I admit at once that the present price of western coal transported from Alberta into Ontario would be so high as to prevent the people of Ontario from considering its general use for fuel purposes, but I believe it is possible to overcome some of the obstacles that do exist in this regard. I believe that Ontario and Quebec can stave off the possibility of the depletion of their supply from Pennsylvania if they co-operate in encouraging the use in Western Canada entirely of Western Canadian coal. At the present time we know that in Manitoba, Pennsylvania coal is used to a very great extent. If that supply was cut off from Manitoba the western mines could have a market which would help them, while at the same time, it would relieve the consumers in the Eastern Provinces. I have been advised that even the Dominion Government, in asking for tenders for coal for some of their buildings in Manitoba, stipulate that it must be Pennsylvania coal; so that they are not encouraging the use of western Canadian coal.

What does it mean to Western Canada to have the market of the three Western Provinces?—I am not speaking of British Columbia because British Columbia has its own coal. We have been accustomed in this Parliament to hear of of the industrial troubles in the mines of Alberta practically every year.

One of the reasons for our industrial troubles is the lack of a permanent market. As the situation stands at the present time, coal is mined in Alberta almost wholly during the early fall and winter months. When we come to the spring and summer months the mines are closed and the min-

ers have to go out and look for work in other occupations. Under circumstances of that kind you cannot expect to have settled conditions in the industrial world in so far as it concerns the miners. I believe that even with coal mining developed to the extent to which it has been in Alberta—and I may say that under existing conditions there is no doubt that the coal mines have been developed to double the capacity of the market that is offered their output—if the governments, the railways, and the commercial organizations were to get together and try to reach an arrangement whereby the coal produced in Western Canada could be utilized to the greatest possible extent throughout the Western Provinces, the result could not but be beneficial to the country at large. Because if we had the market in Manitoba which at present is supplied by Pennsylvania coal it would help o maintain the coal mines on the prairies in operation during the greater part of the year.

Another matter I would like to emphasize in this connection is, the question of transportation. At present our coal is being mined and shipped at about the same time that our grain is being shipped, consequently the railroads are not in a position to handle coal satisfactorily and cheaply. If we were able to have summer mining of coal in Alberta, the railroads should be in a position to haul the coal much more cheaply than they do at the present time, because it would be a slack season in transportation eastward. All that is necessary in that regard is to educate the consumer and the dealer in Winnipeg and in other western cities to store coal in the summer for use in the winter.

Might I also mention the fact, which has been advanced by people who have investigated the coal industry in Alberta, that if it was possible to operate the mines month in and month out during the year, whereby the miners would have steady occupation and a regular income, it would be possible to produce coal a good deal cheaper than it is produced at the present time.

The points I have urged should be kept in mind: there should be encouragement of the use of Western Canada coal in the West in order to help the eastern provinces in obtaining their supply from Pennsylvania; a solution of the transportation problem should be provided by the operation of the mines in the summer months thus guaranteeing steady employment to the miners; and a campaign of education should be conducted to establish to the people in the extreme parts of Western Canada that the coal produced on the prairies, or at least a great amount of it, compares very favourably with the coal produced in the state of Pennsylvania. I know that from experience because I have lived in Ontario and used Pennsylvania coal. I have been using Pennsylvania coal in this city during the past winter, and I certainly do not consider that the coal mined in the southern part of the province of Alberta takes any secondary place to the coal produced in Pennsylvania. But we must educate the people to the need of using our western coal.

Another point I would like to bring out is this: it would be important, in order to educate the people and get them to use Western Canada coal, to grade the coal because as it is at present all Western Canada coals go on the market and they are considered to be prairie coal and are bought as though they were all alike, and of course that is not the case. Certain of our Western Canada coals are of much higher quality than others and if there was a grading of coal it would be very helpful in educating people to their use.

I presume the Acting Prime Minister is desirous of making some observations on the resolution that we have been discussing this afternoon, and therefore I do not want to unduly extend my remarks although I had intended speaking at much greater length on the question of our resources.

An hon. MEMBER: Move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. BELAND: That would kill the debate, we should never reach it again.

Mr. BUCHANAN: It has been suggested that I should move the adjournment of the debate.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The hon. gentleman can speak until six o'clock if he wishes.

Mr. BUCHANAN: We are asking this Government to encourage the development of coal and all the natural resources that we possess in this country. I might point out the fact that to-day individuals as well as companies are investing probably all their means in the development of our natural resources throughout Western Canada. Men are going up into the mountains and looking for ore. They are going about the prairies searching for oil. They are investing their money in digging wells in the effort to obtain oil, and in many instances they are exhausting their entire

financial resources for that purpose. I think therefore it is only right that we should ask not only the Federal Government, but the Provincial Governments where they are in control of the natural resources, to encourage in every possible way the development of our natural resources.

What is the need of Canada at the present time? We have a great debt in this country. How are we going to meet it? We are told to produce. We can produce in the factories, on the land, and in the mines of this country. We have great natural resources that only need to be developed in order to enrich this country; and if we could only develop those resources to the extent of one-fourth of their value at the present time we would have no trouble in meeting our obligations as a nation. There is no cause for any person in this country to be discouraged about the future of Canada. All we need to do is to move around this Dominion to realize the great resources we possess; and we cannot help but become prouder of our country and cannot help but glory in the fact that in Canada we have as great wealth and as great opportunities as are to be found in any land in the world to-day. What is requisite is to encourage the development of those resources, and give an opportunity to the people to take advantage of the wealth that is in the country, and there will be no need for the Government to worry about the future of Canada and no need for the honest, capable and ambitious citizen of Canada to worry about it either.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Now that six o'clock has been reached, may I ask, what will become of this debate?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Government Orders have precedence to-morrow. Under Rule 33 the motion which is being debated shall stand first on the Order Paper under the heading of "Public Bills and Orders," and this debate, which was not adjourned, may be continued at the first sitting of the House at which Public Bills and Orders are called.

At six o'clock the House adjourned, without question being put, pursuant to rule.

INDEX

FOURTH SESSION — THIRTEENTH PARLIAMENT, 1920.

Abbreviations.—1r., 2r., 3r.=first, second, or third reading. Admn.=Administration; Amdt.=Amendment. Com.=Committee. Div.=Division. Dept.=Department. Govt.=Government. M.=Motion. Ques.=Question. Ref.=Reference. Rep.=Report. Res.=Resolution. Sec.=Section.

Abey, Mr. H. R. ques. 1000

Acadia Refining Company, 3226

Acton Vale post office, ques. 1899

Adams, Mr. Thomas, ques. 1002, 3551

Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 11, 47, 87, 114, 161, 181, 231.

Adjournment. *See* House of Commons

Admiralty. *See* Naval Service

Admiralty Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 2842; 2r., 3086; com., 3086; 3r., 3086

Adulteration of Food. *See* Food and Drugs Bill

Aerial Navigation. *See also* British North America Act
Air Service, 4553
Material, purchase of for, ques. 1359
Tax, suggested, 3592

Age of Consent. *See* Criminal Code

Agricultural Gazette, 1085

Agricultural Machinery Bill (Standardization of Parts), 1r., 2079

Agriculture. *See debates under* Canadian Wheat Board; Commercial Feeding Stuffs
Co-operation with the provinces, 603
Dairying industry. *See that title*
Department, Estimates, 2382
Experimental farms. *See that title*
Farm labour, ques. 800, 1011, 1220, 1227
Government, and, 610
Improvement in, 677
International Institute of, 2411
Potatoes, exportation, ques. 1360
Statement and review by Minister, 2366

Agriculture and Colonization, Com., 306, 540

Alberta Penitentiary, ques. 2777, 3855

Alcohol. *See also* Inland Revenue; Opium and Drugs; Proprietary; Prohibition; Special War Revenue
Industrial, 70, 324

Aliens, 150, 155, 229. *See also* Dominion Franchise; Education; Immigration; Naturalization
Detention camps, in, ques. 314
Enemy, naturalization, ques. 992
Immigrants and Canadian Citizenship, M (Mr. Steele), 812

Allan, Mr. G. W. (South Winnipeg)
Returns to House, 1295

Allies. *See also* League of Nations
Peace Conference at Ostend, 2476, 2574

Alpine Club, 3288

Alves, Mr., death of, ques. 1463

Amery, Colonel, and Speaker's Chair, 3224

Ames, Sir Herbert B. (St. Antoine)
League of Nations—review and summary, 3961. League of Nations a reality—partisanship in international relationships deprecated—history and description of League—meetings—specific tasks and achievements—permanent institutions designed and prepared for—transit—armaments—mandates and minorities—registration of treaties—emergent measures—duties as financial director—first assembly, November, 1920—the Secretariat an international civil service—Canada's opportunity. Questions answered; *for details see* League of Nations
Return of to House, 3623

Anderson, Mr. R. K. (Halton)
Brant Military Hospital, ques. 2519
Federal Bureau of Education, 1370
Income tax, errors in returns, 3302
Opium and Drug Bill, 1636-7, 1644-5, 1746
Parliamentary Restaurant—messengers, 3098
Sugar, price of, 1896

Andrews, Mr. George W. (Centre Winnipeg)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 171. Free trade, 171; returned soldiers; true party discipline, 173; going over to cross benches, 174
Budget, 3012. Members' indemnity, 3012; pensions for soldiers and their dependents—war profits, 3013; conscription of financial and managerial ability; Mr. Meighen on Britain and British policy—trust the people, 3015
Canadian Wheat Board, ques. 2182
Canteen profits, ques. 800
Hudson Bay Company lands, ques. 1897
League of Nations and United States, ques. 1118
Oleomargarine, 1869
Pensions, 433, 511
Returned soldiers, provision for, M. for special com. 511
Soldier Settlement, 2135-6
Universal military training, 945

Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 1622-3; 2r., com., 1839; 3r., 1840

Animals, Feeding of. *See* Commercial Feeding Stuffs

Annuities. *See* Government Annuities

Anticosti, North Point light, ques. 1361

Antigonish and North Sydney, Public works, ques. 543, ques. 1004

Appeals. *See* Supreme Court Act

Apple Barrels. *See* Inspection and Sale

Appropriation Acts
1. Bill No. 36 (for 1920-1, for $62,900,-986.09), 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 756
2. Bill No. 67 (for 1920-21, for $2,083,-333.33). Res., 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 1289
3. Bill No. 166 (for 1919-20, for $3,175,-199.81; and for 1920-1, for $64,984,-319.42 interim). Res., 3215, 3217; 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 3218
4. Bill No. 221 (for 1919-20, for $15,875,-999.03; and for 1920-21, for $321,980,-760.61). Res., 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 4587

"Arabic," SS. Loss of Govt. vouchers in, ques., 3489

Archambault, Mr. Joseph (Chambly and Verchères)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 292. Address seconded in English, not in French—proposed general election; reply to Mr. Meighen, 292; reply to Mr. Hocken, 293; dissolution of Parliament, historical review, 294
Auditor General's report, 4276
Bankruptcy Bill, 4263
Budget, 2925. Farmers' delegation on conscription, 2925; increase of public debt, 2926; "advances unaccounted for," 2927; income tax, exemption on account of children, 2928; cost of living—Board of Commerce—profiteers, 2929; Dominion Textile Company—purchases in connection with advances to Greece and Roumania, members of Parliament interested, 2930; new taxes, proposed taxation of war wealth, 2932; food gamblers, 2933; banks and credits for speculation; tariff commission and revision, personal position, 2934; exchange rate and soldiers' pay—withholding of information on public affairs by Gov., 2936
Canteen profits, 709
Chambly fort, 3769
Daylight saving, 1574
Desjardins, "Ti-Noir," ques. 315
Dominion Franchise Bill
Aliens—certificate, 2216, 2221, 2243
Liquor on polling day, 1108
Polling divisions, 1517
Proclamation—language of publication, 1834, 2292
Explosive works at Beloeil, 2247-48
Freight car situation, ques. 319; ques. 997
French wine imports, ques, 1627
Gambling, 3428
Grand Trunk shareholders, 3426-27
Greece and Roumania, ques. 415; ques. 2414
Habeas Corpus, 3296
House of Commons
Debates—translation of French speeches, 697, 4587
Income tax
Exemptions on account of children, 2928, 3297-8
Forms in French, 1084, 1573
Inquiry for returns, 618, 4258
International Labour Conference, ques. 803

Archambault, Mr. Joseph—*Con.*
Kingston harbour works, 458
Kinmel Camp riots, 709
Judges' salaries, 3227
Letter of French Canadian at war front, 284
Militia, 3660-3
Naturalization, Alsace-Lorraine, 3921
Navy League of Canada, ques. 802
Opium and Drug Bill, 1749, 1759
Peace Treaty, Bulgaria, 489
Printing Bureau, Sunday work, 4020
Purchasing Commission—Public Accounts Com., 1474, 4580-3
Racial and religious rights, 489
Roumania, ques. 2413, ques. 3488
Russia, trade with, 4322
St. Johns election, 2239
St. Lawrence channel, 230, 856
Shipbuilding, 640
Contracts, ques. 314, 917
Steel plates for, ques. 706
Soldiers
Cash gratuities, 1084
Payments to in sterling, ques. 2008
Steel and shipping merger, 1953
United States railways and Canadian freight, 1789
Victory loans, ques. 803
Commissions, ques. 320
Committee, ques. 2008
Vimy battlefield, ques. 1358
Washington, Canadian Minister at, 2474

Archibald, Col. Grassie, ques. 2007

Argue, Mr. Ira E. (Swift Current)
Eight-hour day, 449
Experimental Farms, 2389, 3159

Armenians,
League of Nations and, 855, 1465, 3979

Armstrong, Mr. John A. M. (North York)
Franchise Bill, 1067

Armstrong, Mr. Joseph E. (East Lambton)
Budget Speech, copies of, 2626
Car shortage, 884
Daylight saving, 1084
Ethyl alcohol, 3497
Franchise Bill
Advance and proxy voting, 1164
Voters' lists, 2419-20
Grand Trunk strike and pensions, 1129
Illustration farms, 2384
International Parliamentary Conference, ques. 2721

Armstrong, Mr. Joseph E.—*Con.*
Mines Department, 3803
National defence, 4305
Naval Service, additional appropriation, 4305-10
Newspaper postage, 3349, 3755-8
Oil—Hudson Bay—Great Slave Lake, 3811-2
Royal Commission on Natural Resources, ques. 4502
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill, 3476
Collection, progress of, 3480-1, 3600
Furniture—auctions, 3575
Jewellery, 3579
Musical instruments, 3595
Proprietary medicines, 3600-4
Steel and Shipping merger, 1956
British Empire Steel Corporation, ques. 2777
Vessel Rates
Board of Railway Commissioners, control by, ques. 2414, 2777
Inland and coastwise (Railway Act Amdt. Bill), 160, 1707-27, ques. 2772
Ocean; res., 2013

Armstrong, Mr., Director of Coal Operations. *See under* Coal Operations

Army. *See also* Soldiers
Court martial procedure, ques. 1359
Surplus stores, ques. 1229
War Boots and Shoes, ques. 506

Arsenals. *See* Dominion arsenals; Militia

Arthabaska-Victoriaville, branch line, ques. 4502

Arthur Young Company, 3742. *See also* Civil Service; Griffenhagen
Wolff, Mr. L. R., ques. 1624

Arthurs, Mr. James (Parry Sound)
Alves, Mr., death of, ques. 1463.
Franchise Bill
Aliens—certificate, 2231-56
Peace and good order, 1106-8
Voters' list, 2421, 3892
Pensions and Re-establishment, 3936-40
Point of order—militia—relevancy, 3663
War trophies, 4557

Asbestos, 4513. *See*
Asbestos postmaster, ques. 320

Asiatics in Canada. *See* Chinese; Japanese; Naturalization; Orientals; Franchise Bill

Assiniboia
By-election. 56, 126, 137, 168, 3473. *See also* Recall
Expenses of Candidates, 1172, 1174-84
Grasshopper plague, 128
Sessional indemnities for unrepresented years, 129

Atlantic Sugar Refinery Company, 3226

Auditor General's Report, 458, 4276
Fourth volume, 2179, 2390
Publication in French, ques. 1627

Austrian and German Imports, ques. 2416, ques., 3359

Automobiles, 119, 2823, 2815. *See also* Special War Revenue Act
Imports and excise, ques. 591
Manufacturing plants in Canada, ques. 1201
Smuggled, ques. 807; ques. 1001
Taxes on, 2487

Autonomy of Canada. *See* Canada's National Status; **Bulgarian Treaty; League of** Nations; Peace Treaty

Bacon Industry. *See* Commercial Feeding Stuffs

Badges, Naval Service, 437. *See also* Naval Service

Bagot County
Electoral list, ques. 2011
Postal inspection, ques. 2721

Baie de Chaleur Harbours, 2185

Baker, Late Lieut. Col. G. H., M.P.,
Memorial to, 181, 2776, 3557,

Baldwin, Mr. Willis K. (Stanstead)
Budget, 2539. Luxury taxes, 2539; parties and reciprocity, 2540; Liberal party's tariff policy, 2540; immigration and national development, 2541; railways; West Indies, and Confederation, 2543
Food and Drugs Bill, 1262
Opium and Drug Bill, 1755
Scientific Research, 2174
Special War Revenue Bill, 3463
Retailer, effect upon, 3474
Sale (1 per cent) tax, 3467
Stamp taxes, collection of, 1262, 1755

Ball, Mr. Robert J. (Southeast Grey)
Burbidge-Messines, ques. 2721

Ballantyne, Hon. C. C. (Minister of Marine and Fisheries and Minister of the Naval Service)
Budget, 2533. Business profits war tax—tariff and cost of living, 2534; Liberal party tariff policy, 2535; free trade and the farmers, 2539
Buoy Service, 2116
Canada Shipping Act Amdt (Masters and Mates) 406-7, 563, 573-4, 980-3, 1610-2
Canada Shipping Act Amdt (Pilotage) 1839, 1967
Canada Shipping Act Amdt (Steamboat Inspection) 1050-2, 1762, 1776, 2125
Canadian Government Merchant Marine. *See also under this title* Shipbuilding
Business statement, 950
Operation, 641, 645
Information concerning withheld-policy justified, 1650, 1659-61, 1667, 1681
Steamers
"Canadian Inventor," delay in sailing, 3226, 3360
"Canadian Recruit" wreck of, 649
"Canadian Sealer," 649
"Canadian Spinner," 649
Canadian National Railway, ships and, 904
Cape Race, 2117
Export trade, larger desired, 621
Fish inspection, 1052-4, 4585-6
Fisheries, 3521-3
Overseers and guardians, 3523
Protection and patrol, 3524
Treaty with United States, 1290
Government policy, expected announcement, 583
Government steamers
Buying for, 1610
Wages, 1598, 1600, 1609-11
Halifax marine agency, 2110
Icebreakers, 1598-1612, 2103-7
"J. D. Hazen," 1599, 1602
"Montcalm," 1606-7
St. Lawrence, new vessel for, 1620-1
Uniforms of men, 1603-4
Fair wage contracts, 1608-9
Jellicoe, Admiral, report of, 344
Australia and New Zealand, 1160
India, 1290
Printing, 386
Lighthouse Service
British Columbia patrol boats, 1616
Grand Etang, 2114
Lighthouse Board, 2117-8
Salaries, 2110-4
Liquor Shipments, Ontario-Michigan border, 2108

Ballantyne, Hon. C. C.—*Con.*
Little Sands, 4580
Live stock shipments inspection, 1615
Lunenburg—registrar, 2108-10
Magdalen Islands, 649, 651, 1601
Relief ships to, 1742
Marine Dept. and members of Parliament, 2121
Marine Dept., services restored to, 3507
Naval College graduates, 4562
Naval Defence of the Empire
Statement on motion for Supply, 3498 Dominion Ministers' memorandum—Lord Jellicoe, 3499. Government's official statement on naval affairs—acceptance of Admiralty's offer of ships—Naval Service Act, 1910, 3500; "Niobe" and "Rainbow"—war, recruiting and casualties—Naval college—distinguished officers, 3502; reorganization—details of ships from Admiralty—Naval estimates, 3503; efficiency of Service—fisheries protection—Navy Leagues, 3504; submarines to be sold—other Overseas Dominions and Great Britain, expenditures, 3505; service on pre-war lines, 3507. *See also under this title* Naval Service
Naval Service. *See also, under this title,* Naval Defence
Additional appropriation, $1,700,000—4291-4302, 4314, 4398-4402, 4408-9
Civil Service insurance and, 1779
Correspondence and negotiations, 4408, 4413
Ministerial statement, 707-8
Pre-war lines, 4391
Naval Service Badge, 439-45
Naval Service Dept.
Estimates—agreement as to debate on, 441-2
Salaries, 4409-11
Navigation
Aid and protection, 2115
Schools of, 1612-3
Pardee, Mr. and taxation—Montreal address, 2742
Pictou Harbour Bill, 2184-90; 3491-94
Pilots. *See also under this head,* Canada Shipping Act
Pensions, 4579-80
St. John, 2119-22
Quebec grain elevators, 657
Race tracks, influence of, 3428
Registration of shipping, 1614
St. John harbour, 2119, 3492-3
St. Lawrence channel, ice conditions, 230, 856-8

Ballantyne, Hon. C. C.—*Con.*
St. Lawrence dredging, 1616-20
Shipbuilding, 618, 641, 651, 662-9
Canadian-built ships, quality of, 625
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 622, 659
Cattle shippers, and, 911
Contracts, 662-9, 892, 907-910, 916
Georgian Bay Canal, and, 915
Government ownership, 903, 908
Government programme finished, 905-7
Prices, 895, 900-2. *See also under this title,* Contracts
Profiteering, denied, 901
Profits—financial statement, 902-3
Ship plates, 623
Ships at Quebec, 916
Supply—vote of $20,000,000, 618, 892
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 3994, 4001, 4013-14, 4145-51, 4157-68
Unforeseen expenses, 1616
Wharves, 2122
Winter fishing, 1609
Wrecks—investigation, 1612

Bank Act Amdt. Bill (Interest rate), 1r., 992

Banking and Commerce, Com., 306

Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bills.
1. 1r., 920 (Mr. Jacobs)
2. 1r., 2246; 2r., com., 3255; 3r., 3265
Senate amdt. 4263
Trustees, ques. 2414

Banks, Chartered, ques., 591. *See also* Special War Revenue; Finance
Interest allowed to Government by, ques. 673
Moneys received from, 1001
Shipbuilding and, 4008
Wheat crop and, 4351

Barley. *See* Commercial Feeding Stuffs

Barron, Capt. John A., 857

Batiscan Bridge, ques. 317, ques. 1230

Battlefields Memorials
Com. on, 1460, 1738, 2078, 2177
Quebec, fortifications of, 421

Baugh, E. L. and **Tapley, W. H.,** 2015

Bawdy Houses. *See* Criminal Code

Begin, Cardinal, insult to, 1574

Béland, Hon. Henri S. (Beauce)
Air Service, 4555-6
Ames, Sir Herbert and League of Nations, 3623
Budget, date of, 2247
Butter and cheese, grading, 603
Canada and the Empire, 503
Canada Year Book, 1879
Canadian National Railways
Operation and withholding of information, 1656, 3086
Canadian Trade, extension of, 1883-5
Car shortage, 885
Civil Service
Classification, 4172. *See also, under this title,* House of Commons
Holidays, 4061, 4261
Retirement, 2179, 4464-5
Conservation Commission, 3286
Demobilization, 4552
Federal Bureau of Education, 1372
Franchise Bill
Proclamation—language of publication, 1834-6, 2272
Voters' lists, posting of, 3910
Franking privilege, 3763-7
Grosse Isle, 3555
House of Commons
Members, attendance of, 445-9
Staff, classification, 949, 1037-9, 4504, 4563-7
Imperial ex-Service men immigration of, 387
Income tax
Canadian Pacific Railway and, 3306
Dividends, when liable, 3305
Indemnity of members, 3242-3
Indemnity of Members and salaries of Ministers; votes of Messrs. Lanctot and Proulx, 4455
Indians, tuberculosis amongst, 3276
Inquiries for returns, 4258
International Financial Conference, 1465
International Labour Conference, 3359
League of Nations
Belgium, Spain, Greece, Brazil, 3978
Canada's status and relations, 352-3, 481-3
Canadian representative in Assembly, 567, 1046
Commercial treaties, 3973
Next assembly of League, 3977
Saar Basin, 3974
United States, 3977
Mint, the, 616
Moving Pictures of Canada, 1882-3
National parks—big game, 3285

Béland, Hon. Henri S.—*Con*
Naval Service
Estimates, agreement as to, debate on, 4411
Estimates and expenditure, 3508-10
Opium and Drug Bill, 1630-6, 1646-8, 1706, 1752-3
Parliament Buildings, 7
Parliamentary restaurant, 3094-5
Peace Treaty
Belgium, 481
Ratification, 477
Pensions and Re-establishment, 615
Com. on
Recommendations, legislation concerning, 4504
Report not printed in French, 2016
Resignation of Mr. Peck, 2082
Prime Minister, health of, 114
Proprietary medicines, 3603
Purchasing Board, 1468, 1471
Rural mail carriers, 4524
St. Lawrence dredging, 1617-8
Serbia, reported credit to, 567
Soldier Settlement, 2130
Special War Revenue Bill, 3327-8, 3343
Spirits and medicated wines, 3793
Sporting goods, 3571
Universal military training, 945
Washington, Canadian representative at, 1742, 2473-4

Belgium, advances to, ques. 318. *See also* League of Nations; Peace Treaty

Bell Telephone Company, rates appeal, ques. 2009

Beloeil, explosive works at, 2247, 2314

Bersimis and Rimouski service, ques. 1463

Best, Mr. John (Dufferin)
Civil Service
Classification, salary increases in advance of, 551
Senate staff, 4060
Superannuation, 4266-7
Eight-hour day, 374
Franchise Bill
Assiniboia expenses, 1174, 1183
Deposit, 1095
Recall, the, 2028-9
Returning officers, 1525, 1527-8
Voting on certificate, 1099
Indians, education of, 3280
Judges' salaries and pensions, 4417-22
Oleomargarine, 1852-56
Purchasing Board, 1468, 1471
Rural mail, 4529
Special War Revenue Bill, 3330, 3335-6

Biggar, Lieut. Col Oliver Mowat, K.C. 588, ques. 1462, 4264-9, 4516. *See also* Dominion Franchise, Chief Electoral Officer.

Bills, Divorce, remission of charges in, 4321, 4413

Biological Board, ques. 2572

Bird, Mr. Eustace G. ques. 1625

Blair, Mr. W. J. (Battle River)
Screenings, ques. 704

Blake, Mr. Matthew R. (North Winnipeg)
Coal operations director, 3179
Indemnity of Members, 4082
Opium and Drug Bill, 1638-9
Purchasing Commission, 1473-4
Universal military training, 940

Blondin, Hon. P. E., 57, 79, 82, 138, 209
Trip to Europe, ques. 541. *See also* Postmaster General

Board of Commerce, 198, 229, ques. 408, ques. 592, ques. 1740, 1947
Canners, inquiry concerning, 1045
Chairman, Judge Robson, resignation of, 11, 73, 114, 120, 3769, 3863
Correspondence tabled, 85, 4258, 4502-03
M. for papers, 1900
Civil Service Commission, and, 3426
Dairy and pork industry and, 605, 611, 1009, 1017, 1844
Farmers and, 3401
McNichol, Mr. J. L., 994
M. (Mr. Deslauriers) for abolition, 1139
M. for papers, 2015
Murdock, Mr., resignation of, 4170-71, 4466
Letter, text of, 4481
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., K.C., resignation of, 1684, 3685
Prosecutions, ques. 996
Report, ques. 2012
Inquiry as to, 3227, 3426, 3427
Presented, 3358
Resignation of members, 4258-59
Robson, Judge. *See title under this,* Chairman
Validity of Act constituting, 3685
Wholesale grocers, dismissal of Mr. Arthur S. Porter, 568

Board of Railway Commissioners. *See* Railway Commission.

Board of Translators. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. (French Version)

Boards of Trade Act Amdt Bill. 1r., 2r., 4414; com., 3r., 4460

Boivin, Mr. George Henry (Shefford). *See* Deputy Speaker

Bolshevism, 1495, 3649. *See also* Criminal Code; Immigration; Industrial Unrest.

Bonaventure
Experimental Farms, ques. 414
Pensioners, ques. 993
Postmasters, ques. 507
Public Works engineer, ques. 411
Wharves, ques. 411

Bonaventure and Gaspe
Dairy products and fish, ques. 587

Bonds. *See also* Finance; Loans; Victory Loans
Canadian Government, since beginning of war, ques. 2008

Bonus. *See* Civil Service

Book-making. *See* Criminal Code

Books
Banned, Regina library, 396
Customs duties, 3110
German and Austrian imports, ques. 806

Boots. *See also* Special War Revenue
And shoes, army, ques. 506, ques. 1229
And shoes, prices, 3329-30

Borden, Right Hon. Sir Robert (Prime Minister)
Allies conference at Ostend, 2476, 2574
Bankruptcy Bill, 4097
Bill disposed of—question not to be raised during same session, 3426
Board of Commerce
Correspondence, 3426
Murdock, Mr., resignation of, 4171
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., resignation of, 3685
Report, 3227
Resignation of members, 4258-9
Robson, Judge, Chairman
Correspondence, 3769, 4258, 4502-3,
Budget debate, not limited by amdt., 2518
Budget Speech, inquiry for copies, 2626
Canadian Wheat Board, 3561
Civil Service
Grievances—appeal, 3141-2
Holidays, 4061-2, 4259-62
Senate amdts to Bill, 4259
Coal Operations Director Bill, jurisdiction, 3692
Orders in Council, ratification of, 3362-5

Borden, Right hon. Sir Robert—*Con.*
Coal problem. M. for supply to discuss, 3685-8, 3692
Customs Act (Export regulations) 3620-2, 3690, 3768
Customs and Post Office Departments
Rumoured investigation, 3623, 3941
DeCelles, Mr. A. D., 2968
Departments of Government, reductions of, 4456
Electricity and gas, taxation of, 3106
Fisheries treaties with United States, 3161
French treaty, 4505
Fuel Supply—Special powers for Railway Commission, 4506, 4324-31
United States, attitude of, 4329
See also under this title, Coal
Gauthier, Mr.—complaint of treatment by civil servant, 4097
Grand Trunk Railway Acquisition—Arbitrators, 3490, 3860-1
Health of, absence from Parliament, 9, 18, 31, 38, 49, 51, 114, 199
House of Commons. *See also under this title,* Indemnity
Adjournments
Empire day, 2574-5, 2625-6
King's Birthday, 3080
Business of the House, 3106, 3957
Honour of—statement by Rev. Dr. Speer, 3490, 3558
Members, attendance of, 4457-9
Saturday and morning sittings, preparedness of Government's legislation, attendance of Ministers, 2778-84, 3684
Two o'clock sittings, 3080
Immigration Act, Amdt of, 3426
Indemnity of Members, 3228, 4076
Illness, 4458
Increase proposed, 4379-80
Round robin, alleged, 2967
Indemnity of Members and Salaries of Ministers
General statement on moving 2r. of Bill, 4427-31
In reply, 4454-6
In Com. on Bill, 4456-9
Inquiries for returns, 3226, 3769, 4258
International Joint Commission, 3986
International Labour Conference, 3359
Judges' Salaries and Pensions, 4425-6
Lachine Canal, 3424
League of Nations—Ames, Sir Herbert, return of, 3623
Militia Pension Bill, 3959
Munitions Resources Commission, 2892
Naval Service
Additional appropriation $1,700,000, 4385
Correspondence with Imperial Gov,. 4503

Borden, Right hon. Sir Robert—*Con.*
News Service, 4532-3
Newsprint, 2893, 3227
Parliament, two sessions in one year, 4457
Pecuniary Claims Convention, 3857
Pensions Bill, 3959
Widowed mother, dependent parent, 4050-3
Pensions and Re-establishment
Com. recommendations, special facilities for legislation provided, 3957
M. (Mr. Cronyn) to adopt Com. report, 3954
Fisheries and returned men amdt. (Mr. Peck) 3955
Further legislation, 4504
Post Office and Customs Department
Rumoured investigation by United States firm, 3623, 3491
Prime Minister and portfolio, 4456
Printing Com. report, 4503
Private Bills, special facilities, 3957
Race track betting, 3433
Return of to the House, 2315-16
Salaries Act and House of Commons Act Amdt. (Indemnity and Salaries) 4380
Ships from British Admiralty, correspondence, 4413
Speaker's Chair, 3224-5
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. 3321-2
Speer, Rev. Dr., statement by, 3090, 3558
State Insurance for returned soldiers, 3958
Supplementary Estimates, inquiry as to, 3769
Theriault and St. Quentin, N.B.. 3080
War Memorial, 3228
Washington, Canadian representative at, 2451-4, 4538-43
Correspondence, 3081
West Indies Conference, 3161

Border Chamber of Commerce
Vessel rates—resolution, 1733

Boucher, Mr. Philippe, ques. 2413

Boundary Waters, pollution of, 3552

Bounties Act Administration, 1877

Bourassa, Mr. Joseph B. (Lévis)
Boucher, Mr. Philippe, ques. 2413
Chaudière station, ques. 508
Lévis drill hall caretaker, ques. 1360
Printing Bureau employees, ques. 2005
Quebec harbour steam dredge, ques. 999
St. Romuald postmaster, ques. 2005

Boyce, Mr. George (Carleton)
Commercial Feeding Stuffs, 3405
Eight-hour day, 376

Boyce, Mr. George—*Con*
Franchise Bill
Debate on, 1837-8
Proclamation, language of publication, 2303-4
Oleomargarine, 608, 1870-1
Rural mail, 4525

Boyer, Mr. Gustave (Vaudreuil-Soulanges)
Lighthouse keepers, ques. 1897
Ste. Anne bridge, 3774-5
Ste. Anne de Bellevue hospital, ques. 1115
Soulanges canal road, ques. 999

Boys, Mr. William A. (South Simcoe)
Food and Drugs Bill, 972-8
Grand Trunk strike and pensions, 1130-6
Icebreakers, 2107
Indian Act Amdt. Bill—enfranchisement, 4029-35, 4176

Bran. *See* Commercial Feeding Stuffs

Brant Military Hospital, ques. 2519

Bridges, provincial and Dominion authorities, and, 3769

Brien, Mr. John Wesley (South Essex)
Opium and Drug Bill, 1643

Bristol, Mr. Edmund (Toronto Centre)
Shipbuilding, 628
Steel and shiping merger, 1948
Vessel rates, proposed regulation, 1718

British Columbia
Lighthouse service, 1616
Railways. *See* Railway Act Amdt.
Water Powers, ques. 1118

British Columbia Indian Lands Bill, 1r. 386; 2r., com., 787, 950, 3r., 1047, 1152

British Empire Steel Corporation, ques. 2777, 4010. *See also* Steel Industry

British North America Act Amdt. 4379
Aerial navigation, 4169
Motion for papers, 811
Power to amend, 464, 479

British Parliament and Speaker's Chair, 3224

British Preference, ques. 811

Brouillard, Mr. Joseph O. (Drummond and Arthabaska)
Burke, Rev. A. E., ques. 2079
Civil Service Classification, ques. 2181
Parliament Buildings
Commons Chamber floor, ques. 2894

Brouillard, Mr. Joseph O.—*Con.*
Parliament Buildings—*Con.*
Cost of heating plant, ques. 2896
Scaffolding, ques. 3079
Tower, ques. 2894
Roy, Mr. Gustave, ques. 1899
Victoriaville-Arthabaska branch line, ques. 4502

Buchanan, Mr. William A. (Lethbridge)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 121. Proposed general election and western representation, 121; personal attitude and Union Government—public unrest, freedom the cure, 122; profiteering—tariff—income tax, 123; national railways—Peace Treaty, 124
Budget, 2762. Tributes to Mr. Rinfret and Minister of Finance—paying war expenses by taxation, 2763; economy—tariff and cost of living, 2765; tariff and development of resources—favours tariff reduction—trade with trans-pacific countries, 2765
Coal Operations Director Bill, 3373-5
Farm labour for spring work, ques. 800
Flour mills, small, ques. 799
Franchise Bill, 1588
Income and business profits taxes, ques. 806
Industrial disputes, 1979
Industrial Survey by Mr. Ponton, ques. 341
Irrigation, 3695-9
Natural resources development, 1032
Newspaper postage rate, 3353
One Big Union, ques. 409
Pensions and Re-establishment, 536
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 395
Rural mail route, 506
Seed Grain advances, ques. 321, ques. 674
Soldiers' settlement, 3223

Buckwheat. *See* Commercial Feeding Stuffs

Budget. *See also* Ways and Means
Debate on, 2495, 2520, 2575, 2626, 2670, 2723, 2786, 2843, 2896, 2969
Amdt. (Mr. Fielding) neg., resolution agreed to, 3077-8
Arrangements for, and announcement, 2247, 2318, 2576, 2840, 3026, 3045
Date of, inquiry, 1047, 2126, 2247, 2778
Speech, 2476
Announcement as to date of, 2247
Inquiry for copies, 2626

Budget Resolutions, 2492. *See also* Ways and Means

Buffalo, Wainwright herd, 3283

Bulgaria. *See, also* Peace Treaty; Peace Treaty Bill
Peace Treaty, 9, ques. 316, 463
Resolution and statement by Minister, 346; concurrence of Senate in, 1054

Buoys. *See* Marine

Burbidge-Messines, ques. 2721

Bureau, Mr. Jacques (Three Rivers and St. Maurice)
Admiralty Act Amdt. 3086
Apple barrels—Nova Scotia, 2018
Bankruptcy Bill, reprinting, 3265
Bills—Com.—reading of section by Chairman, 584
British Columbia Indians, 788-95
Business Profits Tax, public utilities, 3232-5
Cabinet changes, 447
Canadian National Railways
Construction and organization, ques. 510
Damage claims, delays, 886-7
Deficit, 886
Operation, suggested improvements, 888
Canadian Northern Railway
Port Arthur terminals, ques. 2012
Capital punishment, 308
Civil Service
Classification—Arthur Young Co. 549
Holidays, 4262
Insurance, 1779
Naturalized British subjects, 510
Retirement, 3826-9, 4460
Coal Operations Director Bill, 3371
Commercial Feeding Stuffs, 3163
Criminal Code Amdt. (French version) 3082-5
Dominion arsenals, 3717, 3721-2
Eight-hour day, 452-8
Electricity and gas competition and taxation, 3106, 3110, 3113-7
Enterprise Foundry Company, ques. 2415
Export regulations, 3621
Franchise Bill
Advance polls, 2000-1, 3874
Aliens, certificate, 2078, 2082, 2217
Canada Temperance Act 3865-6
Debate arrangements for, 1838, 2001
Disqualification of voters
Charitable aid, those receiving, 1814-9
"Election papers," 2023
Indians, 2055-6
Interpretation, 1986-8, 1989-91, 1994
Notices, 777
Oaths, administration of, 779
Proclamation, language of publication, 1829-31, 2273-7, 2281-2, 2291, 2305-6, 2308

Bureau, Mr. Jacques—*Con.*
Franchise Bill—*Con.*
Returning officers, 1577-84, 1591-3
Public officials, 1790
Voters' lists,
Copies, procuring of, 2320
Provincial, adoption of, 2347, 2357-66, 3895
Franking privilege, 3763
Grand Trunk Railway acquisition, 1491-3, 1505
Habeas Corpus. *See under this title,* Labrie
Honey adulteration, 2315
House of Commons. *See also under this title,* Indemnity
King's Birthday adjournment, 3080
Lobbies, admission of strangers to, 1629
Saturday and morning sittings, 2783
Serjeant-at-arms department, 3094
Staff, classification, 4504, 4563-4
Two o'clock sittings, 3080
Housing expenditure, 3545-8
Icebreakers, 1598
Ile Verte, 2111
Income tax
Absentees, 3303
Indemnity of members, 3242-3
Part payment with return, 3253
Residence or investment outside Canada, 3250
Indemnity of members, 3096, 3853, 4073, 4450
Income tax and, 3242-3
Indian Affairs Dept., 3266-7
Indians
Destitute, relief for, 3275-6
Education of, 3278
Inspection and Sale Act Amdt.—Fruit, 2018
Penalties, 2019-21
Sections repealed, 2016
Judges' salaries, 3851-3
Labrie Brothers, case of, 3296, 3847-50, 3560
League of Nations, 349
Loan Companies Act Amdt., 1776-8
Maple products, 796
Naval Service Dept.
Estimates—agreement as to debate—misunderstanding — compromise suggested, 4412
Opium and Drug Bill, 1621-2, 1630-3, 1636-8, 1703
Parliament Buildings construction, 1419-33
Parliamentary restaurant, 3095-6
Official list, 2842-3
Parliamentary translators, 3093
Petroleum and Naphtha Act Amdt. 1762

Bureau, Mr. Jacques—*Con.*
Pictou harbour, 2188-9, 3491
Purchasing Commission, 1478, 4583
Questions, inquiry as to, 2126
Questions passed as orders for returns, 1743
Race track betting, 3431-2
Railway Act Amdt. (Jurisdiction), 2413
Registered postal rate, 3732-3
Ross Rifle factory, ques. 1898; ques. 2721, 3722
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 3204, 4575
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 3989, 4003
Soldier Settlement, 1685, 1702
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. 3337-8
Acetylene gas, 3796
Automobiles, 3597-9, 3793
Bank overdrafts, 3624, 3797-9
"Consumer" how defined, 3794
Debate on Bill, arrangements for, 3455
Refunds, 3629-31
Sales taxes, 3616
Sporting goods, 3571-2
Stamp taxes, 3627
Speer, Rev. Dr., statement by, 3491, 3558
Steamboat Inspection, 1762-3
Stigma on members—personal denial, 547
Supply, interim vote, 754-5
Supreme Court Act Amdt. 2004
Technical education, 1761
Toronto letter carriers, 3424-25
Trust and Loan Company of Canada, 585
Yukon Placer Mining Act, 3106-8

Bureau of Statistics, *See* Statistics

Burke, Rev. A. E., ques., 2079

Burlington, Military Hospital, ques. 2519

Burnham, Mr. John Hampden (West Peterborough)
Adress in reply to Governor General's Speech, 66. Quebec and its "hour"—feeling developed by the war, 67; treatment of returned soldiers—cost of living, 68; farmers and class movement—exchange rate and trade—industrial alcohol, the new motive power, 70; individual liberty—prohibition—drop race and party cries, 71
Agriculture, problems of, 2400
Alien immigrants, 826
Budget, 2611. War policy and peace policy—Liberal party and Farmers' party, 2611; land taxation and security of employment—unrest and how to be quieted, 2612; group government—soldiers and their dependents—the profit system of trade, 2613; the People's party, 2614

Burnham, Mr. John Hampden—*Con.*
Business profits tax—public utilities, 3235
Campaign Funds, 1182,
Res. prohibiting, 1216, 1224; withdrawn 1228;
Civil Service
Classification, 546
Reduction of pay, 3135-8
Retirement, 3830
Superannuation, ques. 920
Coal operations director, 3178, 3372
Currie, General Sir Arthur, 3652
Demonstration farms, 2391
Eight-hour day, 334-7 454-8
Contractual rights, 373-81
Farm labour, 1220
Farmers' organization, 1219
Farmers' Party and the Dept. of Agriculture estimates, 2399-2400
Federal Bureau of Education, 1389-90
Franchise Bill
Advance and proxy voting, 1162
Aliens, 733, 2211
Contributions, 1182
Disqualification of candidates, 1089
Enumerators, 3900
Notices, 778
Proceeding by information, 776
Proclamation—language of publication, 2286-7
Provincial lists, 3888, 3897
Recall, the, 2040
Fuel situation, 3178
Grand Trunk Railway acquisition, 1487
Strike of 1910, 1540, 1565
Honour of members—point of order, 1186
Income tax
Charities, 3245-6
Exemptions on account of children, 3300
Indemnity of members, 4069-81
Indians—enfranchisement, 4033
Industrial disputes, 2250
Labour—life not arithmetic, basis of reward, 389
League of Nations
Canada's status, 349, 353
Enforcement of decisions, 3975
Militia—cadet service, 3705
Naval service, 3516
Badges, 446
Old-age pensions, 3830
Oleomargarine, 608
Parliament Buildings, 1420
Peterborough, Gov employees in, ques. 542
Postmaster, ques. 342
Prices of fuel and other necessaries; res. to fix time for full discussion, 321, 333
Prohibition, 1218, 1228

Burnham, Mr. John Hampden—*Con.*
Race track betting, 3427
Returned soldiers, provision for; m. for special Com., 514
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 389
Shipbuilding, 639
Special War Revenue Act Amdt Bill, 3326
Proprietary medicines, 3794
Trent Canal wharves, ques. 586
Wheat, new variety, 1013
Y. M. C. A., 1219

Burns, P. Company, 582

Burrell, Hon. Martin (Minister of Customs and Inland Revenue)
Address in Reply to Governor General's Speech, 273. Parliament Building—congratulations to mover and seconder, 273; Addresses of Mr. Mackenzie King and Mr. Murphy, 274; absence of Ministers from the House; Mr. Mackenzie King's record—Soldiers' Settlement, 275; Farmers' party—proposed general election, 276; protection and wheat growers, 277; tariff free list, 278; England and tariff, 279; representation of the West, 281
Civil Service, reorganization, 3738-9
Conner, James, dismissal of, 418, 421
Customs Act Amdt Bill (Firearms) 617, 1048
Customs and Excise
Collections, 3859
Estimates, 3858-9
Entomology branch, 2402
French treaty, 4505
Hewitt, the late Dr. Gordon, 2402
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. 3494-8, 3815-21, 4263
Acetic acid, 3497
Alcohol tax, 3496
Methylated spirits, 3497
Resolutions, 3494
Spirits, 3815-8
Evaporation, 3815
Illicit distillation, 3817
Illicit sales, 3498
Malt used to make vinegar, 3818
Warehoused two years, 3816
Wood alcohol, 3820
Tobacco, 3498, 3815, 3818-9
Mines Department—explosives, 3804
Peat, 3807-8
Petroleum and Naphtha Act Amdt. 1762, 1916
Post Office Act Amdt. 3347-58, 4263
Franking, 3356-8
Free matter, 3761-8

Burrell, Hon. Martin—*Con.*
Post Office Act Amdt.—*Con.*
Newspaper postage, 3347-56, 3753, 3757-61
Zone system, 3351
Postage stamps for inland revenue, 3737
Registration fee, 3347, 3732-44
Express companies and, 3744
Statutes, proposed revision, 3821

Business Profits Tax 2489. *See also* Budget; Revenue Bills; Taxation

Business Profits War Tax Act amdt Bill, res., 3111; 1r., 3117; 2r., com., 3229; 3r., 3237

Butter.. *See* Dairy; Oleomargarine
Cold storage, in, ques. 543, ques. 807
Oleomargarine and, food values, ques. 2720

Buttons, Soldiers', unauthorized wearing of, 4020

Butts, Mr. Robert H. (Cape Breton South and Richmond)
Franchise Bill
Contributions, 1197
Conveyances, 787
Provincial voters' lists, 2326-31
Hudson Bay Railway, 4243
Indemnity of members, 4089
Inverness coal, 4241
Masters and mates, 575
Newfoundland, 4242
Trade, and the Sydneys, 876
Prohibition, 102
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 3198-9
Shipbuilding, 646
Iron industry and, 900

By-Elections.. *See* House of Commons

Cabana, Mr., K.C., 3227

Cabinet Organization and Representation, 32, 40-1, 138
Blondin, Hon, Mr., 57. *See also that title.*
Changes, 447
New Brunswick, 110

Cadet Corps. *See* Militia

Cahill, Mr. Frank S. (Pontiac)
Appeal from ruling of Chair, 1071; withdrawn, 1072
Auditor General's report, 2179
Bonds, tax exempt, 3338-9
British Columbia Indians, 950-4
Canada Grain Act, 3823
Canadian National Railways; deficit and rates — construction — colonization — townsites — Mackenzie and Mann — contracts for management—equipment —finance—insurance of property, 4181-94

Cahill, Mr. Frank S.—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Coal purchases, 2380, 4251
Deficit, maintenance, 890-1
Estimates, discussion of, 4249, 4257
Extensions, 3380-1
Information, withholding of objected to, 1655, 1669
Insurance, 4257
Ties, 4250-1
Car shortage, 883, 886
Transcontinental, ques. 999
Civil Service, 3140, 3146-7
Bonus, slide masters, 1279.
Holidays, 4061
Colonization, 2399, 4182
Dredging, 1619
Excise tax (10 per cent) 3467
Filing cases, 3155
Franchise Bill
Advance polls, 1935-43
Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, 1071-2
Election expenses, 1932-3
Qualification of electors, 2243
Government annuities, 462-3
Grand Trunk Railway acquisition Bill, 1308, 1486, 1503
Arbitrators, 1047
Branch lines, 1314-7
Hanna, Mr. D. B., suit for libel, 2379
Housing, 3545-52
Soldiers, and, 3545-6
Indians
Enfranchisement, 4038-9
Lands, 3274
Kapuskasing and Spirit Lake, 2398-2401
Militia, 3974-80
Oleomargarine, 959
Ottawa River conservation, 3779
Peat, ques. 671
Penitentiaries, purchasing agent, 3840
Post Office Department, 3740-1
Question—complaint of unsatisfactory answer, 1047
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 3203
Royal Military College, 3153
Scottish Canadian Insurance Corporation, 584
Shipbuilding, 645, 3992, 4004, 4010-16
Special War Revenue Act Amdt.
Changes, when effective, 3338
Clothes, made to order, 4290
Statistical department, 3296
Steel and shipping merger, 1956-7, 4010
Timiskaming Lake, wharves, 2187-8, 3493
Trust and Loan Company of Canada, 585
Yukon Placer Mining, 3109

Calder, Hon. James A. (Minister of Immigration and Colonization)
Canadian National Railways and Canadian Government Merchant Marine—withholding of information justified, 1671-4, 1683
Civil Service Retirement, 2178-9, 3824-40, 4062-8, 4460-6
Grievances and appeal, 4460
Conner, Mr. James, 419
Distressed Canadians abroad, 4559
Exhibition Commissioner, 4558-9
Franchise Bill
Advance Polls, 1938-40
Ballot boxes, expense of returning, 1927
Provincial lists, 3889
Voters' lists, 2423, 2434-7
Voting notwithstanding disqualification, 1825
Immigrants, landing of at Montreal and Quebec, 3226-8
Immigration and Colonization Department, 4556-9
Imperial ex-Service men coming to Canada, 387
Income tax—charities, 3248
Mennonites, 2179, 2248
Militia, permanent force, 3210
Pensions Bill
Approved by Com. 4041
Canadian in French forces as reservist, 4048
Pensioner resident outside of Canada, 4045-6
Returned soldiers' insurance, 4054-6
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 4012
Soldiers' dependents in Britain, 4556

Caldwell, Mr. Thomas W. (Victoria and Carleton, N.B.)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 118. Union Government, 118; Production and Protection, 119; Farmers and Customs tariff—Board of Commerce, 120; Victoria and Carleton by-election, 121;
Budget, 2823. Ford car prices, 2823; Mr. Meighen on the tariff—the farmers' tariff policy, 2826; Mr. Fielding's amendment, 2827; the new taxes—export duty on newsprint, 2827; United States' manufacturers and Canadian prices, 2828; agricultural implements, prices, 2829; direct taxation, 2830; Victory bonds, 2831; St. John and Quebec Railway, 2832; new party, its name and policy, 2834; potato growing, 2835; farmers and prices, 2837

Caldwell, Mr. Thomas W.—*Con*
Campaign funds, 1222
Canadian National Railways
Damage claims, 4230
Demurrage—"bunched" cars, 4229-30
Maine Central connection, 3376
Rates, 1445
Westfield Beach, ques, 508, 4230
Canadian Pacific Railway, taxation, ques. 1360
Carleton and Victoria election, 121, 1223
Farm labour, 1220
Ford car, 119, 2823
Franchise Bill
Advance polls, 1933-5
Ballot and counterfoil, 1105
Election expenses, 1931
Election papers, 1928
Indians, 2055
Hours to be open, 1920-3
Residence, 1159
Voters' lists—delay, 3903
Grand Trunk Acquisition Bill, 1305, 1445, Stock, ques. 590, 753, ques. 1362
House of Commons, discussions, difficulty in hearing, 4055
Pensions and Re-establishment, 434, 3942, 4049
Potatoes exported, ques. 1360
Returned soldiers, 515
Pensions, 516
University students, 519
St. John and Quebec Railway, ques. 1036
Soldier settlement, 516, 2136-7, 2150, 3218
Special War Revenue—boots, 3563-5, 3585

Campaign Funds. *See also* Dominion Franchise Bill, contributions
Res. (Mr. Burnham) to prohibit, 1182

Campbell, Mr. J. A. (Nelson)
Budget, 3045. Direct taxes approved—luxury taxes, fees, 3045; canoes—difficulty of collecting tax—tariff, 3046; tariff situation in England—trade policy for Canada, 3047; farming not to be handicapped, 3048; mining machinery should be free of duty—Prairie provinces and their natural resources, 3049
Canadian motor car plants, ques. 1201
Canadian National Railways
Townsites—equipment, 4191
Western branch lines, 4232
Canoes, tax on, 3588
Economic Development Commission, ques. 1896
Franchise Bill—telegraph, communications by, 1068

Campbell, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*
Hudson Bay Railway, ques. 806, 4231-3
Completion, Res. in favour of, 2014
Natural resources prairie provinces, ques. 995, 1047, ques. 1461
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 3195-6
Special War Revenue—furs, 3792
Trent Canal, ques. 1359
Welland canal, ques. 1358

Campbellton-Cross Point, ques. 411, ques. 1789, ques. 2415
Bridge and ferry, ques. 342, ques. 3490
Steamer service, ques. 588

Canada and United States. *See* that title under League of Nations; Washington, Canadian representative,

Canada Gazette, ques. 2179

Canada Grain Act Amdt Bill, Res. 3684, 3822; 1r., 3824; 2r., com., 3r., 4459

Canada Highways Act, ques. 1119
Ontario, 1046
Operation of, ques. 802
Payments under, ques. 806

Canada Shipping Act Amdt. Bills:
1. Masters and Mates. Res., 406; 562; 569; 1r., 576; 2r., com., 979; 3r., 1047
2. Pilotage. Res. 1405, 1839; 1r., 1839; 2r., com., 1967; 3r., 1968
3. Sick and Distressed Mariners. Res., 1628, 2251; 2260; 1r., 2267; 2r., 3099; com., 3103; 3r., 3105, Sen. amdts. 4056
4. Steamboat Inspection. Res. 855, 1050; 1r., 1052; 2r., com., 1762; 3r., 1776

Canada Steamships, Limited. *See* Debate on Railway Act Amdt
Hanna, Mr. D. B. and, 1742, 1789

Canada Temperance Act, ques. 807. *See also that title under* Dominion Franchise
Expenses under, 4559

Canada Year Book, 1879

Canada's National Status, 91, 156, 465. *See also* League of Nations; Peace; Washington, Canadian Representative at
Empire, and, 359

Canadian Council of Agriculture. *See also* Farmers.
Platform, 125, 2954
Recall, 2052
Tariff, 2907
Vessel rates, resolution, 1717

Canadian Expeditionary Force. *See* Soldiers; War

Canadian Explosives Company, 2247-8

Canadian Forestry Association, 3285

Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 622, ques. 921, ques. 921, ques. 996. *See also* Canadian National Railways; Shipbuilding; Vessels.
Annual report, 2311
Answers to questions, 1649
Business statement 903, ques. 921, 950, 1650, 1677, 1681
Captains, ques. 1624
Civil Service Insurance—Naval Service, and, 1779-80
Coal, ques. 1115, ques. 1623
Crews, 641
Earnings, ques., 1359. *See, under this title,* Business
Freight rates, ques. 2009
Inland navigation and, ques., 2572
Insurance on vessels, ques. 1511, ques. 2011
Loading and unloading, ques. 1623
Operation, 641-5
Freights, 646
Shareholders, directors, investment, ques. 2011
Vessels
"Canadian Inventor," 3226, 3359
"Canadian Recruit," 648, ques. 1199
"Canadian Sealer," 649
Withholding of information debated, 1649

Canadian Government Railways. *See* Canadian National Railways

Canadian Manufacturers' Association
Appeal to Supreme Court, M. (Mr. Devlin) for papers, 321
Vessel rates, communication on, 1728

Canadian Mission in London, ques. 410

Canadian National Railways. *See also* Grand Trunk; Canadian Northern
Brudenheim branch, 4250
Canadian currency and United States lines, ques. 341
Canadian Government Merchant Marine. *See* that title.
"Canadian Government Railways," defined, 4219
Canadian National Railway Company, 345
Car haulage cost, ques. 2313, ques. 2413
Car shortage—Transcontinental—ques. 999
Cars, 4184
Chaudiere station, ques. 508
Coal purchases, 2380
Contracts—details, 4251-6

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Colonization, 4182, 4197
Community centres, 4198
Construction betterments, 4181-2
Construction and organization, ques. 510
Damage claims, delays, 887
Deficits, 4181, 4201, 4203
Demurrage, "bunched" cars, 4229
Duplication, 4196
Earnings, 4185
Eastern branch lines, 4247. *See also that title under* Reid, Hon. J. D.
Electric systems, ques. 1510
Engine repairs, ques. 3079
Equipment, 4185, 4191
District east of Edmonton, 4250
Express companies and, ques. 801
Finance, 4186
Fire insurance, ques. 1623
Grand Trunk Railway, 11, 37, 92, 866, 4579,
Montreal, improved entrance, ques. 413
Hudson Bay Railway, 4231. *See also that title.*
Incorporation, ques. 2012
Information, withholding of, debated, 1649, 4195
Insurance, 4257
Intercolonial Railway
Moncton office, 4206, 4220, 4248
Pensions, ques. 313, ques. 509, ques. 589
Rivière Ouelle service, ques. 997-8
Inverness Railway, 4236-49
Mackenzie, Sir William and, ques. 1628
Mackenzie and Mann, 4184, 4191
Management and directorate, 4183, 4189, 4190, 4194
Ministerial statement by Hon. J. D. Reid 859. Passengers and freight, 860; operating costs, 861; labour conditions, 861; betterments, 861; construction programme, 1920, 863; rolling stock, 863; rates, 864; Grand Trunk, 866; Hudson Bay Railway, 867; Operating costs—details, 867-9
National Transcontinental, 4199
Car shortage, ques. 999
Champlain market site, motion, 2015
Rentals, ques. 1461
Official and private cars, ques. 409, 4220, 4247
Operation—goods imported from United States, ques. 998
Orangedale-Cheticamp, 4263
Political patronage, 4194, 4221
Prince Edward Island Railway, 891, 4210, 4245

Canadian National Railways—Con.
Quebec, Oriental and Atlantic, consideration of acquirement of, ques. 507
Rates, 4181, 4187, 4203, 4207
Riviere du Loup workshops, ques. 315
Roadbed, 124
Service, 100
Standard time, ques. 588
Steamships and, 897, 904, 915
Claimed to be necessary, 653, 658. *See also* Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Ties—list of contracts, 4250-1
Toronto Eastern, ques. 1004
Townsites and subsidiaries, 4183, 4191. *See also* Cahill, Mr. F. S.; Hanna, Mr. D. B.
Victoria—Arthabaska, ques. 4502
Western branch lines, 4231. *See also that title under* Reid, Hon. J. D., Canadian National
List of, 4232
Westfield Beach, ques. 508, 4230
Westmount-St. Henri gatekeepers, ques. 998

Canadian National Railways Bill. 1r. 2842; 2r., 3085; com. 3375-9; 3r., 3395

Canadian News Service at Washington or New York, ques. 414

Canadian Northern Railway Company
Bonds guaranteed by province of Alberta, ques. 2180
Liabilities, ques. 2011
Neuville station, ques. 2721
North Bay, right of way through, ques. 3619
Port Arthur terminals, ques. 2012
Private cars
Mackenzie, Sir William, ques. 2572
Mann, Sir Donald, ques. 2183
Quebec lands, ques. 1626, ques. 2008
Report, 2311
Securities, ques. 2006
Toronto Eastern; Toronto Suburban, ques. 2080

Canadian Northern Town Properties Company, 2379

Canadian Pacific Railway Company
Burbidge-Messines station, ques. 2721
Freight tariffs, ques. 2010
Taxation
Business profits, ques. 1360
Special taxes, ques. 1360

Canadian Press Limited, 4532

Canadian Railway War Board, ques. 508

Canadian Reconstruction Association, 178, 677

Canadian Representative at Washington. *See* Washington

Canadian Wheat Board, 156, ques. 799, ques. 801, ques. 2182, 3402. *See also* Commercial Feeding Stuffs, Winnipeg Grain Exchange; Wheat; Canada Grain Act.
Continuation of, ques. 3294
Protest against reappointment of, 3561
Young, Mr. F., ques. 2313

Canadian Wheat Board Bill. Res. 3863, 4098, 4323; 1r., 4136; 2r., 4341; com., 4343; 3r., 4358
Cars, 4357
Imports and exports, control of, 4352
Losses, possible, 4325
Mill feeds, 4343, 4353. *See also* Commercial Feeding
Oats and barley, 4357
Personnel of Board, 4343

Canadianizing Foreigners. *See* Alien Immigrants.

Canadians in Imperial Service, 857

Canals
Lachine, 3423, 3561
Highway, 3778
Trent, ques. 1359
Welland
Highway, ques. 1200
Work on, ques. 1358

Canners. *See* Board of Commerce

Cannon, Mr. Lucien (Dorchester)
Appeal from ruling of the Chair, 3664
Canadian Aviation Corps, ques. 1359
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, ques. 921; ques. 921
Loading and unloading, ques. 1623
Civil Service
Bonus, 1284,
Holidays, 4057-8
House of Commons staff, 1042
Retirement, 4063-5
Senate staff, 4058
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. (U.S. Soldiers) 1233
Education, two languages, 287
Food and Drugs Bill, 1257-9, 1266-8
Franchise Bill, 773
Aliens—certificate, 2070, 2083-90, 2232-4
Bribery, etc., 1156-7
Canada Temperance Act, 2053
Contributions, 781-2

Cannon, Mr. Lucien—*Con.*
Franchise Bill—*Con.*
Disqualification
Charitable aid, those receiving, 1816-7
Criminals, 1820
Election officers, 1075-8
False statement, made to affect election, 1067
Indians, 2055-6, 2087-8
Misfeasance, etc.—penalty, 1074-5
Non-electors and non-residents, 784
Point of order—school system, 2283
Proclamation, language of publication, 2287-9, 2306
Returning officers, disqualification of, 1073-4
Public officials, 1795-8, 1804-6
Telegraph, communications by, 1068
Grand Trunk Railway acquisition, 1238, 1244-5, 1250-3, 1493-1500, 1505
Strike of 1910, 1549
Hurons of Lorette, 1152, 2014
Indemnity of members, 4080
Indian Reserves, ques. 802
Industrial Disputes Bill—objection to 3r., 2200
Intercolonial, Rivière Ouelle Service, ques. 597
International boundary surveys, 3294
Levis drill hall, 3727
Maple products—"sucre de fresne," 1255
Militia
Active militia, allowances, 3663-7
Annual drill, 3678-82
Natural resources of western provinces, 3293
Parliament Buildings—French reporters' room, 1425-9
Peace treaties and League of Nations, 347-66
Pictou harbour, 2186
Points of order
Franchise Bill, 2283
Militia estimates, 3667
Relevancy, Cockshutt, Mr., remarks of, 3672
Portland, shipments by, 653-5
Post Office Department, 3740
Purchasing Commission, 1474-5, 1484-5
Rural mail carriers, 1283-4
St. John river water-powers, 3291
San Remo Conference, 1465
Shipbuilding, 642
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 4016-7
Supply, interim vote, understanding concerning, 754-6
War equipment—guns, 3662-4
Wharves, 2123

Canso, Marine Hospital proposed, 2255

Canteen. *See* War

Cape Race, 2117

Capilano Bridge, 3778

Capital and Labour. *See also* Popular Unrest; Labour.
Readjustment of relations, 373

Capital Punishment. *See* Criminal Code

Caraquet and Gulf Shore Railway, 4217

Cardin, Mr. P. J. A. (Richelieu)
SS. "Three Rivers," ques. 1897
Sorel Government shipyard, ques. 2180

Carleton-Victoria
Election, 1223
Visit of Ministers to, ques. 409

Car Shortage. *See* Railways

Carvell, Hon. F. B.
Letter from—loading out of Fort William elevators, 565

Carvill, Mr. George, ques. 586, 4219, 4224

Casgrain, Mr. Pierre F. (Charlevoix-Montmorency)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 71. Economy—anti-democratic policies, 72; prices, cost of living, Board of Commerce—production, 73; tariff—resignations from the Government, 74; proposed general election, 75; peace and work—the Liberal party, 76
Aliens in detention camps, ques. 314
Bankruptcy Bill, trustees, ques. 2414
Biggar, Mr. O. M., K.C., ques. 1462
Bilingual stamps, ques. 314
Board of Commerce, ques. 592, ques. 1740
Canners, 1045
Motion for papers, 2013-5
Price Brothers, 1789
Report, date of, ques. 2012
Budget, 2808. Grain Growers and Canadian manufacturers, 2809; the Government and Socialism—Liberal party's fiscal policy—new taxes, 2809; income tax—financial conditions, 2810; business profits tax—moving pictures—tariff, 2811; Board of Commerce, 2812; war profits—national unity, 2813
Business profits war tax, ques. 314, ques. 2012
Canadian National Railways, 877
Car haulage cost, ques. 2313
Canadian Northern, ques. 2413

Casgrain, Mr. Pierre F.—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Incorporation, ques. 2012
Withholding of information, 1675
Canadian Northern Railway
Car haulage cost, ques. 2313, ques. 2413
Canadian Wheat Board, 4129
Carleton-Victoria, visit of ministers to, ques. 409
"Champlain," the, ques. 314, ques. 672, ques. 921, ques. 1121
Charlevoix-Montmorency
Bridges and highways, 3778
Customs officers, ques. 415, ques. 588
Lighthouse keepers, ques. 319
Pensioners, ques. 994, ques. 1358
Postmasters and mail carriers, ques. 320
Public works, ques. 590, ques. 592
Railway facilities and projects, 878
Wharf repairs, ques. 589
Criminal trials, correspondence, 2014
Franchise Bill, returning officers, 1591
French language, publications in, ques. 541
House of Commons calendar, 2005
French letters, replies in English to, 1045
French origin, Canadian of, ques. 1357
French speeches in House, translation of, 702
General election, cost of, ques. 587
Grand Trunk Railway Company, ques. 996
Lack of information complained of, 1450
Hydro-Electric, Ontario, 4172
Income tax
Earned and unearned incomes, 3309-10
Indemnity of members, 3310
Jellicoe, Lord, visit of, ques. 314
Labrie brothers, case of; also Mantezono, 3560
Lotbinière and Megantic Railway, ques. 590
Mackenzie, Sir William and Canadian National, ques. 1628, 2572
McNichol, Mr. J. L., ques. 994
Mann, Sir Donald, ques. 2183
Members' stenographers, salary of, ques. 2311
Montmorency public works, ques. 592
Naval Service, 4402
Ballantyne, Hon. Mr., reference to leader of Opposition, 4411
Newspapers, payments to, ques. 1114
Newsprint, ques. 994, ques. 588, ques. 589, ques. 2720
Export, ques. 1358, ques. 1114
Parliament Buildings, 1428-32
Parliamentary Secretaries, ques. 1036
Paroled prisoners, ques. 2005
Quebec and Saguenay Railway, ques. 506, ques. 672, ques. 1120

Casgrain, Mr. Pierre F.—*Con.*
Quebec and Saguenay Railway—*Con.*
Freight rates, ques. 589
St. Irenée, 3423
Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix, ques. 673
Rivière du Gouffre, ques. 1121
Russia, military expedition to, ques. 995
St. James by-election, 707
St. Joachim postmaster, ques. 1121
Ste. Anne de Beaupre wharf, ques. 506
Shipbuilding, 651
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill 3334
Tapley, W. H., and Baugh, E. L., 2015

Casselman, Mr. Orren D. (Dundas)
Budget, 2879. Repetitions in debate condemned—proposed general election, 2879; Government keeps its pre-election promises, 2880; Civil Service reform—mail carriers—Union Government and the farmers, 2881; Farmers' party platform, 2882; Opposition fiscal policy—tax on unimproved land—Union Government's successful policy and administration, 2883
Experimental farms, motion to adjourn debate, 1017

Cattle Embargo, ques. 340

Cattle Shippers and Government Vessels, 911

Caughnawaga, 3266

Censorship, 4556
Press, ques. 541
Regina library searched for banned books, 396

Census, the last, ques. 2009

Census and Election, 122

Cent Coin, ques. 2007

Central Vermont Railway, ques. 1035. *See also* Grand Trunk

Certificates of Service. *See* Canada Shipping Act (Masters and Mates)

Chabot, Mr. J. L. (Ottawa)
Mackenzie Avenue, Ottawa, ques. 999

Chair, Speaker's 3224-5

Chairman of Committees. *See* Deputy Speaker

Chambly Fort, 3769

Champlain Market Site, 2015

Champlain, Steamer. *See that title under* Vessels

Chaplin, Mr. James D. (Lincoln)
Budget, 2814. Messrs. W. C. Kennedy, McCoig and Pardee, and Canadian industries, 2814; Ford car prices, 2815; Farmers' platform, 2816; manufacturers and duties on animals, grain, coal, etc., 2817; boot and shoe industry—canning industry—"no trusts in free-trade England," 2818; present condition of British trade, 2819; iron and steel industry of Great Britain, 2820; United States and tinplate—"who pays the duty"? 2821; local conditions in Lincoln, 2822; freight rates as a form of protection, 2823
Food and Drugs Bill, 963
Income tax
Absentees, 3303
Shares of no par value, 3239
Newspaper postage, 3751-5
Welland canal employees, 3138-9

Charlevoix-Montmorency
Customs collections, ques. 588
Customs officers, ques. 415
Lighthouse keepers, ques. 319
Pensioners, ques. 994, ques. 1358
Postmasters and mail carriers, ques. 320
Public works, ques. 590, ques. 592
Wharf repairs, ques. 589

Chartered Banks. *See* Banks

Charters, Mr. Samuel (Peel)
Alien immigrants, 818
Departmental printing plants, ques. 1738

Cheese. *See* Dairy

Cheese Factories. *See* Commercial Feeding Stuffs

Cheques and Promissory Notes, taxes on, 2487

Cheticamp, life saving station, 2115

Chicoutimi, defaulters, ques. 409.

Child Labour, 368

Children and Income Tax, 2928, 3297

Chinese in Canada, ques. 805.

Chisholm, Mr. Alexander W. (Inverness)
Buoy service, 2116
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Captains, ques. 1624
Withholding of information, 1653
Canadian National Railways, 4236
Orangedale-Cheticamp line, 4239
Canadian Wheat Board, ques. 801

Chisholm, Mr. Alexander W.—*Con.*
Federal Emergency fund, ques. 998, ques. 1199
Grand Etang, 2114, 3779-80
Icebreakers, 1610
Illustration farms, 2390
Inverness railway, ques. 319, 4236
Lighthouses
Lighthouse Board, 2117-8
Lightkeepers' salaries, 2114
Margaree island, telephones, 2124
Marine department, 2121
Marine hospitals, 3554
Militia, headquarters staff, ques., 1511
Port Hood, 3159
Registration of shipping, 1614
Soldier Settlement, aid to fishermen, 1691
Wrecks, investigation, 1612

Chisholm, Col. H. A., ques. 3359

Chopped Feeds. *See* Commercial Feeding Stuffs

Choquette, Ex-Senator P. A., ques. 2572

Cimon, Mr., and Military Service Act, ques. 1461, ques. 1462

Cinematographic Films, tax on, ques. 3489. *See also* Moving pictures.

Civil Service. *See also* Civil Service Act Amdts. *For departments see their titles*
Additions to, 2642, 2675, 2941, 3005, 3145, 3408
Analysts and inspectors under Food and Drugs Act, 964
Appointments—soldiers serving in Bermuda, ques. 1461
Bonus, 1269, 3228
Cheques, preparation of, 1280, 1285
Lightkeepers, 2110
Regulations, 1274
Salaries and, ques. 2079, ques. 2311
Telegraph operators, 2182
Classification, ques. 84, ques. 505, 675, ques. 997, 1292, ques. 1624, 3769. *For classification of the several depts. see their titles*
Arthur Young Co. 592, ques. 1511
Effective from 1st April, 1919, 345, ques. 674
Experts and, ques. 2413
Inside service, 4019, 4172
Motions for papers:
Ethier, Mr., 592
Fripp, Mr., 544,
Secretary to executive, ques. 2181
Vote to pay increased salaries, 4546
Commission, ques. 997, 4563-7. For classification of the departments, see their

Civil Service—*Con.*
Commission—*Con.*
titles. *See also* debates under Board of Commerce
Appointments by, ques. 311, ques. 320
Board of Commerce, and, 3426
Board of hearing, 3424
Cole, Mr. W. B., ques. 2898
Dominion land surveyors, ques. 1115, ques. 2006
Health Department and, 3543
House of Commons officials and, 4504
Positions, manner of filling, ques. 2006-7
Promotions and, ques. 2007
Putman, Mr., ques. 2414
Returned soldiers, ques. 2006-7
Returning officers—suggested appointment of by, 1803, 1808-9
Staff, ques. 1121, ques. 2414
Unrest due to, 4060
Dismissals and appointments, ques. 320
Appeals in case of proposed. *See debates under* Civil Service Retirement.
Efficiency through reduction of, 2662
Grievances, 3141
Griffenhagen and associates, investigation by, 3861, ques. 4521
Holidays, 4056, 4259
Inside service, ques. 510
Insurance. *See* Civil Service Insurance Bill
Members of, with war record, 3129
Reform, 42
Reorganization, 3735, 3738-43, ques. 3861. *See also under this title,* Classification.
Retirement fund, rate of interest, 459
Returned soldiers and, 19
Suggested disqualification as election officers, 1075
Superannuation, 391-4, ques. 920, 4266. *See debates under* Civil Service Retirement; Judges' Act
Pensions, and, 391
Peterborough employees, ques. 542
Taxation of income. *See debates on* Ottawa Agreement Bill
Technical officers, how to retain, 692
Temporary employees, ques. 415

Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 1r., 1112; 2r., com., 3128; 3r., 3161. Senate amendments, 4056, 4259, 4416

Civil Service Insurance Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 949; 1054; 1r., 1229; 2r., com., 1779; 3r., 1781

Civil Service Retirement. Bill. 1r., 2178-9; 2r., 3824; com. 3840; 4062; 4460; 3r., 4466
Appeal, 4460

Civil Service Superannuation and Retirement Act Amdt. Bill (Rate of interest); Res. 459; 1r., 460; 2r., com., 3r., 581

Clark, Mr. Hugh (Parliamentary Secretary for the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment)
Franchise Bill, advance polls, 3876
Pensions and Re-establishment, 3939

Clark, Mr. Michael (Red Deer)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 161. League of Nations—economy and prices, 161; the Farmers' party, 162; classes and politics, 163; debate on the Address and debate on the Budget, 164; protection, profiteering and wages—rate of exchange and trade, 165; inflation and extravagance, 166; direct taxation, 167; Assiniboia by-election, 168; proposed general election—census of 1920 and redistribution, 169; unrest and disquiet, 170; what did men fight for? 171
Bureaucracy, 405
Budget, 2670. Return to the House of Sir Robert Borden, 2670; Mr. Fielding's amdt., tariff revision and stability of tariff, 2671, 2681-2; export trade and exports of agricultural products, 2673; Great Britain and free trade 2673; increasing income or lower expenditure—advances unaccounted for 2674; numerous Civil Service appointments—shipping subsidies—the new taxes. 2675, "a new species in the fiscal zoological garden," 2677; limits to teaching practice of individual economy, 2678; new taxes increase cost of living—income tax 2679; New Zealand and income tax, 2681; Progressive party and free trade, 2682; "army of emancipation" 2683; luxury taxes, 2684-5
Coal Operations Director Bill, 3372-4
Daylight saving, 3449
Export trade, means to promote, 626
Federal Bureau of Education, 1393
Fiscal policy of the Government, 583
Franchise Bill, 748
Aliens—certificate, 2208, 2223
Recall, the, 2033-4, 2045, 2052
Returning officers, 1800-1, 1806
Government annuities, 405
Grand Trunk Railway acquisition, 1437-43, 1448, 1453

Clark, Mr. Michael—*Con.*
House of Commons—acoustics and audibility of debates, 345, 1417, 2317, 2081-2, 3952
Housing programme, ques. 707
Income tax, 3120, 3124
Charities, 3312
Exemptions on account of children, 3300
Incomes over $100,000, ques. 3490
Indemnity of members and salaries of Ministers, 4435
Judges' salaries and pensions, 4425-6
McKenzie, Mr., and Liberal leadership, 898
Militia—active militia, allowances, 3666-7
Naval service, 4395-9
Additional appropriation, $1,700,000, 4381, 4389-90
Oleomargarine, 1785-6, 1848-53, 1855
Parliament Buildings, 1417, 1422-4, 1433
Pensions and Re-establishment, 3952
Committee—resignation of Mr. Peck, 2081-2
Public finance, economy in, 628
Point of order—Franchise Bill, 2223
Political prisoners, 1790
Race track betting, 3428-9
Saturday and morning sittings, 2783
Shipbuilding, 625, 647
Government programme ended, 905
Government vs. private ownership, 905
Profiteering, 898, 901
Subsidies, 899
Soldier Settlement, 2138
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill
Amendment, "Sales taxes," 3318, 3321-4
Changes proposed by Finance Minister, 3434, 3438, 3443
Collection, machinery for, 3325-7
Methods of—refunds, 3334, 3434-51
Progress of—retailers not collecting, 3479-80
Debate of Bill, arrangements for, 3454-5
Drayton, Sir Henry, reply to, 3448
Edwards, Mr., reply to, 3438
New taxes not "excise," 3316-8, 3321-4
Permanency of taxes, 3479
Returned soldier, exemption of—amdt (Mr. Lemieux) 3448
Steel and Shipping merger, 1948-54

Clements, Mr. H. S. (Comox-Alberni)
Franchise Bill
Advance polls, 3876
Recall, the, 2042
Skeena and Comox-Alberni, 3868
Voters' lists, 2434
Fraudulent naturalization papers, ques. 4096
Opium and Drug Bill, 1755

Clements Mr. H. S.—*Con.*
Soldier Settlement, aid to fishermen, 1692
Vessel rates—shortage of ships, 1717-8

Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. *See that title under* Dominion Franchise Bill

Coal. *See also* Director of Coal Operations. *See also* Industrial Disputes
Edmonton Board of Trade resolution, 322
Inverness railway and, 4236, 4241
Prices, 321
Purchases by Government Merchant Marine, ques. 1115, ques. 1623
Supply of—M. (Mr. Lemieux) to adjourn House to discuss, 3685
See also Railways, Car shortage

Coal Operations, Director of
Orders-in-Council, ratification of, 3360
Orders of laid on table, 3225

Coal Operations Director Bill; 1r., 3106; 2r., 3175; com., 3185; com., 3360; 3r., 3690

Coasting Vessels. *See* Railway Commission; Railway Act Amdt

Cocagne, N. B. 3159

Cockshutt, Mr. W. F. (Brantford)
Address in reply to Governor General's speech, 96. Parliament Buildings—Peace Treaty and League of Nations, 96; Christian Church and the Forward movement, 98; popular unrest; record of Union Government, 99; trade, Canadian National railways, 100; labour situation; farmers' movement, 101 prohibition, 102; Quebec and the trade question—general election, 100, 104
Budget, 2840. Congratulations to Minister of Finance, 2843; the new taxes, 2843; income tax—deficit on National Railways—West Indies, 2844; Mr. Devlin and outrages on negroes in United States, 2845; trade conditions, 2846; Canadian surplus, British deficit; Britian's national balance sheet; Canadian Merchant Marine—Mr. Fielding's policy when Minister of Finance, 2848; comments on other speeches, 2849; tariff—parable of the farmers—United Farmers' platform, 2851; protection for farm products, 2852; "implement of production," 2853, income tax defaulters, 2854; farmer candidates in Brant—the labour man, 2855; Canada and United States, competition in manufacturing, 2857

Cockshutt Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways, Rates, 1453
Currency, coinage, 400
Eight-hour day, 377
Firearms, licenses, 3413
Franchise Bill
"Ecclesiastics," 1076-7
Polls—pencil, 1102
Franking privilege, 3765
Grand Trunk Railway acquisition, 1451-4
House of Commons staff, 4547
Income tax
Accounting period, 3308
Charities, 3311
Dividends, when liable, 3304-6
Indemnity of members, 3311
Indians, Six Nations, 3278
League of Nations
Ames, Sir Herbert, statement by, 3979
Canada and the Empire, 491
Militia—Active militia—allowances, 3672-3
Newspaper postage, 3759
Oleomargarine, 1782, 1787
Opium and Drug Bill, 1750
Parliament Buildings, 1430
Peace treaty—Bulgaria, 490
Pensions, 429-35
Purchasing Board, 1479-82
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill, 3323, 3342-4
Automobiles, 3598
Boats, canoes, etc., 3591
Candy—maple products, 3593
Collection—method of, 3469
Food, 3617
Licenses, 3606-7
Manufacturers' agents, 3609
Overdrafts, 3798
Sales tax, 3794
Goods contracted for, not delivered, 3614
Stock transfers, 3800
War trophies, 4557

Coinage. *See* Currency.

Cold Storage, 2407-09
Butter in, ques. 543, ques. 807

Cole, Mr. W. B., ques. 2893

Collingwood, Marine hospital, 2255-56

Commerce, International Parliamentary conference on, ques. 2721

Commercial Feeding Stuffs Bills:
1. 1r., 617; withdrawn, 1290-1
2. Res. 2184; 3161; 1r., 3174; 2r., 3395; 3405; com., 3405; 3r., 3409

Commission of Conservation, 3286
Consulting Engineer, ques. 1002
Deputy Chairman, ques. 2573
Town Planning Adviser, ques. 1002

Compulsory Voting, 1062-4

Concurrence in supply, 3217, 4586

Connaught Rifle Range, 3728

Conner, James, dismissal of, 415

Conscription, 59. *See also* Military Service

Cooper, Col. John A., ques. 308, ques. 414

Cooper, Mr. Richard C. (Vancouver South)
Pensioner resident outside of Canada, 4052
Returned soldiers, provision for—motion for special com., 513
Soldier's buttons, unauthorized wearing of, 4020

Co-operation, 109

Copp, Mr. Arthur B. (Westmorland)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 195. Sir Thomas White as champion of the Government—proposed general election, 195; the farmers' movement — lower tariff — public revenue and private profits, 197; Franchise Act—Board of Commerce, 198; Union Government—illness and absence of Prime Minister, 199
Bankruptcy Bill, 3256-60
Board of Commerce, Murdock, Mr., letter of, 4479
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, information withheld, 1661
Canadian National Railways, 4195-6
Goods for use of, imported from United States, ques. 998
Extensions, 3390-2
Information wanted, 3392
Intercolonial—equipment deteriorated—scenery and opportunities for viewing it—train connections—need for local headquarters — political influence — superannuation allowances—Mr. George Carvill, former ticket agent, 4219-4228
Carvill, Mr. George, ques. 586, 4219
Cereal shipments, ques. 1626
Civil Service
Bonus, 1280
Putman, Mr., ques. 2414
Customs, rentals paid, 3858-9
Drill halls, 3148
Experimental farms—buildings, 3157-8, 3160
Flour, Canadian Shipments, ques. 1788

Copp, Mr. Arthur B.—*Con.*
Franchise Bill
Advance polls, 1937-9
Assistant Chief Electoral Officer, 1514-5
Candidate's consent, 1095
"Ecclesiastics," 1077
Oath by elector, 1102
Personation, etc., 1159
Polls, hours to be open, 1921-3
Provincial lists, 3893
Amdt. (Mr. Mackenzie King) to 3r., 4366
Returning officers, 1576-81
Voting, manner of, 1104
Government steamers, wages, 1599-1600
Grand Trunk Railway acquisition, 1506
Icebreakers, 2105-7
Maple products, 1255
Parliament Buildings, ques. 705
Furniture, 1421, 1427-8, 1434
Pensions and Re-establishment, 3956
Pensioners resident outside of Canada, 4048-9
Widowed mothers, 429
Post Office buildings, 3160
Re-establishment
Fishermen and loans, 4048
Students, 4048
Sackville public building, 3150, 3158
St. John district pension office, 1742
St. John harbour—pilots, 2119-21
St. John river wharves, 2122-3
Scammel, Mr. J. K., 3784-5
Shipbuilding, 643, 660
Material, importation, ques. 1114
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 4013
Special War Revenue Bill, 3329-30
Bank overdrafts, 3799
Sales tax, 3615
Tender and contract, 3160
West Indies, trade with, 1884

Copper, 4513

Copyright Bill, 1r., 751-2

Corn. *See* Commercial Feeding Stuffs

Cost of Living. *See* High Cost. *See also debates under* Address; Budget: Board of Commerce

Coughlan Shipbuilding Company, 3360, ques. 3620

Courts, appeals from. *See* Supreme Court Act

Courts Martial, ques. 1359

Cowan, Mr. Walter D. (Regina)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 224. Union Government an honest government—democracy and democratic measures, 225; tariff, balance of trade, 226; tariff and prices—income tax, 227; tax on unimproved lands—war-time elections Act, 228; naturalization of aliens—Board of Commerce, 229
Canadian Northern Railway
Willow Bunch, Wood Mountain—western extensions, 3379-82
Coal operations, director, 3178, 3191
Experimental farms, 2390
Franchise Bill
Aliens—certificate, 2085
Voters' lists, 2433
Provincial, adoption of, 2337-8, 2340-1
Indemnity of members, 4094
Last Mountain river dam, 3788-9
Natural resources development, 1021
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 390, 394, 3198
Scientific research, 2167
Superannuation of public employees, 394

Crerar, Hon. T. A. (Marquette)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 143. New Parliament building, 143; parliamentary government — League of Nations and Canada's status, 144; monetary exchange and trade, 145; natural resources and production — tariff — wheat production, 147; pulpwood—the "Agrarian" movement—by-elections, 148; luxury and income taxes, 149; immigration, 150; franchise and citizenship, 151; proposed general election, 152
Agriculture—federal and provincial control, avoidance of duplication, 2386-7
Bridges and the provinces, 3777-9
Budget, date of, 2126
Budget, 2896. Criticisms of Progressive group, 2896; government control in wheat not desirable—operations of farmers' business organizations—Timiskaming by-election and One Big Union, 2897; expenditure should be reduced—new taxes, 2898; business profits and income taxes—the tariff, 2899; the Government and protective tariff, 2900—Great Britain's fiscal policy—Britain and Germany, 2901; British trade and foreign investments—tinplate industry, 2902; British industrial and social conditions, 2903;

Crerar, Hon. T. A.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
agriculture in Canada and Great Britain—inquiries into industries, 2905; result of the war, Britain and other countries compared, 2906; Canadian Council of Agriculture tariff policy, 2907; British tariff policy would apply advantageously in Canada—agriculture under disadvantages—textile industry, 2908; business combines and the tariff, 2909; Mr. Fielding's amendment, 2910
Canadian Wheat Board, 4119, 4348-54
Cold storage, 2407-9
Commercial Feeding Stuffs, 3166, 3400
Dairy industry, 2405
Dominion arsenals, 3719
Fox farming, 2410
Franchise Bill
Aliens—certificate, 2217, 2223
House of Commons
Audibility of debates, 2126, 2314
Two o'clock suggested as hour for meeting, 2781
Income tax—errors in returns, 3315-6
Indemnity of members and salaries of Ministers, 4434
Judges' salaries, 3853
League of Nations, 4319-20
Militia—active militia—allowances, 3660, 3671-2
Mineral deposits
Leases, etc., 3808-13
Tax on unused, 3810
Naval Service, additional appropriation, $1,700,000, 4319
Retirement of members of public service, 3834
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 3206-7
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 3995
Special War Revenue Act Amdt., 3332-3
Bank overdrafts, 3799-3800
Collection, method of, 3483
Amdt.—taxes to be collected at source, 3484-7

Cressé, Mr. L. G. A., K.C., ques. 4502

Criminal Cases, appeals in. *See* Criminal Code

Criminal Code Amendment Bills:
1. Capital punishment. 1r., 308
2. French version. 1r., 2571; 2r., com., 3081; ref. to Spl. Com. 3106; 3r., 3488
3. Firearms; Use of Documents not sworn to; sexual offences; gambling; attempted rape; unlawful use of uniform; differences on appeal; Quebec

Criminal Code—*Con.*
change of venue; 1r., 2840; 2r., com., 3410; 3r., 3427; Sen. amdts., 4414
For details of debate see Doherty, Rt. Hon. C. J.

Criminals, alleged, removal from one province to another.
See Criminal Code

Cronyn, Mr. Hume (London)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech (Mover) 11. Parliament Buildings—Union Government—League of Nations, 12; thrift—public finance, 13; tariff commission — immigration — scientific research, 14; representation and government — re-establishment, 15; capital and labour—after-war condition, 16; race and religion—Canada, 17; Earl Grey's farewell message, 18
Income tax
Charities, 3311-4
Patriotic funds, 3244
Pensions Bill, 4043, 4050
Drafting in accordance with decisions of Com., 4041
Pensioner resident outside of Canada, 4044
Widowed mother, dependent parent, 4043
Pensions and Re-establishment Com.
Peck, Mr., resignation of, 2081
Report; M. to adopt, 3922. History of pensions increase, 3923; changes and present state, 3927; insurance, 3928; war service gratuities—Re-establishment, 3930; work of Com. 3931; in reply—unanswered letter, explanation, 3957
Printing additional copies, 4321
Pensions, widowed mothers, M. (Mr. Power), 428
Returned soldiers' insurance, 4054
Scientific Research—Com., Special, report of, 2154
Trust and Loan Company of Canada, 585

Crothers, Hon. T. W. (West Elgin)
Civil Service
Retirement of members, 4063-6
Superannuation, 391-2, 4268
Coal Operations Director Bill, 3368, 3375
Food and Drugs Bill, 959-60
Franchise Bill
Chief Electoral Officer—Biggar, Mr. O. M., appointment of, 4268-70
Returning officers, 1535, 1577-86
Voting notwithstanding disqualification, 1824-5

Crothers, Hon. T. W.—*Con.*
Grand Trunk strike of 1910 and pensions, 1126, 1349-51, 1541
Income tax
Charities, 3247-8
Suggestions, 3122, 3126
Industrial disputes, 2192-6
Judges' salaries and pensions, 4334-8, 4420-3
Opium and Drug Bill, 1641, 1646-8
Postmasters' salaries, 4526
Race track betting, 3427
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 391, 394

Crowe, Mr. S. J. (Burrard)
German and Austrian books, ques. 806
Shipping—sick and distressed mariners, 3104

Currency. *See also* Finance
Canadian, in United States, ques. 341
Copper—new one cent coins, 402, ques. 2067
Dominion notes and gold, ques. 588
Inflation, 107
Token money, 401
United States silver coins, 402

Currency Act Amdt. Bill (Coinage). Res. 399;1r., 402; 2r., com., 460; 3r., 462

Currie, General Sir Arthur, 3641, 3648, 3652-6, 3706, 3708

Currie, Mr. John A. (North Simcoe)
Balance of trade, 4329
Budget, 3053. Reduced tariff protection, 3053; Liberal-Conservatives and the Budget—how to secure greater markets—"jug-handled" free trade, 3054; home market for beef—effect of cotton duty in United States—Canadian conditions before protection—3055; danger of increasing purchases from United States—indirect and direct taxation—luxury tax and key industries, 3056; free trade agitation sectional—protection needed for glass, chinaware, silk spinning—tinplate—Canada's opportunity and how to meet it, 3057; resources, population, wise and paternal government—injurious effect of free trade agitation, 3058; Liberals and manufacturers—luxury tax opposed—socialists influence, 3059; free trade and public revenues—Adam Smith on sales tax, 3060—"Who pays the duty?"—a free trade Budget. 3061; "going to the country"—Mr. Fielding's amdt. 3062; national policy approved—not pledged

Currie, Mr. John A.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
to support present policy further than next session, 3063
Canadian National Railways
Canadian Pacific Railway, and, 3384
Deficit—rates, 3382-3
Extensions, 3383
Political patronage, 4222-3
Coal operations, director, 3175-6
Franchise Bill
Chief Electoral Officer, 1071-3
Disqualification of candidates, 1086
Naturalization—amdt. (Mr. Euler) to 3r., 4368-72
Polling divisions, 1520
Returning officers, 1530
Voters' lists, provincial, 2355-63
Franking privilege, 3356-8, 3762-7
Fuel Supply
Demurrage charges, 4328
Special powers for Railway Commission, 4327
Grain transportation charges, 2634
Grand Trunk strike and pensions, 1122, 1131, 1138, 4511
M. to restore pension status, 1122
House of Commons Staff, classification, 1041-4
Income tax
Deficits and losses, 3241
Patriotic and charitable funds, 3245-8
Stock dividends, 3238
Surplus revenues, 3252
Inland revenue, spirits, 3816
Luxury taxes—United States, in, 2528
National defence, 4303-5
Newspaper postage rate, 3351
Catalogues and parcels, 3356
Newspapers and propaganda, 4378
Parliament Buildings, 1420
Pensions Committee
Report, printing, 4321
Resignation of member of, 1085
Printing, Joint Com. on, 4257-8, 4321-2, 4503-6
Quebec's ancient fortifications, 425-6
Sick and distressed mariners, 2256
Soldier settlement—fishermen, 3220
Steel and shipping merger, 1960
Toronto
Letter carriers, 345
Militia property, 3728-31
Wealth, taxation of, 2527
Workmen's compensation Act and seamen, 2263

Customs. *See also* Customs Tariff
Automobiles, smuggled, ques. 807

Customs—*Con.*
Brokers, 3716
Department
Employees, ques. 317
Rumoured investigation by U.S. firm, 3491, 3623
Salaries, 3858
Duties, basis of estimates, ques. 1788
Entries and exchange rates, 109
Franco-Canadian tariff Convention, ques. 3684
French Treaty. *See that title*
Imports for 1919, ques. 2182
Textile imports, duties on, ques. 1899
War duty, removal of, 2489, 3110

Customs Act Amendment Bills
1. Importation of Firearms. Res. 616; 1r., 617; 2r., com., 3r., 1048
2. Export Regulations. Res. 3620; 1r., 3623; 2r., Ref. to Special Com. 3690; Report of Com. that Bill be not further proceeded with, 4504

Customs Tariff Act, 1907. Amdt. Bill. Res. 3110; 1r., 3111; 2r., com. 3174, 3r., 3229

Dager, Herman J., ques. 2182

Dairying Industry, 2403. *See also* Board of Commerce; Commercial Feeding Stuffs; Oleomargarine
Butter, prices, ques. 807
Feed, 605
Grading Export Butter and Cheese
Res. (Mr. Edwards) moved, 592; withdrawn, 614
Production records of cows, 1014
Products, quality of, improvement in, 599-607
United States market, advertising in, 601

Daly Building, Ottawa, ques. 1200

d'Anjou, Mr. Joseph E. S. E. (Rimouski)
Active militia—allowances, 3659
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 81. Tariff, duty on Government to formulate a policy, 81; Quebec representation in the Cabinet—Hon. Br. Blondin—French language—Quebec province and the Government, 82; Franchise, 83; popular unrest—Printing Bureau dismissals and Civil Service classification, 84; proposed general election, 85;
Board of Commerce, prices, 1151
Budget, 2568. Amdt. (Mr. Fielding) approved—defence of the farmers, 2568; public debt, 2569; economy and encouragement of agriculture, 2569; production and consumption — railway policy, 2570; Union Government and election, 2571;
Experimental farms, 1016, 2384
Franchise Bill—Proclamation, language of publication, 2309
French speeches, translation of, 699
Militia headquarters officers and service at the front, ques. 506
Naval Service, additional appropriation, $1,700,000, 4400
Universal military training, 942

Daughters of Canada, 244, 396

Davidson, Mr. A. L. (Digby and Annapolis)
Dominion Franchise Bill
Advance polls, 1936
Returning officers, 1523-4, 1580, 1588
Voters' lists, provincial, 2327-38
Naval Service Dept. estimates—agreement as to debate, 4409, 4412

Davis, Mr. Fred Langdon (Neepawa)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 106. New Parliament Building—taxation, increased, needed, 106; Civil Service and returned soldiers—inflation of currency—public revenues and expenditure, 107; Parliamentary control and its methods, 108; customs duties and exchange rates—profits, prices and co-operation, 109
Budget, 3023. New taxes and the business outlook—public finances, 3023; reduction of expenditure—Committee on estimates, 3024; Government should watch mergers—Budget supported—controversy on protection or free trade, Germany and Great Britain as examples—taxes probably to be revised, 3026
Coins, Canadian and American, 461-2
Franchise Bill
Ballot boxes, expenses of returning, 1927
Contributions, 1186
Misfeasance—penalty, 1075
Non-electors and non-residents, 786
Oath, administration of, 779
Polls, hours to be open, 1926
Proclamation, language of publication, 1834
Recall, the, 2035
Soldier land settlement, 2148
Special War Revenue Act Amdt Bill
Collection, method of, 3477
Ethyl alcohol, 3603-4

Daylight Saving, 1084, 1574

Debates. *See* House of Commons

Debt, National, ques. 309, 2478

DeCelles, Mr., 114, 210
Superannuation, 2968, ques. 3489

Déchène, Mr. Aimé Miville (Montgomery)
Budget, 2946. The new taxes, 2946; manufacturers and their products, 2947; rural population and its problems—new ideas in farming—votes for experimental farms and for Department of Agriculture generally, 2948; demonstration farms and local demonstrators in Quebec—well-being of the farmer the country's safest asset, 2951
Butter and cheese grading, 599
Canadian National Railways
Electric systems, ques. 1510
Express companies and, ques. 801
Civil Service
Bonus, 7191
Classification, ques. 1624
Quarantine station operators, 1281
Commercial Feeding Stuffs, 3169-70
Food and Drugs Bill, 1258, 1262
Franchise Bill, fees—statement to be in box, 1927
French speeches in House, translation of, 703
Government employees at Sorel, ques. 1199
Government steamers, 1604-6
Grosse Isle, public works, ques. 343, ques. 344
Maple products, 1255, 1258
Naval Service, 4406
Public loan, ques. 810
St. Lawrence dredge, 1616-20
St. Regis Indians, ques. 799
Toronto Eastern Railway, Toronto Suburban Railway, ques. 1004, ques. 2080

Defaulters. *See* Military Service

Delinquents. *See* Juvenile Delinquents

Delisle, Mr. Michel Siméon (Portneuf)
Icebreakers, St. Lawrence channel, ques. 317

Demers, Mr. M. J. (St. Johns and Iberville)
Bank interest, 992
Blue books, language in which published, ques. 992, ques. 1004
Budget, 2708. Balance of trade, 2708; cost of living—economy, 2709; protection and its effects, 2710; development of natural industries, 2711

Demers, Mr. M. J.—*Con.*
Bulgarian Peace treaty, ques. 316
Canadian Expeditionary Force, numbers, ques. 315
Commission of Conservation
Engineer, ques. 1002
Town Planning Adviser, ques. 1002
Farmers' Account book, French edition, ques. 315
Franchise Bill
Polling divisions, 1517, 1520
Polls, hours to be open, 1920
Registrars, 720
League of Nations, Canada's contribution, ques. 316
Mines department, ques. 672
Naval Service, 4401-2
Newsprint Controller, ques. 315
Ottawa new public building, ques. 1002
Quebec city mail deliveries, ques. 591
Rural mail carriers, ques. 591
Smith, Mr. J. E., ques. 2722
Vancouver dry dock, ques. 316

Demobilization, 19, 53, 4550, 4556, 4585. *See also* War Bonds; Reconstruction; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment

Demobilization Appropriation Bill. Res. 4137. (*See* War Bonds, Over-subscriptions.)

Demobilization Vote—Housing and, 3545

Denis, Mr. Jean J. (Joliette)
Budget, 3043. Late sittings of the House—congratulations to Minister of Finance—tobacco duties, 3043; national emergency and the Budget—revenue and expenditure, 3044
Business of the House, state of, 3216
Canadian National Railways—stations, 891
Criminal Code Amdt. (French version) 3083-4
Dairy industry, 2403
Exhibition Commissioner, 4558-9
Fertilizer, freight rates on, 2407
Food and Drugs Bill, 960
Franchise Bill
Advance polls, 1940-3, 3875
Ballots and ballot boxes, 1097, 1104
Deposit, 1093-5
Disqualification
Candidates, of, 1088-9
Electors of—charitable support, those receiving, 1812-7, 1997
1812-7, 1997
Interpretation, 1987
"Candidate," 1985
"During an election," 1985-6

Denis, Mr. John J.—*Con.*
Franchise Bill—*Con.*
Nomination,
Place of, 1092-3
Postponement of, 1096
Polling divisions, 1516-9
Reading of clauses in Com., 1919
Returning officers, 1528-30, 1574-5, 1585-8
Public officials, 1802-4, 1809
Votes for informal candidate, 1096
Voting on certificate, 1099-1100
Women voters, 2418-9
Married, names how listed, 1827, 3869
General election, deposits lost, ques. 922
Grand Trunk Railway Acquisition Bill, 1303, 1317, 1357, 1435, 1442-3, 1449-50
Strike of 1910 and pensions, 1553
Gold shipment to New York, 181
Icebreakers, 1602
Income tax
Additional information, demand for, 3302
Checking returns, 3128
Multiplicity of laws, 3315
Overpayment, 3254
Those who did not make reports, 3118-21
Interim Supply Bill, 3216
Judges' salaries, 3851
Moving pictures, 3627
National defence, 4302
Naval Service, 4300-5
One-cent coin, ques. 2007
Parliament buildings, 1423, 1427
Railways—public ownership rates, 1442, 1449
Royal Military College, 3152-3
Scientific Research, 2162
Session of Parliament, time of, 3217
Shipbuilding, contracts, 894
Statutes, suggested revision, 3821
Supply, undue haste complained of, 4562
Supreme Court Act, 2389
Tobacco growing, 2383, 3819-20
West Indies Conference, 3860
Yukon, 3281-2

Departments of Government, reduction of, 4456

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees (Mr. George H. Boivin)
Rulings and Statements of
Adjournment—order to be maintained, 1838
Amdts., one at a time, 1819
Appeal from ruling as Chairman, put by him as Speaker, 3664
Appeal from ruling—statement of appeal questioned, 1327, 3664
Arrangements to facilitate business—Franchise Bill, 3903

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees—*Con.*
Rulings and Statements of—*Con.*
Bills
Amdts. to, order of, 2224-5
Involving charge on public revenue, 1513. *See also, under this title,* Motions
Com.
Clause cannot be re-opened after adoption, 1256
Com. and 3r. at same sitting, 1061
Discussion, subsection by subsection, 1935, 1943
Explanation of Bill only by unanimous consent, 396, 1685
Reading of section by Chairman, 584, 1254, 1919
Section adopted, amendable only on reconsideration, 2365
Sub-clause amended, clause not passed—further discussion, procedure in, 1744
Consolidation of two, 1234
Preamble, proposal to insert, 4155
Special Com., ref. to by House, not by Com. of the Whole, 1639, 2022
Title, discussion of details without motion irrelevant, 4466
3r.,
Immediately after amdt. in, Com. only by consent, 1256
Chair to be addressed, 2030, 2231, 3308, 3550
Debate closed, 1044
Debates—publication of matter not spoken, 447, 4251
Decorum—conversation, 2317-8
Denials, 1184
Documents re-read at same session, 2294
Explanation—section amended, 3391
Granby public building, 3149-50
House of Commons officials, 949
Interim supply vote, explanation—rule 17c, 755
Interruptions, 353, 1131, 1179, 2033, 2528, 2916, 3062, 3500, 4118, 4150
Cahill, Mr.—Sir Henry Drayton, 3339
Member may rise to ask permission to ask question, 2047
Member requested to give way, 3454
Questions, 286-7
Asked by permission, not in question form, 1719
Limited, 2562
May exhaust right to speak, 2568
Language
"Delusional insanity," 2732
"False statements," 3006

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees—*Con.*
Rulings and Statements of—*Con.*
Language—*Con.*
"Knows that the statement he has made is untrue" 3549
"You are trying to fool someone," 3550
Matters sub-judice—Labrie brothers, 3849
Members
Honour of—insinuation, 1186
How to be referred to, 2831
—"the hon delegate" 2032
Interrupted, but address not completed, holds the floor, 3520
Recognition of by the Chair, 2756
Whips' list of names, 3045
Resume seat when Chairman rises, 2042
Right to speak exhausted, 871, 1718, 3086
Motion to adjourn debate negatived, 2951
Speaking, may not interrogate others, 2042
Statement of, to be accepted, 1224, 2291-2, 2334
To keep the floor, must speak, 2242
Motions
Involving charge upon public revenue, 1513, 3587, 4052
Non-debatable—Com. rise, etc., 1044, 1082, 1585, 3617
Seconder not needed, 3587
To be in writing, 1263
Mover to close debate, 333, 419, 553, 1225, 3837, 3403
Indemnity of members—Sir Robert Borden, 4454
Negative motion, 1264, 1915
Nothing before the Chair, 1597
Notice of motion passed over, afterwards called, 703
Point of order
May be discussed, 2032
Right of member to raise, 1183
Previous debate, 1397, 1677-8
Privilege—question not to be raised, 2918
Quorum, count of members, 964
Relevancy, 394, 645, 648, 656-7, 864, 915, 985, 1060, 1313, 1317-8, 1692, 3140, 3401, 3474, 3491, 3545, 3627, 3663, 3667, 3849, 3996
Appeal (Mr. McMaster) from ruling, 1327
Budget resolutions, 3338
Canadian National Railways Bill, 3384-5
Car shortage, 1317
Doherty, Mr., and Irish question, 1496
"Excise" taxes, 3318
Explanation and request for instructions—Special War Revenue Act

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees—*Con.*
Rulings and Statements of—*Con.*
Relevancy—*Con.*
Amdt. Bill, 3455
Franchise Bill, 1064, 1071-3, 1176, 1196, 1197-8, 1932, 1935, 2223-31, 2294, 2327, 2334
Amdt suggested, not moved, 2337-8
Canada Temperance Act, 2053
Documents, re-read, 2294
Personalities, 2048-50
Reconsideration of clause, 1997
St. Johns election, 2239
Schedule, discussion of, 1999
School system, 2283
Sermon, 1077
Gould, Mr., election of, 2038
Grand Trunk Railway Acquisition Bill
Section and schedule considered together, 1435
Strike of, 1910, 4511.
Judges' salaries and indemnity of members, 3853
Militia estimates, 3656
Appeal (Mr. Cannon), not sustained, 3663-5
Militia—
Cockshutt, Mr., remarks of, 3673
Peck, Mr., remarks of, 3669
Tweedie, Mr., remarks of, 3667-9
Opium and Drug bill, 1746
Post Office, 3742-4, 4531
Reference allowed as for comparison, otherwise out of order, 3492
Unanimous consent to disregard rule, 2105
Ways and means, 915
Repetitions, 2286
Resolution, error in, 3628
Saturday night—time of adjournment, 4320
Six o'clock interrupts debate—procedure, 1034
Special War Revenue—questions, opportunity for, 3631
Suggestions to facilitate debate, Special War Revenue, 3564
Supply—motion for, limits of debate on, 872
Supply—reverting to previous item, 4565
Taxation—request for statement by Minister, 3597
Unanimous consent, 796, 1692, 1999, 2023, 2389, 3315, 3565
Latitude in debate, 2105
Reverting to former clause of bill, 1061
Stacey, Mr., on Indian Act Amdt., 4021
3r., of Bill immediately after amdt. in Com. 1256

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees—*Con.*
Rulings and Statements of—*Con.*
Vote called, debate closed, 2242
Vote in Com., rule as to counting, 3673
Desaulniers, Mr. Arthur L. (Champlain)
Batiscan bridge, ques. 317
Budget, 2623. Protest against existing government, 2623; reconstruction and economy—navy deficits—general election needed, 2624; popular discontent, 2625
Hennick, Daniel D. patents of, ques. 1510
Loans to foreign countries, ques. 318
Mail carriers, ques. 343
Quebec arsenal. ques. 3862
Desjardins, "Ti-Noir," ques. 315
Deslauriers, Mr. Hermas (St. Mary)
Batiscan river, ques. 1230
Board of Commerce, M. for abolition, 1139
Budget, 3072. Workingmen and taxes, 3072; Minister of Labour and labour policy, 3073; present social upheaval—central labour exchange—distribution of Government contracts, 3074; employment insurance and health protection—stick together, 3075
Enemy aliens, naturalization, ques. 992
Montreal wharves, ques, 674
Proportional representation, ques. 803
Destroyers. *See* Naval Service
Detention Camps, ques. 314
Detroit River
Liquor patrol, 2107, 2118
Devlin, Mr. Emmanuel B. (Wright)
Civil Service
Bonus, 1270-3
Classification, 1272
Coal Operations Director, 3177
Food and Drugs Bill, 959, 1259, 1268
Franchise Bill
Corrupt practices, 1161
Disqualification of candidates, 1085-6
Non-electors and non-residents, canvassing, 772, 785
Public officials, 1802
French speeches in House, translation of, 700
Georgian Bay Canal, 914, 3177
German war payments, ques. 310
Grand Trunk Railway acquisition, 1300-1
Honey adulteration, 798
House of Commons staff organization, 567, 753, 1040
Indemnity of members, 4091
Indian lands, 790-1
Inquiry concerning questions, 2416
Devlin, Mr. Emmanuel B.—*Con.*
Jellicoe, Admiral Viscount, visit of, ques. 310
Manufacturers, aid to in appeals, 321
Natural resources,—Wright county, 3813
Naval Service, 707-9
Orders in Council, Government by, 2020
Peace treaty, 1060-1
Railway cars—Canada and the United States, 881-2
Returned soldiers, 538
Shipbuilding, 914
Expenditure, how to be met, 917
Special War Revenue
Liquor cabinets, smokers' cabinets and tea wagons, 3793
Tooth washes, 3793-4
West Indies—outrages on blacks in the United States, 2845-6
Director of Coal Operations. *See* Coal Operations
Distressed Canadians, relief of, 4559
Distressed Seamen. *See* Canada Shipping Act
Distribution Office, 1037
Divisions. *See* House of Commons
Divorce, 134
Divorce in Ontario and Prince Edward Island Bill, 1r., 1573
Divorce Cases
Remission of fees, 4321, 4413
Documents, not sworn to. *See* Criminal Code
Doherty, Rt. Hon. C. J. (Minister of Justice)
Administration of Justice, 3840-51
Labrie Brothers, case of, 3227, 3295, 3558-60
M. (Mr. Casgrain) for papers, 2014
Admiralty Act Amdt., 2842, 3086
Board of Commerce
Constitutional questions, 3685
Murdock, Mr., letter of, 4476
British North America Act, 4168-70, 4379
Motion for papers, 811-2
Campaign funds, 1227
Canada's national status, 474
Criminal Code Amdt (French Version) 2571-2, 3081-5
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill, 2840, 3410-3
Affidavit, pretended, 3414-5,
Marriage licenses, 3415
Age of consent, 3415
"Appeal Court" defined, 3410
Arrest on summoning of person outside province, 3417-8

Doherty, Right Hon. C. J.—*Con.*
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Courts of appeal—Supreme Court, appeal to, 3422-3
Firearms—weapons, 3410-15
Gambling, 3415-6, 3427
Petty thefts and jury trial, 3421
Quebec, change of venue, 3420-1
Race-track betting, 3427
Re-election by prisoner, 3419-20
Saskatchewan and Alberta, appeals in summary convictions, 3418-9
Senate amendments, 4414—collectors of fares, 4415
Sexual offences, 3416
Uniforms, etc., unlawfully worn, 3417-8
Criminal trials
Motion for papers re, 2015
Eight-hour day, 454
Exchequer Court Act Amdt., 2003, 2201-4
Franchise Bill
Aliens—certificate, 2064-73, 2233-4
Canada Temperance Act, 2053
"Ecclesiastics," 1076
"Hours of the day," "standard time," 1994
Misfeasance—penalty, 1074-5
Pollbooks to returning officer, 1078-80
Franking privilege, 3762-8
Grand Trunk Railway Acquisition Bill, 1298, 1316-21
Loans—amdt. (Mr. Fielding) 1536
Ratification of agreement, 1323-4
Strike of 1910, 1134, 1542, 1545, 1547-53
Amdt. (Mr. Mackenzie King) 1351
Habeas Corpus. *See* under this title Administration of Justice
Internment cases, 4517-8
Irish question, 1496
Judges' salaries, pensions, 3228, 3851, 4331-41, 4417-23
Juvenile Delinquents Act, 2842
League of Nations
Canada and the Empire, 484
Lennox, Mr. Justice, 1232
Military Service Branch, 4516-8
Naturalization
Alien enemy origin, 3920-1
Alsace-Lorraine, 3921
Certificate not issued, 3919
Oaths, administration of, 3919
Naturalization Act Amdt. Bill, 3682, 3915-21, 4416
Revocation of certificate, 3915-9
Newspaper postage rate, 3351
Pecuniary Claims Commission, 3858
Penitentiaries, 3409-10, 3858
Alberta, 3855-7

Doherty, Right Hon. C. J.—*Con.*
Penitentiaries—*Con.*
Dorchester, 3855
Portsmouth, appointments pending, 568
Purchasing agent, 3840, 3854-5
Penitentiary Act Amdt., 2848, 3409-10
Pension as ex-judge, 298-9
Personal position in relation to pension, 4423
Purchasing Commission, 4582-3
Quebec riots of 1918, 1211
St. James by-election, 707, 787
St. Peter river, floods, 859
Shipbuilding, contracts and tenders, 664-6
Stoneham, the late Finlay, 568
Supreme Court Act Amdt., 2003-4, 2315-8, 2389
Supreme Court reports, 3855
Washington, Canadian minister at, 2469-73

Dominion Alliance, 807

Dominion Arsenals, Quebec, 3717, ques. 3862

Dominion Canners, ques. 415. *See also* Board of Commerce

Dominion Franchise Bill, 1r., 338, 2r., 710; 756-775; com., 775, 1061; 1085; 1103, 1152, 1160, 1165, 1175, 1512, 1574, 1790, 1916, 1985, 2023, 2082, 2204, 2267, 2269, 2318, 2417, 3864, 4264; 3r., 4379
Amdts.—recorded divisions;
1. By-elections; 2. Provincial lists;
3. Naturalization; 4. Propaganda;
5. Publicity of contribution, 4360-79
Debate of Bill, arrangements for, 1072, 1166, 1198, 1837, 1944-5, 2417, 2430-2, 3901
Com. on forms, 2001
Non-contentious clauses, 776
Printing, copies of Bill, 704
Statement as to additions, 582
Translation into French, 1061
Sections and subjects discussed:
Accidents and errors—provisions in case of, 1110
Advance polls, 1162, 1933, 1998, 3864, 3873, 4271
List of, 3875
Agents and officers to vote, 1918
Aliens, 340. *See also that title*
Certificate, 2057, 2082, 2204
Amdt. (Mr. Euler) neg. 2224
Amdt. (Mr. Pardee) moved 2225-6, neg. 2242
Amdt. to 3r. (Mr. Euler) 4369; neg. 4373
Armed strangers, 1108
Assistant Chief Electoral Officer, 1513, 4269-70

Dominion Franchise Bill—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed—*Con.*
Ballots, 1097
Counterfoil and, 1103, 1104
Counting before opening of poll, 1101
Forgery or destruction of, 1098
Form of, black border, 1168
Not to be displayed, 1103
Ballot boxes, 1097
Custody of, 1928
Returning, 1927
"Blocking the poll," 1827
Bribery, treating, undue influence, personation, 1156
By-election, simultaneous, 1090-1
Amdt. (Mr. Fielding) 4359-60 to 3r.
Campaign funds. *See under this title* Contribution
Canada Temperance Act, 1166, 1943, 2052, 3864
Candidates,
Consent, 1095
Withdrawal of, 1096
Canvassing by outsiders, 772, 786
Chief Electoral Officer, 339, 1070, 1075, 4264
Remuneration of—res. 4136
Report as to working of law, 1110
Salary, 1512, 4516
To retain papers, 1111, 1928
Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, 1069, 1198
Compulsory voting, 1062-4
Contributions, 781, 1169, 1930
Publicity of, amdt. (Mr. Mackenzie King), 4272; amdt. (Mr. McMaster), 1171; neg. 1198; amdt. (Mr. Maharg) to 3r., neg., 4373
Conveyance of electors to polls, 786, 1061
Corrupt practices—disqualification, 1160
Counting and reporting vote, 1109
Definitions, 775
Deposit, 1091, 1095
Deputy returning officers, 1074
Disfranchisement, 731, 735, 738, 746, 748, 750, 757, 763, 765, 768
Disqualification—*See also under this head,* corrupt
Candidate, of, 1085, 4271
Electors of, 1996
Charitable aid, those receiving, 1812
Criminals, 1820
Returned soldiers exempted from, 1811, 1820
Voting notwithstanding, 1824
"Ecclesiastics," 1070, 1076
Election clerk, 1073, 1515-6
Election expenses, 1152, 1929. *See also under this title* Contributions

Dominion Franchise Bill—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed—*Con.*
Election expenses—*Con.*
Advertising, 1930
Proposal that Dominion treasury pay, 1197
Publicity of, 747
Return of by agent, 1155
Election officers, 1918
Fees and expenses, 3867, 4270
Taxation of, 1111, 1152
Persons disqualified for, 1075
"Election papers, 1928, 2023
Election return, 1110, 1928
Executory contracts void, 781
Expenses
Accounts, taxation of, 1929
Former general elections, 728
Or wages of voter, payment of forbidden, 1064
Personal, 1991
False, oath—penalty, 781
False statements—made to effect election, 1065
Fees, statement to be placed in box, 1926-7
Forms, 1166, 3868
Hindus who were soldiers, 1812, 1821
Interpretation, 1943
"Advance Poll," 1943
"Candidate," 1943, 1985
"During an election," 1985
"Election officer," 1987
"Elector," 1988
"Hours of the day"—"standard time," 1988, 1994
"List of voters," 1989
"Member," 1989
"Official agent," 1991
"Rural Polling Division," 1991-2
"Urban polling division," 1991
"Voter," 1993
Judges and elections, 721
Jurisdiction, 712, 725, 761
Married women's names—how listed, 1827, 3869, 4272
Misfeasance—penalty, 1074
Names not on list, 1926, 3877
Nomination of Candidates, 1090
"Electors" how defined, 1916
Place of, 1092
Postponement, 1096
Non-electors and non-residents, canvassing, 784-6
Notices, 777, 1169
Oaths, 779-81, 1102
Ontario, election laws amdt act, effect of, 3880-98
Ontario provincial voters' lists, 3880

Dominion Franchise Bill—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed—*Con.*
Orders in Council, repeal of, 776
Orientals, 1811, 1820
Paid propaganda—amdt. (Mr. McMaster) to 3r., 4374
Peace and good order, 1105
Liquor, 1108
Penalties, 1160
Personal registration of voters, rules for, 3901, 3907
Rules, 4272
"Plugging," 2350
Political contributions. *See under this title* Contributions.
Poll books to returning officer, 1078
Polls
Hours to be open, 1919
Pencil provided, 1102
When to be held, 1101
Polling divisions, 1516, 1811, 1995
Polling place—parties present, 1098, 1102
Additional, 1826
Population and status of place, 2320
Present laws, insufficiency of, 710, 724
Printers' name, 779
Proclamation—language of publication, 1918, 2267, 2277, 1828, (Amdt) Mr. Turgeon, 1834
Mailed to postmaster, 1080
Notices, etc., 2319
Provincial lists
Amdt. (Mr. Mackenzie King) to 3r., 4363; neg. 4366
Jurisdiction, 339, 3889
Qualification of electors, 1811, 4271. *See also under this title* Aliens
Indians, 2055
Recall, the, 2023-5
Amdt. (Mr. Tweedie) 2023-5, neg. 2052
Recount by Judge, 1110
If judge fails to act, 1110
Registrar and enumerator, 1096
Registrars, 720, 728, 3899
Public officers, choice of, as, 722
Registration of voters
Interrogatories, 1167
Removing notices, 779
"Residence," 1159
Returning officer, 720, 759
Civil Service Commission, proposed appointment by, 1809
Duty on receipt of writ, 1516
Further duty of, 1096
Oath of, 1166
Rules for personal registration amdts. 3901
Rural municipalities, 339
Schedules, 1166

Dominion Franchise Bill—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed—*Con.*
Secrecy during poll, 1103
Staff and temporary assistance, 1073
Swearing in of names. *See under this title* Voters' list.
Swearing in voters, 721
Telegraph communications by, 1068, 1198
Time element, the, 728
Voters' lists, 2319
Corrections in, 1103
Married woman's name, 1827
New lists, 1825, 1997
Not necessary, 1826, 4272
Preparation of, 3878, 4271
Provincial, use of, 2417. *See also under this title* Provincial
Voting
By mail, 1163
By proxy, 1162
Manner of, 1103
On certificate, 1098
War-time Elections Act, effect of, 711, 725, 734, 765
Women voters, 2418
Writs, 1073, 1166
Nomination—election—delay, 1092
To be addressed to returning officers, 1515

Dominion Land Surveyors. *See* Land Surveyors

Dominion Lands, acreage unsold in West, ques. 1118

Dominion Lands and Parks, 3283

Dominion Lands Act Amendment Bills
1. Alien Homesteaders. 1r., 704; 2r., 1048, 1233; com., 1233; Consolidated with Bill following
2. Soldiers of Associated Powers. 1r., 1113; 2r., com., 1233; 3r., 1235

Dominion Police. *See* Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Dominion Steamers, 1598

Dominion Steel Corporation, 623

Dominion Troops, Services of overseas, Resolution of thanks from British House of Commons, 1159

Dorval Military Property, 3727, 3731

Doughty, Dr., and war trophies, 4557

Douglas, Mr. James M. (Strathcona)
Budget, 2838. Tariff for revenue, 2838; income tax—manufacturers and farmers, and prices, 2839

Douglas, Mr. James M.—*Con.*
Franchise Bill
Counting and reporting vote, 1109
Oath by elector, 1102
Polling divisions, 1517
Polls, hours to be open, 1924
Returning officers, 1584
Grand Trunk Railway acquisition, 1458
Rulings and statements as Chairman
Bills, printed in both languages, 3251
Soldiers Settlement Act—cattle branding, 1698
Special War Revenue Amdt. Bill
Bank overdrafts, 3798
Candy, 3592
Carpets and rugs, 3585
Hats, 3453
Jams and marmalades, 3796
Underwear, 3453-4, 3567

Douglas, Mr. John C. (Cape Breton South and Richmond)
Coal purchases by Canadian Merchant Marine, ques. 1115

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry (Minister of Finance)
Auditor General's report, 458, 2179, 2390
Belgium, proposed credit, 583
Bonds, tax-exempt, 3339
Budget, inquiry as to, 1047
Budget, the, 2476. Exports and imports (aggregate trade) 2477; national debt, 2478; inflation, 2479; trade with Great Britain and with United States, 2481; revenue and expenditure, 1919-20 and estimated for 1920-1, 2483; Grand Trunk acquisition, 2484; luxury taxes, 2486; motor cars, liquors, sales, stamps, moving pictures, 2487; income tax, 2488; business profits tax—customs war duty removal, 2489; tariff, 2490; resolutions, 2492
Business profits war tax, 3111-7, 3229-37
Public utilities, 3230-7
Canadian National Railways and Canadian Government Merchant Marine—withholding of information justified, 1679-80
Civil Service
Bonus, 1269-71, 1279-89
Slide masters, 1279
Insurance, 1054-6, 1779-81
Retirement fund, 459-60
Currency (coinage) 399, 401
Exchange and, 461
Currency Act Amdt., 460-2
Customs Tariff Act Amdt. Bill, 3110-1, 3174

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry—*Con.*
Demobilization. *See under this title,* War Loans
Gas and electricity, tax, 3111-4
Gold shipment to New York, 181
Government annuities, 402-6, 462-3
Income War Tax Act Amdt. Bill, 3118-28, 3237-55, 3296, 3316, 4288
Absentees, 3303
Accounting period, 3305-8
Additional information, demand for, 3302
Beneficiaries, 3309
Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and, 3306
Charities, 3313
Consolidation of laws, 3315
Deficits and losses, 3240-1, 3297
Delinquents, disputable assessments, 3118-27
Distraint of goods, 3304
Dividends, when liable, 3305-6
Earned and unearned incomes, 3309-10
Errors in returns, 3315-6
Estate accumulating in trust, 3243, 3309
Exemptions on account of children, 3297
Five per cent added, 3251-2
Graduated tax, 3126
"Householders," 3249, 3315
Indemnity of members and, 3306, 3310-1
Installments, 3301, 3253
Partnerships, 3252
Part payment with return, 3253
Patriotic and charitable funds, 3244-8, 3309
Penalties, 3303
Pensions, 3253
Refunds, 3301
Residence or investment outside Canada, 3249-51
Retroactive provision, 3304
Returns, 3253-4
Forms, in French, 1085, 1573
Stock dividends, 3238-40
Tax Bills delayed, 3125
Interim Supply Bill, 3215-8
Kingston Harbour works, 459
Loan Companies Act Amdt., 1776-1779
Mint, the, 615-6, 798
Newsprint shortage, 2967-8
Returned soldiers' insurance, Senate amdts., 4466
Returns and questions, 753
Scottish Canadian Insurance Corporation, 583-4
Session of Parliament, time of, 3217
Shipbuilding, cost of—not another popular loan, 917

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry—*Con.*
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 3988-4017, 4155-68
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill
Administration—cards of directions, 3480, 3791
Amdt. (Mr. Crerar). Taxes payable at source, 3483-7
Auctions, 3575
Automobiles, 3597, 3793
Bank overdrafts, 3624-5, 3798-3800
Beer used to make vinegar, 3604
Binder twine, 3623
Boats, canoes, etc., 3588-92
Boots, 3563-3585
Breakfast foods, 3795
Bric-a-brac, 3576
Candy, 3592-4
Caps, 3566, 3790
Carpets and rugs, 3585
Chandeliers, 3578
Changes made in resolutions, 3345
Clark, Mr. M., reply to, 3442-5, 3449
Date of coming into effect, 3607, 3629
Defended—precedent of 1896, 3444
Duties paid before, 3624
List and explanation, 3561-2
Chewing gum, 3594
Clocks and watches, 3574
Clothes, 3564, 4289-90
Collection,
Method of, 3465-8, 3458-9
Progress of—retailers and collections, 3479
"Consumer," how defined, 3795
Containers, 3633-4
Curtains, 3578
Debate of, arrangements for, 3454-6
Dresses, except silk, 3587
Duties paid before changes, 3624
"Excise and sale" and luxury taxes, 3316, 3319-20, 3465-8
Amdt. (Mr. Lemieux), exemption of returned soldiers, 3447
Explanation and answering of questions, 3326-35
Firearms, 3595, 3793
Food, 3616, 3795
Fountain pens, etc., 3577-8, 4289
Furniture, 3575-6
Gas and electric light fixtures, 3597
Glass, cut, 3569
Imports and manufactures, 3566
Instructions issued, 3791, 3480
Jams and marmalades, 3796
Jewellery, 3578-85
Licenses, 3581
Medals, 3585
Wedding rings, 3584, 3797

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry—*Con.*
Special War Revenue Act—*Con.*
Lace, 3792-3
Lace and braid, 3574
Licenses, 3606-8, 4290
Small manufacturers, 3797
Liquor cabinets, smokers' cabinets and tea wagons, 3793
Merchandise not delivered on May 19, 3613
Moving pictures, 3627-8
Musical instruments, 3595-6, 3628-9
Oriental rugs, 3577
Overcoats, 3586
Paragraph by paragraph, consideration, M. 3487-8
Peas (split), etc., 3795
Penalties, 4290
Permanency of taxes, 3479
Plated ware, 3572
Playing cards, 3599-4000
Prices, how arrived at, 3790
Promissory notes, 3624
Proprietary medicines, 3600-6
Purses and pocketbooks, 3568
Real estate sales, 3796
Refunds, 3607-8, 3629-31
Ribbons, 3574
Sales taxes, 3608-17, 3794
Foods, 3616-7
Manufacturers' agents, 3610
Senate amendments, 4505-6
Silk fabrics, 3572-3
Silk kimonas, etc., 3790
Silk waists, 3632
Silks, 3563
Spirits and medicated wines, 3600, 3793
Sporting goods, 3569-72
Stamps, 4290
Stamp taxes, 3627, 3801
Stock transfers, 3625-6, 3800
Stockings, 3567
Tobacco pipes, 4289
Toilet ware, 3576
Tooth washes and powders, 3794
Underwear, 3568
Wedding rings, 3797
Wheat meal, 3796
Supply
Interim vote, 754-6
Taxation of mutual insurance companies, 2080
Trust and Loan Company of Canada, 586
Trust Companies, 855
Trust Companies Act Amdt., 1779
Victoria Shipowners (limited) 4584
War loans—oversubscriptions, 4137, 4180-1, 4287-8

Dredging, 3781-90

Drugs. *See* Opium and Drugs; Food and Drugs; Proprietary Medicines

Dry Docks, 4567
Vancouver, B.C., ques. 316, ques. 3620
Victoria, B.C., ques. 3619

Duff, Mr. William (Lunenburg)
Archibald, Col. Grassie, ques. 2007
"Canada," steamer, ques. 1230
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, Ques. 996
Income and expense, 623
Information withheld, policy opposed, 1676, 1681
Canadian navy, ques. 540
"Canadian Recruit," steamer, ques. 312
Cape Race, 2117
Charlottetown fish hatchery, ques. 313
Civil Service
Insurance, 1054-5
Retirement fund, 459-60
Dredging, 3783-4
Extension of trade, 1884
Firearms—licenses—ship-captains, 3411
Fisheries
British Columbia, 3534
Department, estimates, 3521-5
Development of, M. in favour, 839
Food inspectors, 3539-41
Franchise Bill
Advance and proxy voting, 1164, 1933-6, 2001
Peace and good order, 1107
Voters' lists, provincial, 2333-7
Govt. steamers, crews, wages, 2112-3
Grand Trunk Railway acquisition, branch lines, 1318-9
Halifax marine agency, 2110
Hanna, Mr. D. B. and Canada Steamships, Limited, 1742
Health Department and Civil Service Commission, 3543
Housing expenditure, 3550
Icebreakers, "Montcalm," 2112
Ice conditions, Atlantic coast, 2105-7
International Fisheries Commission, ques. 311
Liquor shipments and Marine Dept., 2108
Lunenburg, registrar, 2108-10
Margeson, Mr. J. W., ques. 1036
Marine hospitals, 3554
Masters and mates, 569, 984-6
Naval defence
Newfoundland, position of premier of, 3499
Naval service, 3516-20, 4395

Duff, Mr. Wm.—*Con.*
Naval Service..*Con.*
Additional appropriation, $1,700,000, 4401-2, 4291-9
Badges, 437-446
Department
Ballantyne, Hon. Mr., statement as to leader of Opposition, 4412
Salaries, 4409
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., K.C., ques. 3618
Oleomargarine, 1865
Pensions Board employees and soldier organizations, ques. 1116
Pictou harbour, 2184-89, 3493
Wharfage dues, 2189
Pilotage, 2120-1
Public buildings—payments, 3724
Roumania, shipments to, ques. 312, ques. 343
St. Lawrence river power development, ques. 1120, ques. 1230
Shipbuilding and Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 632, 641, 646
Expense and income, 904-6
Government ownership, 906
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 4001-8, 4148-51, 4159-67
Sick and distressed mariners, 2256-58, 2260
Skeena river hatchery, ques. 412
Soldier settlement, and fishermen, 1690
Special War Revenue Act Amdt Bill, 3466
Bank overdrafts, 3625
Collection, method of, 3478-80
Motor boats, canoes, etc., 3588-90
Musical instruments, 3595
Staff, estimated, 3478
"Stanley," steamer, ques. 312
Steamboat inspection 1051-2, 1763-75
West Indies, 1885

Duncan, Mr. Walter, ques. 1117, ques. 2720

Dupont, Mr. Joseph, ques. 590

Du Tremblay, Mr. P. R. (Laurier-Outremont)
Allies conference at Ostend, 2476
Budget, 3063. New taxes and high cost of living, 3063; income tax—revenue needs as argument for new taxes—tariff commission, 3064; shipbuilding—the German war indemnity, 3065; England after the war—congratulations to Minister of Finance, 3066
Franchise Bill
"Candidate," 1985
Proclamation—two languages, 1082
Newspaper postage, 3760
Ottawa city, agreement with, 988
Parliament buildings, 1427
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 4005, 4009
War indemnity—Canada's share, 1084

Economic Conditions of the World
Peace conference declaration, 1888. Prices; peace not yet established; production, increase of needed; consumption, increase of; inflation of currency; profiteering; thrift; credit, difficulties in; co-operation of all classes needed; conclusions, summary of

Economic Development Commission, ques. 1896

Editorial Committee, 4322. *See also* Printing
French member necessary, 4503-5

Edmonton
Alberta penitentiary, 3855, ques. 2777
Post Office, 4518
Deputy postmaster, ques. 1739
Papers, motion for, 1900
Money parcel lost, ques. 412, 923

Edmundston
Post office and customs, ques. 2722

Education. *See also* Technical Education; Schools
Aliens, of, 819, 822
English speech among the foreign-born, 814
Federal Bureau of, 826
M. (Mr. Edwards) in favour of, 1362
Methods of, 820

Edwards, Mr. John Wesley (Frontenac)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 135. Reply to Mr. W. F. Maclean, 135; vacancies and by-elections, 136; Assiniboia by-election—absence of Prime Minister, 137; cabinet representation—Hon. Mr. Blondin, 138; French-Canadians and Hon Mr. Blondin—War-time elections act, 139; Military Voters Act and its effect on election, 140; Opium, Hon. Mr. Mackenzie King and, 141; Hearst papers, 142; Quebec and its "hour," 143
Aliens
Immigrants and Canadian citizenship, 826
"Suckling traitors," 732
Budget, 2723. Tariff inquiry and revision, 2723; Liberal party and tariff, 2724; comparison of party records on the tariff, 2725; tariff amdts. of Mr. McMaster and Mr. Fielding, 2728, 2732; Mr. M. Clark and tariff proposals, 2729; Great Britain and protection—fiscal matters and prices in 1909, 2730; reciprocity, 2731; rural depopulation, 2733; Canadian agriculture and United States markets and competition, 2734; Mr. Crerar and the farmers, 2737;

Edwards, Mr. John Wesley—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
Grain Growers' Grain Company, etc., 2738; protection not for a section, but for the country, 2739
Capital punishment, 308
Civil Service
Holidays, 4059
Senate staff, 4059
Clark, Mr. M., record and views on free trade, 2729, 3436-8
Farmers' party, 610
Federal Bureau of Education, 826, 1362, 1384-5, 1396, 1400
Franchise Act, 733
Aliens—certificate, 2231, 2245
Contributions—Assiniboia expenses, 1187
Proclamation, language of publication, 1831-2, 1836, 2280-4, 2288-91, 2295
Recall, the, 2030-4, 2039-42
Assiniboia 1180-1, 1186
Registration—interrogatories, 1168
Returning officers, public officials, 1793
Grading export butter and cheese, 592, 609
Hearst publications, 142, ques. 993, 1290
Income tax
Charities, 3312
Exemptions on account of children, 3297-3300
Inspector at Kingston, ques. 2181
Indemnity of members and salaries of, ministers, 4083
Lighthouses and keepers, 2114
Military training, 3713
Militia
Active militia—allowances, 3671
Cadet service, 3712
Musical instruments, tax on, 3595
Oleomargarine, 597, 612, 1782-7, 1849-73
Pensions and re-establishment, 3941
Pensioner resident outside of Canada, 4047-9
Widowed mother resident outside of Canada, 4047
Portsmouth penitentiary, vacancies in chief positions—Stoneham case, 568
Press gallery reporters, 4503
Race track betting, 3430
Rural mail carriers, 4525
Shipbuilding contracts, 666-7
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 4011
Soldier settlement, 1688-89
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill, 3319, 3339
Changes proposed by Finance Minister, 3436
Stoneham, Finlay, deceased convict, 568
The Menace, ques. 1899
Timiskaming election, 1188

Eggs—imports and exports, ques. 1898

Eight-hour Day, 334, 367, 449
Agriculture and, 374-80, 384, 453
Contractual rights, 372, 373-4
Dominion and provinces, jurisdiction, 450, ques. 509
Minister of Justice, opinion of, 455
International Conference at Washington—draft provisions, 371
League of Nations and, 383
Peace Treaty and, 381
Summary of position in different countries, 382

Electoral Atlas, ques. 317

Electoral Lists,
Bagot county, ques. 2011
By-elections, for, ques. 310. *See also* Dominion Franchise

Election, General
Cost of, ques. 587
Deposits lost, ques. 922
Opposition leader's motion in favour of, 35

Electric Railways. *See* Railway Act, 1919 Amdt. (Provincial Jurisdiction)

Electricity
Competition in sale of—taxation, 3106, 3113
Export of, ques. 1624. *See also* Special War Revenue Act
Inspection, 1887

Elevators. *See also* Grain; Canada Grain Act; Commercial Feeding Stuffs
Dominion Government, ques. 3862-3
Fort William, 565
Screenings, ques. 704, 3401-2
Terminal, 1878

Elgin East vacancy, 1, 11

Elkin, Mr. Stanley E. (St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert)
Budget, 2559. Exchange rate, 2560; business profits war tax—natural resources and development, 2560; protective tariff and those who benefit by it, 2561; the organized farmers and their business activities, 2561; farmers are prosperous, 2562; voting strength of country and city, 2563; American factories brought into Canada by protection—reductions in Canadian tariff, 2564; free trade, effect of on transportation and credit, 2567; duty of members of Parliament to lead public opinion, 2568

Emigration,
Canada, from, ques. 1119
Mennonites to United States, 2127, 2179, 2248

Empire, the. *See also* Washington, Canadian Minister at; League of Nations; Peace Treaty
Canada's status in, 359
Independence opposed by Government and Parliament, 365
Imperial War Cabinet, 362

Employment Offices, 4512-3
Order in Council affecting, 3087

Employment Offices Co-ordination Bill, 1r., 2313-14; 2r., 3086; com., 3088; 3r., 3092

Enemy Aliens. *See* Aliens; Naturalization; Dominion Franchise

Enterprise Foundry Company, ques. 2415

Entomology, Branch, 2401

Erieau, 2115

Estimates. *See also* Supply, Com. of
Form of objected to,
Civil Service bonus, 1276
Method of voting, 108, 2778. *See also* King, Hon. Mr.
Supplementary, 1920-21, 1229, 1254, 2412, 4257, 4413
Inquiry as to, 3769
"Examiner of Estimates" 108

Ethier, Mr. Joseph A. C. (Laval-Two Mountains)
Bankruptcy Bill, 4097
Cinematographic films, tax on, ques. 3489
Civil Service
Bonus, 3228
Classification, ques. 505, 552, 592, 675. *See also under this title,* House of Commons
Conscription, ques. 320
Conservation Commission, ques. 2573
House of Commons
French language, rights of, 1040
Organization and classification of staff, 858, 1038
Naval Service—Ballantyne, Hon. Mr., reference to leader of Opposition, 4411
Otter, Sir William Dillon, ques. 673
Post Office and Customs Departments, rumoured investigation, 3623
St. Hermas postal service, ques. 412
Tobacco, duties on, ques. 1114

Ethyl Alcohol. *See* Inland Revenue; Special War Revenue

Euler, Mr. William D. (North Waterloo)
Aliens and franchise, 340. *See also under this title,* Franchise; Naturalization
Belgium, proposed credit to, 582
Canadian National Railways, mail contracts and, 4530
Civil Service bonus, 4547
Eight-hour day, 357, 383
Jurisdiction, ques. 509
Franchise Bill, 739
Advance polls, 3876
Aliens, 2057, 2065-6, 2071, 2074-5, 2091-6, 2227-8, 2231-2, 2240-2
Amdt. 2096
Amdt. to 3r., 4367-72
Voters' lists, 2429
Provincial lists, 3895
Grand Trunk Railway acquisition, 1501, 1505
Income tax, 3126
Internment case, 4518
League of Nations, 357
Letter carriers, 4529
Naturalization Act, 3683
Alien, enemy origin, 3920
Certificate not issued, 3919
Imperial citizenship and, ques. 996
Revocation of certificate, 3915-8
Opium and Drug Bill, 1633-4, 1746, 1751-3
Parliament Buildings, 1425-7
Postal employees' salaries, 2670, 3145
Roumania, advance to, ques. 3488
Rural mail carriers, ques. 414, 4523
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 4144-7, 4156
Special War Revenue Act Amdt, 3439
Auctions, 3575
Automobiles, 3598
Boats, canoes, etc., 3590-1
Collection, method of, 3439, 3459-62
Furniture, 3574-5
Hats, 3562
Gas and electric light fixtures, 3596
Jewelry, 3579
Luxuries, on retail sale, list of, 3462
Musical instruments, 3628

Europe, distress in, 116, 4545. *See also* League of Nations

"Examiner of Estimates," 108

Exchange, rate of, 69, 112, 126, 145, 157, 165, 178, 190
Gold shipment to New York, 181
United States trade, and, 55

Exchequer Court Act Amdt. Bill, 1r., 2003; 2r. com., 2200; 3r., 2204

Excise
Estimates, 3859

Excise and Sales Tax. *See also* Special War Revenue
Prices, effect on, 3329

Exhibitions, 4558

Exhibition Buildings, use of by Militia, ques. 2009

Experimental Farms. *See also* Agriculture; Commercial Feeding Stuffs, ques. 1360, 2382, 2390, 2412
Achievements of, 1013
New buildings, etc, 3156
Ontario, extension in, M. by Mr. Sutherland, 1005
Swift Current, 4560

Exploration
Stefansson expedition, ques, 704

Explosives, 2248. *See also* Beloeil; Mines

Export Regulations. *See* Customs Act Amdt

Exports. *See also* Trade
Hides to United States, ques. 313
Increase of and means to promote, 621, 626
Wheat to United States, ques. 313
Wheat to Greece, ques. 415

Expropriation. *See* Irrigation Act

External Affairs, Dep, 4534

Extra-Territorial effect of Dominion legislation, 4169

Fafard, Mr. J. Fernand (L'Islet)
Budget, 2717. Wish courage to those who have to pay taxes—railway deficits—standing army, 2717; militarism—new taxes—tariff revision, 2718; high cost of living and popular unrest, 2719; national unity, 2720
Cimon, Mr., and Military defaulters, ques. 1462
Civil Service classification, ques. 997
Dominion land surveyors, ques. 1115, ques. 2006
Flax industry, 693
Food—price regulation, 1144, 1151
High cost of living, 1151
St. Camille-Cabano proposed railway, ques. 589

Farm Labour, 1011, 1220, 1227
Spring work, for, ques. 800

Farms, Fertility of. *See* Commercial Feeding Stuffs

Farmers' Account Book, ques. 315

Farmers' Movement and party, 102, 127, 153, 186, 196, 282, 1219, 1226, 2057. *See also* Canadian Council of Agriculture
Subsidies and bounties, position on, 899

Federal Bureau of Education. *See* Education

Federal Emergency Fund, ques. 1199; ques. 2182

Fertilizers, 119

Fielding, Hon. William Stevens (Shelburne and Queen's)
Admiralty Act Amdt, 3086
"Allied and Associated Powers," 1234
Bill—printing of in English and French, 1057
Board of Commerce, 1685
Bridges, 3772-9
British Columbia Indians, 952
British North America Act Amdt, 41-69-70
Budget, The, 2495. Congratulations to Minister of Finance in view of difficulties of situation, 2496; loans, stabilizing the market, 2507-2517; borrowing in Canada and its effect, 2490; revenues and expenditure, 2500; net debt, 2501; economy needed, 2502; tariff, free trade or protection 2,503; bounties, 2506; the Farmers' party, 2507; Liberal party and policy, 2508; tariff inquiry, 2509; amdt moved, 2510
Budget, date of, 2247, 2318
Budget debate not limited by amdt, 2518
Business of the House, order of, 2314
Business profits war tax, 3111
Public utilities, 3231-2
Canada and the Empire, 493
Canada and the United States, 496
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, Crews, 641
Canadian National Railways
Lockeport proposed extension, 3085, 3376, 4218
Nomenclature and legislation, 3390
Western extensions, 3390
Withholding of information, 1667
Withholding of information, 1667
Canadian representative at Washington. *See, under this title,* Washington
Correspondence, 3081
Canadian Wheat Board, 4358
Capital punishment, 308
Civil Service
Bonus, 1269-72, 1289
Insurance, 1056
Ottawa, taxation, 579
Retirement, 3825-30, 4460-5
Retirement fund, 459-60
Returned soldiers and, 3131

Fielding, Hon. William Stevens—*Con.*
Civil Service—*Con.*
Superannuation
Pensions, inadequacy of based on former values, 391
Principle approved, 392-4
Temporary employment, 3129-33
Coal Operations Director Bill, 3361-3
Concurrence in supply, 4586
Criminal Code Amdt (French version) 3081-84
Currency, coinage, 399
DeCelles, Mr., superannuation of, 2968
Dominion Lands Act Amdt (United States soldiers) 1234
Dredging, 3783
Dry docks, 4570-2
Eight-hour day, 380
Estimates and their discussion, 4586, 4589
Experimental and demonstration farms, 2385-6
Export regulations, 3621
Extra session, 1919, ques. 543
Firearms, licenses, 3410-3
Fish inspection, 1054, 4586
Food and drugs Bill, 956-69, 1257, 1260-2
Franchise Bill, 759
Advance and proxy voting, 1162
Aliens—certificate, 2072-6, 2234-7
Ballot and counterfoil, 1105
By-elections, simultaneous, 1090-1
Amdt. to 3r., 4359
Chief Electoral Officer, 1513, 4136-7
Successor to, 4270
Contributions—expenses—public treasury should pay, 1197
Conveying voters, 1063
Corrupt practices, 1160
Deposit, 1091, 1110
Disqualification of candidate, 1086-8
Election expenses, return, 1155
Election officers, fees, etc., 1111-2
False statement made to affect election, 1067
Nomination of candidates, 1090-2
Proclamation, 1081-2
Provincial lists, 2323, 2352-5, 2419-20
Amdt. (Mr. Mackenzie King) to 3r., 4365
Nova Scotia lists, 3899-3900
Returning officers, 1515 ,1521-5, 1532-5, 1581
Amdt—public officers, 1521
"Standard time," 1988-9
Franking privilege, 3358
French speeches in House, translation of, 700
Government annuities, 403, 4528

Fielding, Hon. William Stevens—*Con.*
Grand Trunk Railway, 1251, 1296-1303, 1356
Branch lines, 1319-21
Loans—amdt., 1504, 1537
London—Trafalgar Square office, 1251
Ratification of agreement, 1321-4
Stocks, value of, 1562-3, 1567
Halifax, Militia Dept. property, 3724
Hartney, Mr. E. P., 4566
House of Commons
Empire Day adjournment, 2575
Monday for Government business, 1464
Orders of the day—time taken by Minister in reply to question, 3425
Saturday and morning sittings, 2786
Staff, organization and classification of, 1037
Messengers, 3097
Icebreakers — Nova Scotia south shore ports, 1607, 2124
Income tax, 3251
Charities, 3247-9, 3312-3
Deficits and losses, 3241
Dividends, when liable, 3304-6
Part payment with return, 3253
Indemnity of members and salaries of Ministers, 4078
Correction of press report, 4171
Separate bills suggested, 4380, 4454
Inquiry for return, 3226
Inspection and Sale Act Amdt
Nova Scotia fruit growers, 2017, 3109
Jellicoe, Admiral, 386
Judges' salaries and pensions, 4418-23
Doherty, Right Hon. Mr., case of, 4424
League of Nations
Canada's contribution toward expenses, ques. 589, que. 618
Canada's status, 350 353, 366
Labour, 355-6
Peace, maintenance of, 353
Loan Companies Act Amdt, 1778
Lockeport, 3085, 3376, 4218
Lockeport-Froude's Point steamer service, 4514, 4284-5
Lotbiniere and Megantic Railway, 4585
Maple products, 796-7, 1254
Militia, Contingencies, 3714
Mint, the, 616
Naval College graduates, 4562
Naval Service
Additional appropriation, $1,700,000, 4386
Estimates, 4316-20
Newspaper postage, 3761
Nickel coinage, 400
Oil—leases, royalty on, 3809-10
Oleomargarine, ques. 1117, 1787, 1856-74

Fielding, Hon. William Stevens—*Con.*
Opium and Drug Bill, 1750, 1760
Ottawa city, agreement with, 580, 991-2
Parliament Buildings, 1418-23, 1429-32
Furniture and fittings, 3155
Partisanship, extreme, 493
Peace Treaty
Bulgaria, with, 475, 493, 1058-9
Canada's position, 493
France—protection against Germany, 1059
Ratification, 475
Peat, 3807
Penitentiary Act Amdt., 3409-10
Pensions—widowed mother, 4044-6, 4050
Point of order—matter pending before com., 3652
Prime Minister and portfolio, 4456
Privilege—Press report — indemnity of members, 4171
Public accounts, 1839
Public buildings, none new, 3147
Purchasing Board, 1469-78
Registered postal rate, 3733
Registrar of shipping, 2109
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 3203, 4575
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 3997, 4155-6, 4160-6
Sick and distressed mariners, 2265-6
Soldier Settlement, 1692
Fishermen and, 1690
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill, 3320
Automobiles, 3599
Boats, canoes, etc., 3589-90
Collection, method of, 3464-6
Containers, 3615
Debate on Bill, arrangements for, 3454-5
Fountain pens, 3577-8
Furniture, 3576
Imposition, mode of, 3340
Jewellery, 3339, 3578-84
Musical instruments, 3596, 3629
Proprietary medicines, 3602
Sporting goods, 3570
Stock transfers, 3626
Sugar embargo, 3226
Supply
Interim vote, 754-6
Terminal elevators, 1878
Trade Commissioners, 1886
War loans
Bonds, amount of, ques. 2008
Validation of over-subscriptions, 4180-1
Victory loans, 2520
Washington, Canadian Minister at
M. in amdt. to Supply, 2442-4, 2453, 3081, 4534-42

Finance. *See also* Budget; Grand Trunk Railway; Highways; Loans; Taxation; Chartered Banks.
Department, employees, ques. 592
Dominion revenues, ques. 1001
Federal emergency fund, ques. 1199; ques. 2182
International Financial Conference, 1465
Obligations and revenues, ques. 998
Tax-free bonds, 192

Firearms. *See* Customs Act; Criminal Code

Fiscal Policy of Government. *See also* Address; Budget
Inquiry, 583

Fiset, Dr. Michel, ques. 317, 2015, 4530

Fish Inspection Act Amdt. Bill. Res. 855, 1052; 1r., 1054; 2r., 1175; Com., 4585; 3r., 4586

Fish Meat used as food for hogs, 3164

Fisheries
Biological Board, ques. 2572
British Columbia fish, quantity, ques. 505
Development. Res. (Mr. Duff) in favour of, 839
Dogfish, 848
Estimates, 3520
Fishermen, education of, 846
Grenfell, Dr., and, 2266
Hatcheries
Charlottetown, ques. 313
Salmon, 848
Skeena river, ques. 412
International Commission, ques. 311
Japanese and, 844
Lobster hatchery employees, ques. 4096
Lobsters, illegal fishing, ques. 410
Officers,
Isle Madame, ques. 3294, 3520
Overseers and guardians, 3522
Pacific Coast, 3521-2
Patrol, 3521, 3523-4
Returned soldiers, and, 531, 885
Peck, Mr., M. Res. 3933. *See also* Soldier Settlement
Treaty with United States 1290, ques. 1002, 1290, 3161
Vessels. *See that title*

Flax. *See also debates on* Scientific Research
Bounty, 1886
Grants, ques. 806
Industry, res. (Mr. Glass), 675
Seed. *See* Commercial Feeding Stuffs

Flour. *See also* Wheat
Canadian, shipments of, ques. 1788
Mills, small, ques. 799

Flynn, Capt. Percy, ques. 2415

Fontaine, Mr. Joseph E. (Hull)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 104. Opposition leader and the War—public debt and expenditure, 104; Board of Commerce—Franchise Act—capital and labour, French Canadians, 105, proposed general election, 106
Budget, 2715. Union Government and tariff revision, 2715; war profits—unwarranted expenditures and inadvisable economies, 2716; downward revision of the tariff, 2717
French speeches in House, translation of, 701
Income tax, 3251
Purchasing Board, 1484
Special War Revenue Act Amendment Bill, 3468

Food
Gambling in, 4133
Hoarding of, ques. 807
Inspection. *See* Food and Drugs Bill
Production, compared with United States, 679
Shortage, 385, 1845
World situation, 675

Food and Drugs Bill. 1r., 582; 2r., 955, Com., 955, 1256; 3r., 1465
Amdt. (Mr. Pedlow) to refer back, 1465, neg. 1466
Access, refusal of, 977
Adulterations
Drugs, 957-8
Food, 961
Analyses, 963-4
Chief analyst, 967
Compounds to be marked as such, 960
Inspector, 957
Materials usable for adulteration, 977
Misbranding, 958, 1256
Proceedings—evidence, 962
Expenses, counsel fees, 978
Knowledge, 973
No certiorari, 975
Other remedies, 979
Prosecutions, 1263
Regulations, 958, 967-9
Sales, penalties, 971
Samples and bulk, 961
Seizure, 967
Standard containers, 1258
Voluntary payments, 976

Ford Car, 119, 2815, 2823

Foreign Credits
Belgium, proposed, 582
Serbia, reported, 567

Foreign Relations. *See* League of Nations; Washington, Canadian Minister at

Foreign Trade, 2477, 2481. *See also* Budget

Forestry, 3285

Forests, Waterways and Water Powers. *See also* Dominion Lands and Parks
Com. appointed, 307

Fortier, Mr. H. A. (Labelle)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 132. Canada under federal compact, 132; Imperialism, 133; Canada's relations with the Empire—divorce—Labour's legitimate claims, 134; proposed general election, 135
Budget, 2889. Congratulations to Minister of Finance—production and thrift—government extravagance—militarism, 2889; soldiers turning to occupations of peace—railway nationalization, 2890; Liberal fiscal policy—general election advocates, 2891
Exchequer Court Act Amdt. 2201-3
Hull and Montreal highway, 1113
Judges' salaries, 4339-40
Printing Bureau linotypes, ques. 670

Fort William elevator, 565, ques. 1358. *See also* Elevators

Forward Movement of Christian churches, 98

Foster, Mr. A. DeWitt, ques., 1201

Foster, Right Hon. Sir George (Minister of Trade and Commerce and Acting Prime Minister February 26-May 12).
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 35. Congratulations to mover and seconder, 35; Opposition leader's criticism, 36; Franchise Bill—Grand Trunk agreement, 37; preparedness of sessional programme—government by Order in Council—absence of Prime Minister, 38; Peace negotiations and treaty, Canadian Ministers needed in Europe, 39; Ministers of the Crown in the Senate—commissions, 40; cabinet responsibility, 41; proposed general election—the Government's work and record—prosecution of the war, 42; Civil Service reform—Health department—scientific research, 43; women's franchise — prohibition — shipbuilding—cost of living, 44; production—War Purchasing Commission, 45; finance—returned soldiers, 46
Amnesty, general, to political prisoners, 1790
Archambault, Mr., questions by, 709
Armenians, 855
Auditor General's report, 2179, 4276
Bill (Mr. Stevens) proposed introduction, 1216
Board of Commerce
Canners, 1046
Correspondence, 3426
Motion for papers, 2013, 3863
O'Connor, Mr., reported resignation of, 1685
Porter, Mr. Arthur, dismissal of, 568
Robson, Judge, resignation of, 114, 1900
Budget, date of, 1465, 2126, 2247, 2318
Budget, 2510. Debt, gross and net, 2511; economy of administration, 2512; Civil Service policy, 2513; no more loans at present, 2513; taxation to meet present needs, methods of taxation, 2514; forethought and afterthought, 2515; Bank of Montreal trading account, 2516; free trade or protection—Liberal party's policy, 2517
Business of the House
Easter adjournment, 752
Empire Day adjournment, 2575
Late sittings, 1894
Legislation foreshadowed, 1789
Monday for Government business, 1464, 1573
Notices of motion standing, 1628, 2013
Order of, 2314
Wednesday evening sittings, 1044-5
Cabinet changes, 386, 447
Canada Grain Act, administration of, 1877, 3822-4
Canada Steamships Limited and Mr. D. B. Hanna, 1789
Canada Year Book, 1879
Canada's national status, 486
Canada's representative at Washington, 449, 1742, 2177, 2460
Canadian Wheat Board, 4323, 4098, 4110-1, 4341-58
Losses, possible, 4348, 4516
Magill, Dr., statement by, 4124-5, 4342-7
Telegram to Mr. Sifton, 4348
Canadians in Imperial Service, 857
Civil Service classification, 675
Correspondence, motion for, 592
Copyright Bill, 752
Daylight saving, 1574

Foster, Right Hon. Sir George—*Con.*
East Elgin vacancy, 11, 1085
Economic conditions of the world—Peace Conference declaration, 1888
Estimates and their discussion, 4588-9
When to be brought down, 567
Explosive works at Beloeil, 2248
Extension of trade, 1880-6
Federal Bureau of Education, 1398
Flax bounty, 1886
Franchise Bill
Disqualification of candidates, 1089
Returning officers, 1531
Statement as to possible additions, 582
French speeches in House, translation of, 700
French treaty, 3425-26, 4274
Gisborne, Mr. F. H., K.C., Parliamentary Counsel, 4587
Grain Exchange, closing of, reimbursement of losses, 4516
Grand Trunk Railway, 11
Correspondence, 1228
Stock, 754
Hearst Publications, 1290
House of Commons.
Acoustic properties of, 1418, 2126
Debates, Translation of French speeches, 4588, 700
Staff, 1037
Hudson Bay Railway, 2014
Hurons of Lorette, 2014
Imperial Conference, 114
Industrial legislation, 1790
Inquiry for returns, 857
International Financial Conference, 1465
Ireland, condition of, 856
Japanese occupation of Vladivostock, 1945
Jellicoe, Admiral, visit of, 11
Joint distribution office, 1037
League of Nations, 567
Armenian mandate, 1465
French occupation of German territory, 1046
Marshall, the late David, M.P., 10
Mennonites, 2127
Ministers and Grand Trunk stock, 590
Ministers' knowledge of their business, 527
Naval service, ministerial statement, 708
Newfoundland, 4276-81
Oral answers to questions, 1623
Parliament buildings, 2,. 1418-20, 1432-3
Parliamentary librarian, 114
Partisanship, 485, 488
Peace, 230
Peace Treaty, 485
Pensions and Re-establishment Com.
Resignation of:

Foster, Right Hon. Sir George—*Con.*
Pensions and Re-establishment Com.—*Con.*
Lang, Mr., 1085
Peck, Mr., 2081-2
Pensions, soldiers, taxation of, 1895
Prime Minister
Illness and absence of, 9, 114
Return of, 2126
Printing, Joint Committee on, 4321
Public accounts, 1838
Purchasing Board, 1467-70, 1474-9
Questions not answered, 949
Railways, freight to Canada from United States prepaid, 1893
Returned soldiers, 520. *See also, under this title,* Pensions; Soldiers
Cash gratuities to, 1082-84
Life insurance, 522
Returns, delayed, 459
Russia, 4322
Saar Valley Commission, 344
St. Julien, battle of, 1357
St. Lawrence route, insurance, 4515
San Remo Conference, 1465
Scientific Research, 617, 2176
Serbia, reported credit to, 567
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Dept., 520
Soldier Settlement, 521
Statistical Department, 1880, 3296
Steamship companies, supervision of, 2013
Steamship Services
Cape Breton; Lockeport-Froude's Point; Magdalen Islands; Newfoundland; New Zealand; St. Lawrence, etc.; St. John-Digby; South Africa, etc., 4276-87
Economies in, 4287, 4515
Steel and Shipping merger, 1895, 1955-6
Sugar
Embargo, 3226
Prices, 1896
Supply, Com., of, arrangements for, 1597
Interim vote, 755
Terminal elevators, 1878
Trade Commissioners, 1885-6
Universal military training, 948
Victory loan transactions, 2520
War indemnity, Canada's share, 1084
Washington, Canadian Minister at. *See under this title* Canada's representative at Washington
Water carriage of goods, 1216
West Indies, 1884, 2892-3, 3860

Foster, Mr. Thomas (East York)
Bell Telephone rates appeal, ques. 2009
"Excise and sales" tax, 3451
Returned soldier (amdt. Mr. Lemieux) 3452, 3455, 3458-9

Foster, Mr. Thomas—*Con.*
Exhibition buildings and militia, ques. 2009
Franchise Bill, 763
Grand Trunk Railway
Head office, ques. 2008
Technical education, ques. 2519
Toronto
Grain elevators, ques. 1897
Harbour improvements, ques. 2181

Fournier, Mr. C. A. (Bellechasse)
Board of Commerce, 3227
Canadian National Railways, official cars, ques. 409
Cattle embargo, ques. 340
Electric power, export, ques. 1624
Food and Drugs Bill, 958, 977, 1260
Hides, exports to United States, ques. 313; ques. 343
Intercolonial Railway, pensions, ques. 313
St. Valier wharf, ques. 1231

France
Advances to, ques. 318
Occupation of German territory by, 1046

Franchise, 25, 28, 36, 37, 53, 114, 151, 155, 283
By-election lists, ques., 310. *See also* Dominion Franchise Bill

Franco-Canadian Customs Tariff Convention, ques. 3684

Franking Privilege. *See* Post Office Act Amdt. Bill

Fraser, Mr. Evan E. (Welland)
Judges' salaries, 4339

Fraudulent Naturalization Papers, ques. 4096

Freight Cars. *See also* Railways
Grain and grain products in, ques. 1035

Freight Rates. *See* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Railways; Railway Act Amdt.

French Language. *See* Language Questions

French Treaty, ques. 1788; 3425-6, 3684, 4274, ques. 4323

Fripp, Mr. A. E. (Ottawa)
Biggar, Mr. O. M., K.C., 4265-6
Canada Highways Act, ques. 802, ques. 1119
Choquette, Ex-Senator P. A., ques. 2572
Civil Service
Classification, M. for papers, 544, 556
Commission, staff, ques. 2414
Printing Bureau, ques. 320, 3742
Taxation of incomes, 579-80
Ottawa city, agreement with, 579

Fruit Packages. *See* Inspection and Sale

Fuel. *See also* Coal
Price, 321

Fulton, Mr. Frederick J. (Cariboo)
British Columbia Indians, 953
Soldier Settlement, 1695
Cattle branding, 1699

Gambling. *See* Criminal Code

Game. *See* National Parks; Northwest Game Act

Gargoyles, 1433, 1493

Gas, taxation of, 3106

Gas and Electricity inspection, 1887

Gascons Wharf, ques. 411

Gaspesia, resources, attractions and need of railway extensions, 4213-7

Gauthier, Mr. L. J. (St. Hyacinthe-Rouville)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 61. Quebec badly treated, waiting for its hour—war and the constitution, 61; Liberals and Union Government policies, 62; public unrest—Prime Minister's health, 63; proposed election, 64; party system and government, 65
Budget, 2605. Tactics of United Farmers, 2605; Liberals and tariff—Wheat Board, 2606; the Government and its record—Canada's production, 2607; currency, credit and gold reserve—profiteers and prices, 2610
Privilege—Complaint of Treatment by civil servant, 4097

Gauvreau, Mr. Charles A. (Témiscouata)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 209. French language—Hon. Mr. Chapais and conscription—Hon. Mr. Blondin, 209; Mr. DeCelles' retirement, Hon. Mr. Sevigny—Canadian National Railway shops at Rivière du Loup—Quebec biding its time, 210
Arthur Young Co., ques. 1511, ques. 1740
Bank Act Amdt., inquiry, 1573
Business of the House—holiday adjournment moved without notice, unanimous consent denied, 2575
Canadian National Railways
Engine repairs, ques. 3079
Cimon, Mr., collections by, ques. 1461
Civil Service, 670
DeCelles, Mr. A. D., 210, 2968; ques. 3489

Gauvreau, Mr. Charles A.—*Con.*
Dominion Canners ques. 415
Dupont, Mr. Joseph, ques. 590
Empire day adjournment, 2626
Franchise Bill
Disqualification — charitable support, those receiving, 1813-5
French translation, 779, 1061
Indian agents, 3276
Intercolonial employees, pensions, ques. 589
Isle Verte, 3160
Lennox, Mr. Justice, 1232
Lightkeepers, 2110
Montmagny colonization lots, ques. 1229
Parliamentary librarian, 114
Pension Commission employees, ques. 2895
Public Works employees, 3142
Questions
Passed as orders for returns, 1743
Portion deleted, 1045
Rivière du Loup workshops, ques. 315, 801
St. Malo shops, ques. 3079, ques. 3618
Saturday and morning sittings, 2626
Sevigny, Hon. Albert, 210
Témiscouata railway, ques. 674

General Election, proposed. *See* Address

Genoa, International Labour Conference, 3359

Geological Survey, 3801, 4513. *See also* Mines

Georgian Bay Canal and Shipbuilding, 915

Germany
Reparation by, ques., 1463, 2574
Allies Conference at Ostend, 2476

Germany and Austria
Books, ques. 806
Imports from, ques. 2416; ques. 3359
Trade with, ques. 801

Gervais, Mr. Theodore (Berthier)
Budget, 2556. Popular unrest, 2556; tariff policy and its effects, 2557; agriculture, its opportunities and needs—manufacturers and high tariff, 2558
Butter and oleomargarine, ques. 2720
Canada Highways Act, payments under, ques. 806
Scrap iron and steel, ques. 1739
Sorel shipyard superintendent, ques. 343
Vandal, Mr. Calixte, ques. 1740

Gisborne, Mr. F. H., K.C., 4587. *See also* Dominion Franchise Bill; Chief Electoral Officer

Glass, Mr. Samuel F. (East Middlesex)
Alien immigrants, 836
Board of Commerce, 1148-9
Export Butter and Cheese, 598-9
Flax industry, 675
Food and Drugs Bill—Toasted corn flakes, 1261
Franchise Bill
Advance polls, 3876-7
Deposit, 1095-6
Election accounts, 1112
Nomination, place of, 1092
Proclamation, language of publication, 2275-6
Returning officers, 1595
Oleomargarine, 1868
Opium and Drug Bill, 1639
Post Office Department, 3743
Prices, 1148-9
Soldier Settlement, 2133-5
Special War Revenue
Fountain pens, 3577
Gas and electric light fixtures, 3596

Gold, 3107. (*See also* Currency; Yukon)
Commissioner, 3108
Shipment to New York, 181
Standard—Dominion notes and, ques. 588

Good Roads, 45. *See also* Canada Highways Act

Gophers, 3793

Gordon's Reserve school (Indian) 3269, 3278

Gouffre, Riviere Du, ques. 1121

Gould, Mr. Oliver R. (Assiniboia)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 124. Parliament building—Canadian Council of Agriculture platform, 125; Assiniboia election—trade and rates of exchange, 126; tariff and protection—water fronts and mines as taxable resources, 128; conditions in Assiniboia—grasshopper plague, 128; sessional indemnities for unrepresented years, 129
Budget, 2951. Finance Minister's great task—Mr. M. Clark's address—Mr. Meighen on Britain's policy and condition, 2952; exorbitant protection—Dominion Textile Company, 2953; shoes and protective duties; Farmers' platform, 2954; Western Canada Colonization Association—names applied to Progressive group, 2955; Messrs. Stevens, Mowat and Stacey and protective duties, 2956; faith, hope and charity, 2959; farm implement manufacturers, 2960; apple

Gould, Mr. Oliver R.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
prices and protective duty, 2961; lumbering industry and housing problem, 2962; members of the House and special interests, 2964; wages in protected manufactures — proposed railway extension to coal area, 2966
Canadian Wheat Board, 4112-4
Civil Service bonus, 1287
Election for Assiniboia, 1
Franchise Bill
Contributions—Assiniboia expenses, 1172-84
Deposit, 1095
Recall, the, 1181, 2027-30, 2037
Returning officers, 1590-3
Grading export butter and cheese, 607
Grasshopper plague, ques. 705
Indemnity of members, 4449
Indians and wild game, 3280
Parliament Buildings, 1424
Portal immigration hall, ques. 674
Recall. *See under this title,* Franchise
Seed Grain Purchasing Commission, ques. 1117
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 4000, 4015-6
Soldier Settlement Act
Cattle branding, 1699
Increase in stock, 1702
Special War Revenue
Airplanes, 3592
Caps, 3566
Trust and Loan Company of Canada, 586
Universal military training, 947

Government Annuities, 4528

Government Annuities Act Amdt Bill. Res. 402; 1r., 406; 2r., com., 462; 3r., 463

Government Ownership, 124. *See also debates under* Canadian National; Grand Trunk
Ships, of, 627, 659. *See also under* Shipbuilding

Government Printing Bureau. *See* Printing

Government Steamers. *See also* Vessels
Civil Service insurance for crews, 1779

Grain and Grain Trade. *See also* Agriculture; Canada Grain Act; Canadian Wheat Board; Commercial Feeding Stuffs; Seed Grain
Cereal shipments from Canada, ques. 1626
Dominion Seed Grain Purchasing Commission, ques. 1117
Elevators. *See also that title*
Halifax, ques. 1116
Terminal, Port Arthur and Fort William, 565, ques. 1358
Toronto, ques. 1897

Grain and Grain Trade—*Con.*
Flour mills, small, ques. 799
Freight cars, ques. 1035
Grain Exchange, closing of, losses, 4516
Participation certificates, ques. 802
Wheat
Importation in 1912, ques. 590
Shipped by farmers to United States, ques. 802
Spirit River shipments, 566
Winnipeg Grain Exchange, 2005

Granby Public Building, 3149

Grand Etang, 2114, 3779-80

Grand Trunk Railway Company..
Administration of, 4173
Entrance to Montreal, ques. 413
Head office, ques. 2008
London. Trafalgar Square office, 1251
Pensions—and Strike of 1910, 1122
Agreements and letter to Mr. Hays. 4508
Amdt (Mr. Mackenzie King) 1536; neg. 1572
Shareholders, list of, 3426-7, 4258
Stocks, ques. 1361-2, ques. 590, 753
Subsidiary companies, ques. 996

Grand Trunk Railway Acquisition, 11
Arbitrators, 1047, 3860
Taft, Mr., ex-President, 3490
Budget, statement by Minister of Finance, 2484
Correspondence, 1228, 1235
Loan, 4579

Grand Trunk Railway Acquisition Bill. 1r., 1113; 2r., 1235; 1291; 1311; Com. 1311, 1315, 1435, 1486, 1536; 3r., 1572

Grasshopper Plague, 128, ques. 705, 2375

Gratuities to Soldiers
Statement by acting Prime Minister, 1082. *See also* Pensions

Great War Veterans Association, 3669
Soldier Settlement and, 2142

Greece
Advance to, ques. 318
Roumania, and,
Loans, ques. 3488
Purchases by, ques. 2414
Wheat shipments to, ques. 415, ques. 509

Grenfell, Dr., and fishermen, 2266

Grey, Earl, farewell message, 18

Griesbach, Brig.-Gen. William A. (West Edmonton)
Currie, General Sir Arthur, 3653
Enlistments by Provinces, ques. 408
Franchise Bill
Disqualification, charitable aid, those receiving, 1815
Polling divisions, 1516
Returning officers, 1582-4
"Or a returned soldier," 1525
League of Nations, 3976
Militia
Cadet service, 3704
Contingencies, 3716
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 3212
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 4159
Universal military training, 933

Griffenhagen and Associates, 3623, 4521. *See also* Civil Service
Papers moved for and laid on table, 3863

Grosse Isle, ques. 1003
Buildings, ques. 344
Quarantine, 3151
Wharves, ques. 343

Guthrie, Hon. Hugh (Minister of Militia and Defence, and acting Solicitor General)
Bankruptcy Bill, 2246, 3255-65, 4263
Battlefields Memorials, 1460
Demobilization, 4549
Franchise Bill, 338-40, 775-87, 1061-82, 3864-3914; 2r., motion for, 710, 741-2, 773-5
Advance and proxy voting, 1162, 1166, 1933-43, 1997-9, 2002, 3864, 3873
List, 3875-7
Nova Scotia list, 3914
Agents and Officers to vote, 1098, 1918-9, 4271.
Aliens—certificate, 1536, 2057-64, 2214-20, 2226-30. *See also under this title,* Qualifications of Electors.
Armed Strangers, 1108
Assistant Chief Electoral Officer, 1513-5
Ballot
Counterfoil and, 1104-5
Ballots
Counting before opening of poll, 1101
Forgery or destruction of, 1098
To be alike, 1097
Ballot boxes, expenses of returning, 1927-8
Bribery, treating, undue influence, personation, 1156-9
By-elections
Simultaneous 1090-1
Amdt. (Mr. Fielding) to 3r., 4359

Guthrie, Hon. Hugh—*Con.*
Franchise Bill—*Con.*
Campaign funds, Publicity amdt. (Mr. Mackenzie King) to 3r., 4273-4. *See also under this title,* Contributions
Canada Temperance Act, 1166, 2052-4, 3864-6
Candidates,
Consent of, 1095
Disqualification, 4271, 2023
Chief Electoral Officer, 1512-3
Biggar, Mr. O. M., K.C., appointment of, 4264-70
Remuneration, 4136-7
Clerk of Crown in Chancery, 1069-73
Compulsory voting, 1062
Contributions, 781-4, 1169-70
Amdt (Mr. McMaster) 1194-5
Conveying voters, 786, 1061-4
Corrupt practices—disqualification, 1160
Counting and reporting vote, 1109
Debate of Bill, arrangements for, 1072, 1837-8, 1944-5 2001-2
Definitions, 775
Deposit, 1092, 1094-6
Return of, 1110
Deputy returning officers, 1074
Lists of, 1097
Disfranchisement, 1160, 1536
Charitable support, those receiving, 1813-20, 1997
Criminals, 1820
Hindus, 1812
Returned soldiers excepted, 1811-2, 1821-3
Disqualification of candidates, 1160, 1085-8
Election clerk, 1073, 1515-6
Election expenses, 1152-5, 1930-3
Accounts, audit of, 1929
Return by agent, 1155-6
Election officers
Disqualified parties, 1075-8
Fees, etc., 3867-8, 4271
Taxation of, 1111-2
Election papers, 1928, 1988, 2023
Election return, 1928
Executory contracts void, 781
False oath, 781
False statement made to affect election, 1065-7
Fees, statement to be placed in box, 1927
Forms, 3868-76
Advance polls, 3873-5
Indians, 2055-7
Interpretation
"Advance poll," 1943
"Candidate," 2943-5, 1985

Guthrie, Hon. Hugh—*Con.*
Franchise Bill—*Con.*
Interpretation—*Con.*
Opposition, attitude of, 725
"During an election," 1986-7
"Election officer," 1987-8
"Election Papers," 1988
"Electors," 1917
"Hours of the day"—"Standard time" 1988-9, 1944
"List of voters," 1989
"Members,", 1989
"Personal expenses," 1991
"Rural polling division," 1992-3
"Urban polling division," 1991
Liquor on polling day, 1108-9
Misfeasance, etc.,—penalty, 1074-5
Names not on list, 1926, 4272
Oaths, 3877-8
Naturalization—amdt (Mr. Euler) to 3r., 4369
Nomination, 1916
Candidates, of, 1090-6
Place of, 1092-3
Postponement of, 1096
Non-electors and non-residents canvassing, 784-6
Notices, 777-8, 1169
Oaths, 779-81, 1166
Elector, by, 1102
Ontario voters' list, 3880-98
Amdt proposed, 3896; agreed to, 3898
Paid propaganda, publicity of, Amdt. (Mr. McMaster) to 3r., 4375
Pass on railway, 1065
Payment of voters' expenses, 1064-5
Peace and good order, 1105-8
Poll books, etc., to returning officer, 1078-80
Polling divisions, 1516-20, 1996
Polling stations, additional, 1826-7
Polls
Hours to be open, 1920-6
When to be held, 1101-2
Population and status of place, 2320
Printer's name, 779
Proclamation
Language of publication, 1837, 1918, 2268-73, 2291-2, 2301
Mailed to postmaster, 1080-2
Notices, etc., 2319
Provincial lists, amdt. (Mr. Mackenzie King) to 3r., 4364. *See also under this title* Voters' Lists
Qualification of electors, 4271
Aliens—certificate, 2059, 2076, 2085-8, 2092, 2099-2103, 4271
See also under this title Aliens, Naturalization

Guthrie, Hon. Hugh—*Con.*
Franchise Bill—*Con.*
Qualification of electors—*Con.*
Indians, 2055-7
Naturalization, 4271
Recall, the, 2044
Recount by Judge, 1110
"Registrar" and "Enumerator," 1096-7
Registrars, 3899
Duties of, 3909-10
Rural, attendance of, 3908
Registration—interrogatories, 1167
Voters, of, 4272
Removing notices, 779
Repeal, 776
Returning officers
Amdt. (Mr. Fielding) 1574-6
Further duties of, 1096
Ineligible parties, 1073-4
Poll books, etc., to be sent to, 1828
Public officials, 1791-2, 1809-10
Schedules, 1166-9
Standard Time, 1988
Telegraph, communications by, 1068-9, 1198
Translation into French, 779
Voters' lists, 2319
Addition and elimination of names, 3909-13
Copies, securing of, 2319-20
Married woman's name, 1827-8
New—when unnecessary, 1825-6, 1997, 4272
Possible delay in printing, 3902
Preparation of, 3878-99, 4271
Provincial, 2417-23, 2430-4, 2438-41
Amdt. (Mr. Ross) 2324, 2329-30, 2333-4, 2345-66
Amdt. (Mr. Mackenzie King) to 3r., 4364
Voting
Language of voter, 1997
Manner of, 1103-5
Notwithstanding disqualification, 1825
On certificate, 1098-1101
Women voters, Quebec, in, 2419
Writ of election, 1166
Writ, nomination, election—delay, 1092
Militia
Active militia—allowances, 3654-74
Air Service, 4553
Annual drill, 3676-81
Cadet service, 3702-4, 3714
Civil pensions, 4553-5
Contingencies, 3714-6
Customs dues, 3716
Demobilization, 4549
Dominion arsenals, 3717-25
Engineer services and works, 3723-5

Guthrie, Hon. Hugh—*Con.*
Militia—*Con.*
Estimates, 4548-55
Grants to associations, 3725-6
Military properties and maintenance, 3726-7
Dorval, 3731
Toronto, 3729-31
Ministerial statement and summary, 3636-45. Estimates compared by branches with former years, 3636; increase due to higher prices, 3638; permanent force and slowness of recruiting, 3639; returned officers, 3641; volunteer militia, 3642; barracks, rifle ranges, 3643; unity of directing organization, 3644
Ordnance, arms, lands, etc., 3727-32
Permanent force, 4548
Staff, 4548-55
Warlike Stores, 4549
Militia Pension Act, 4020-1
Quebec's ancient fortifications, 424
Returned Soldiers' buttons, unauthorized wearing of, 4020

Guysborough Harbour, 2124

Habeas Corpus
Labrie case, 3227, 3295, 3558, 3840
M. for papers, 2014

Halbert, Mr. Robert H. (North Ontario)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 282. Parliament Building—Farmers' movement not a class movement, 282; popular unrest and its cure, 283; proposed general election—Franchise Act, 283; A United Canada, 284
Budget, 2941. Reply to Mr. Cockshutt, 2941; inheritance and income taxes, 2942; farmers' deputation on conscription—a former Conservative — the farmers and public affairs, 2943; public problems the concern of the ordinary citizen—economic as well as political democracy, 2944; public and press, 2945; profits system should function naturally—food production hampered—decrease of farm population, 2945; drawbacks to manufacturers—tariff tax on the coffin, 2946
Election for North Ontario, 1
Foster, Mr. A. DeWitt, ques. 1201
Franchise Bill
Contributions, 1191
Oath by elector, 1102
Recall, the, 2025
Grading export butter and cheese, 606
Indemnity of members, 4083
Oleomargarine, 1871-2
Soldier Land Settlement, 2147
Halifax
Grain elevator, ques. 1116
Marine agency—telephone, 2110
Halifax and Southwestern Railway, 3085
Halladay, Mr. H. H. (Bow River)
Alien immigrants, 820
Franchise Bill
Polling division, 1518-9
Income tax, charities, 3314
New party movement, 126
Soldier Settlement, 1701
Hanna, Mr. D. B., 622, 642, 1679, 4183. *See also* Canadian National Railway
Canada Steamships Company, and, 1742, 1789
Suit against Mr. Cahill, M.P., 2379
Hanna, town, 2379
Hansard. *See* House of Commons, Debates
Harbours. *See* their titles
Harold, Mr. John (Brant)
Food and Drugs Bill, 971
Indians and Franchise, 2055-7, 4035
Purchasing Board, 1485
Special War Revenue
Binder twine, 3610, 3623
Furs, 3569, 3791-2
Jewellery, 3579-80, 3584
Underwear, 3567

Harris, Mr. Lloyd, 1948

Harrison, Mr. Charles R. (Nipissing)
Budget, 3041. Iron and steel industry, bounties — French River waterway, 3041; Northern Ontario—Timiskaming by-election — Labour and One Big Union—class warfare denounced, 3043; Mr. G. B. Nicholson and organized labour, 3043
Eight-hour day, 382
Franchise Bill
Interpretation, 1991
Polls, hours to be open, 1921
Grand Trunk strike of 1910, and pensions, 1129
North Bay shore protection, 3160

Hartney, Mr. E. P., 4566

Hay, Mr. Thomas (Selkirk)
Campaign funds, 1222
Catalogues, postal rate on, 3744
Civil Service retirement, 3837
Franchise—voters' lists, 2441
House of Commons staff, 4566
Indemnity from Germany, ques. 1463

Health. *See also* Food and Drugs Bill; Honey adulteration; Opium and Drug Bill
Department, 43, 242, 263, 3539

Hearst Publications, 142, ques. 993, 1290

Hearst, Sir William, 3986

Hebertville-St. Joseph D'Alma mail, ques. 1000

Henders, Mr. Richard C. (Macdonald)
Alien immigrants, 835
Budget, 3015. Congratulation to former and present Ministers of Finance — direct taxation approved, 3016; income tax—removal of customs super-tax-postponement of tariff inquiry, 3017; personal position on the tariff, and on proposed taxes, 3019; party records on tariff compared, 3020
Canadian Wheat Board, 4351
Commercial Feeding Stuffs, 3408
Franchise Bill
Polls, hours to be open, 1923
Voters' lists, 2438
Opium and Drug Bill, 1645
Rural mail, 4529
Special War Revenue
Caps, 3566

Henderson, Mrs. Rose, 2807, 2898, 3039

Hennick, Mr. Daniel D., patents of, ques. 1510

Hewitt, the late Dr. Gordon, 2375-6, 2382, 2402

Hickey's Wharf, ques. 706

Hides, exports to United States, ques. 313, ques. 343

High Cost of Living, 68, 72, 78. *See also* Address; Board of Commerce; Budget; Popular unrest; Prices of necessaries, (Mr. Burnham) 321

Highways. *See* Canada Highways

Hindus, soldiers. *See* Dominion Franchise

Hinton, Mr. W. P., 1311

Hocken, Mr. H. C. (Toronto West)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 284. Controversy between Mr. Rowell and Mr. Murphy, 284; French language in schools, position of Orange order, 285; opinion of Senator Belcourt, 286; French Canadian aims and ambitions, 287; clerical influence — Senator David's book, 288; Quebec's local autonomy, 289; French Canadians

Hocken, Mr. H. C.—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
and the war—Orange order's war record, 290; Orangemen and political party; Orangeism a bulwark of the constitution, 291; Orange Sentinel, 292
Alien immigrants, and Canadian citizenship, 821
Budget, 2659. Congratulations to Minister of Finance, 2660; new taxes and the masses, 2660; personal views on tariff changed by conditions — protective tariff necessary, 2661; development of rsources—economy through reducing number of civil servants, 2662; promoting efficiency in Civil Service, 2663;
Canadian Wheat Board, 4113
Civil Service
Commission, employees, ques. 1121
Customs, employees, 317
House of Commons, employees, 1043
Inside, ques. 510
Dager, Herman, J., ques. 2182
Divorce Bills, remission of charges, 4321
Electoral atlas, ques. 317
Empire day adjournment, 2575
Franchise Bill
Polls, hours to be open, 1921-2, 1925
Proclamation, language of publication, 2296-9, 2301-2
Recall, the, 2036-8, 2042-3
Judges' salaries, 4338
Personal position as member, 2043
War profits in Britain, 2631-2

Hogs, raising of. *See* Commercial Feeding Stuffs

Homesteading. *See* Dominion Lands Act

Honey Adulteration Bill. 1r., 582; 2r., com., 3r., 798; Senate amdts., 2314, 2412

Horseracing,
Dr. Rutherford's report, 540
Race tracks and betting, 3415, 3427

Horses
Carload rates on, ques. 2010
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 3204

Hospitals
Alcohol tax and, 3495
Ste. Anne de Bellevue, ques. 1115
Ships. *See* Canada Shipping Act (Sick and Distressed Mariners)

Houle, Mr. Joseph, ques. 2313

House of Commons. *See also* Deputy Speaker; Speaker
Adjournment, decorum at, 1838

House of Commons—*Con.*
Adjournment, to discuss matter of public importance. *See the several subjects*
Adjournments
Ascension Day, 2311
Easter, 752
Empire day, 2574-5, 2625-6
King's birthday, 3080
Answers to questions
Complaint (Mr. Sinclair) 1649
Audibility of debates, 345, 388, 394, 405, 461, 2126, 2317, 3521, 4055, 4419
Statements by Mr. Stevens and others, 1416, 4055
Suggested rearrangement of seats, 394, 1417
Business of, 3216
Complaint of delay, 2778, 3506, 3622, 4102, 4274, 4314, 4547, 4586
Legislation pending, 1789, 2723, 2779
Monday — Government business, 1464, 1573
Order of, 3106
Private Bills, special facilities for, 3957
By-elections, 148
Assiniboia, 1, 56, 126, 137, 168, 1172, 1174-84, 3473
Carleton and Victoria, 1223
Kamouraska, 948-9
Ontario North, 1
St. James, 707, 787
Victoria city, 1
Calendar of the House, ques. 2005
Chamber,
Acoustic properties of, 2317-8. *See also under this title,* Audibility
Central floor, ques. 2894
Committees, standing, 9, 304. *For proceedings and reports, see titles of the several Committees*
Debates, official report of
Documents not read, insertion of. *See* Deputy Speaker; Speaker
French reporters, 1425
French speeches, translation of, 552, 697, 4587
Decorum
Conversation, 2317-8
Distribution office, 1037
Divisions
Address—amdt. (Mr. Mackenzie King) for general election, 303
Appeal from ruling of the Chair, 3664
Budget—amdt. (Mr. Fielding) 3077
Dominion Franchise Bill
By-elections, amdt. (Mr. Fielding) to 3r., 4360
Contributions, publication of, amdt. (Mr. Maharg) to 3r., 4373

House of Commons—*Con.*
Divisions—*Con.*
Dominion Franchise Bill—*Con.*
Naturalization—amdt. (Mr. Euler) to 3r., 4372
Paid propaganda—amdt. (Mr. McMaster) to 3r., 4378
Provincial lists, amdt. (Mr. Mackenzie King) to 3r., 4366
Food and Drugs Bill—amdt. (Mr. Pedlow) to 3r., 1466
Grand Trunk Railway acquisition—strike of 1910;
Amdt. (Mr. Mackenzie King) 1572
Appeal from ruling of Chairman, 1327
Indian Act, amdt., six-months' hoist, 4179
Washington, Canadian minister at, 2475
Estimates, method of voting, 30, 108, 567, 2779, 3769, 4586, 4589
Indemnity of Members, 3228, 3853-4
See also Salaries Act and House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill
Alleged round robin, 2967
Correction (Mr. Fielding) of press report, 4171-2
Debate on motion for supply, 4069-95
Illness, 4458
Press, attitude of, 4441
Provinces and Dominion compared—statistical table, 4440
Taxation of, 3242
Internal Economy Commission, 9
Lobbies, admission of strangers to, 1629
Members,
Attendance of, 135, 964, 1838, 2782, 2968, 4457. *See also, under this title,* Indemnity
New
Election and introduction
Gould, Mr., 1
Halbert, Mr., 1
McDonald, Mr., 1684, 1787
Rinfret, Mr., 1357
Stein, Mr., 949
Tolmie Hon. Mr., 47
Threatened, 1743, 1841
Parliamentary Restaurant. *See that title*
Post Office
Use of box by Mr. K. H. Palmer, ques. 1001
Press Gallery. *See that title*
Private members' business, state of, 564
Privilege
Cronyn, Mr., resignation of Mr. Peck from Pensions and Re-establishment Com., 2081

House of Commons—*Con.*
Privilege—*Con.*
Edwards, Mr., report in Ottawa Journal and Montreal Gazette, 4503
Fielding, Mr., press report, 4171
Gauthier, Mr.—complaint of treatment by civil servant, 4097
Lavigueur, Mr.—Judge Lennox on non-English speaking witness, 1231
Kay, Mr., reference to by Ottawa Citizen as member for "Mississippi," 2016
Mackie, Mr. H. A., comment on absence from House, 2968-9
Questions, inquiry as to, 949, 2126
Questions passed as orders for returns, status of, 1743
Quorum, attendance of members, 964
Report not printed as ordered, 2016
Returns, asked for, 459, 618, 857, 4258
Senate and,
Joint Committee on unification of certain branches, 402
Joint distribution office, 1536
Sittings, duration of, 1838, 1893, 4432
Morning and Saturday, 2723, 2778, 3684
Two o'clock, 3080
Speaker's Chair, offer of from British Parliament, 3224
Staff
Bonus, 3228
Committees, 1042, 4547
Journals, 1038
Law Branch, 1038
Members' stenographers, ques. 2311
Organization and classification of, ques. 590, 753, 858, 919, 949, 1037, 3092, 4172, 4414, 4459, 4504, 4563
Parliamentary Counsel, 339
Sergeant-at-Arms Department, 3094
Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms, 9
Translators, 552, 2093
Supply, Com. of—Friday rule—statement of Minister permitted by consent, 2366
Unauthorized distribution of documents in house, 1743, 1841
Vacancies, 160
Elgin, East, 1, 11, 1085
Kamouraska, 1
St. James, 1

House of Commons Act Amdt.. *See* Salaries Act

Housing, 3543
Adams, Mr., 3551-2
Demobilization and, 3543
Dominion—provinces agreement, 3548
Farmers and, 3546
Houses built, 3545-7
Programme, ques. 707

Hudson Bay Railway, ques. 806, 867, 2752, 4231, 4243
Manitoba land, ques. 1897
Res. (Mr. Campbell) 2014

Hughes, Lt.-Gen. Sir Sam (Victoria, Ont.)
Baker, late Lieut. Col., memorial to, 2776, 3557
Bolshevism, 3649
Canadian Wheat Board, 4123
Chauveau, Col., and Pinze, Col., 3666
Civil Service
Holidays, 4262
Retirement of members, 4066-9
Currie, Col. John A., M.P., 3655
Currie, General Sir Arthur, 3648, 3655
Dorval military property, 3731
Franchise Bill
Provincial lists, 3897
Registrars and enumerators, 3907
Fuel Supply, 3181
Special powers for Railway Commission, 4326-30
Indemnity of members, 4079
Militarism, 3649
Military training, 3704, 3709
Militia
Active militia—allowances, 3658, 3674
Annual drill, 3678
Barracks, 3648
Cadet service, 3704, 3709
Ministerial statement of Mr. Guthrie, 3648
Officers reverting to rank, 3681
Rifle ranges, 3649-54
Toronto property, 3729-31
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 4021
Speer, Rev. Dr., statement by, 3491

Hull and Montreal Highway, 1113

Hungary, 1059-60, 3983-4

Hunt, Mr. A. B. (Compton)
Military districts in Quebec, ques. 1035

Huron. *See* Indians

Hydro-Electric and Ontario Radial Railways, 3113-4, 4172

Ice-Breakers, 1598-1612, 2103-7
"J. D. Hazen," 1599, 1602
"Montcalm," 1606-7. 2112
St. Lawrence, ques., 317
New vessel for, 1620-1
Uniforms for men, 1603-4
Fair wage contracts, 1608-9

Ile D'Orleans and St. Lawrence River Navigation, 3295

Ile Verte, 2111, 3160

Immigrants
Landing of at Montreal and Quebec, 3226-8

Immigration
Emigration and, ques. 1119
Imperial ex-Service men, 387
In 1919 and 1920, ques. 3862
Medical inspection, 3555
Ontario and, 1012
United States from, ques. 1463

Immigration Act Amdt. Bill, rejected by Senate, 3426

Immigration and Colonization
Department, 4557
Conner, Mr. James, dismissal of, 415
Estimates, 3555

Imperial Conference, 114

Imperial Ex-Service Men, immigration of, 387

Imperial Munitions Board
Ships, ques. 1002

Imperial Press Conference, ques. 410

Imports. *See also* Budget; Customs; Trade
Certain countries from, ques. 2182

Income Tax, 2488. *See also* Budget, Ways and Means, Taxation
Inspector at Kingston, ques. 806, ques. 2181
Returns, errors in, 3302
Forms in French, 1084, 1573
Toronto payments, ques. 592

Income War Tax Act, 1917, Amdt. Bill. *See* Revenue Bills. *For details, See* Drayton, Sir Henry

Indemnity of Members. *See* House of Commons

India, Status of under League of Nations, 361

Indian Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 386; 2r., ref. to Special Com., 704; 795; Report, 3617-8; Com., 4021; 3r., 4137, 4173
Amdt. six-months' hoist (Mr. Mackenzie King) 4179

Indian Affairs, Dept. of, 3273
Com. of Supply, in, 3265

Indians, 3265. *See also* British Columbia Indians
Enfranchisement, ques. 807. *See also* Indian Act; Dominion Franchise
Gordon's Reserve, 3628

Indians—*Con.*
Hurons of Lorette, 1152, 2014
Reserves, ques. 802
School buildings, ques. 2894
St. Regis, ques. 799
Sparrow, Dr. C. J., attendance on, ques. 1897
Tuberculosis, 3276

Industrial and Scientific Research, 1886

Industrial Disputes Investigation Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 1357; 2r., 1900; com., 1901, 1971, 2190; 3r., 2248-51

Industrial Legislation, 1790

Industrial Survey of the Dominion, ques. 341

Infectious Diseases. *See* Canada Shipping Act (Sick and Distressed Mariners)

Inflation, 107. *See also* Currency Act

Information Service, Department of External Affairs, 4543

Inland and Coastwise Shipping Rates, proposed to be under Railway Commission. *See* Railway Act Amdt.

Inland Navigation
Canadian Government Merchant Marine and, ques. 2572
Freight boats, ques. 2572

Inland Revenue Act Amdt. Bill. *See* Revenue Bills

Inside Service. *See* Civil Service

Inspection and Sale Act Amendment Bill (Fruit Packages). Res. 1573; 1915; 1r., 1916; 2r., 2016; com., 2016; Ref. to Special Com. on Agriculture, 2023; Com., 3109; 3r., 3110

Institute of Agriculture, 2411

Insurance. *See also* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; State Insurance for Returned Soldiers; Civil Service
Annuities, and, 403
Fire—mutual companies, taxation, ques. 2012, 2080
St. Lawrence route, 4515

Intercolonial Railway. *See* Canadian National

Interior Department, 3192

Internal Economy Commission, 9

International Financial Conference, 1465

International Fisheries Commission, ques. 311

International Institute of Agriculture, 2411

International Joint Commission, 3986
St. Lawrence river development, ques. 1120, ques. 1230

International Labour Conference, 798, ques. 803, 1790
Canadian representative at, 3359

International Parliamentary Conference on Commerce, ques. 2721

International Waterways, 3985. *See also* International Joint Commission

Internment, 4516

Inverness Railway and Coal Company, ques. 319, 2380, 4236-49

Ireland, condition of, 856

Iron and Steel Industry, 21

Irrigation Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 3358; 2r., com., 3694; 3r., 3702

Isle Madame, fishery officers, ques. 3294

Italy, advances to, ques. 318

Jacobs, Mr. Samuel W. (George Etienne Cartier)
Bankruptcy Bill, 920, 3260-5
Board of Commerce
Murdock, Mr., letter of, 4489-99
Robson, Judge, correspondence, 3769
Budget, 3027. Shipbuilding—advances to Roumania and other countries 3027; Mr. M. Clark and Mr. Fielding, references to Jews—advances unaccounted for, 3028; Canadian Northern Railway and Montreal Tunnel Co., 3029; immigration, 3030; excess profits tax, 3031; promises of members of Union Government as to continuance for war only, 3031; beer tax—East Elgin vacancy, 3032; Mr. Rowell's address, 3033
Business profits war tax, 3111-7
Canadian National Pictorial, 4544
Canadian National Railways
Montreal-Ottawa, 4190
Civil Service
Employees on public works, 3134-5
Retirement of members, 4065-6
Criminal Code Amdt. (French version) 3083

Jacobs, Mr. Samuel—*Con.*
Export regulations, 3622-3
Food and Drugs Bill, 978-9, 1264-5
Franchise Bill, 768
Aliens—certificate, 2069, 2076-8, 2097
Assistant Chief Electoral Officer, 1514
Chief Electoral Officer, 1070, 1512-3
Conveying voters, 1062
Disqualification of candidates, 1087
"Ecclesiastics," 1070, 1075-7
Election officers, parties disqualified, 1075-8
False statement made to affect election, 1065-6
Indians, 2055
Naturalization
Amdt. (Mr. Euler) to 3r., 4370
Proclamation, language of publication, 2306
Returning officers, 1533-4
Telegraph, communications by, 1068-9, 1198
Grand Trunk Railway, 1488-91
Branch lines, 1314
Income tax
Distraint of goods, 3303-4
Not a joke, 3119
Indians, Christian missions amongst, 3268
Internment cases, 4517
Japanese occupation of Vladivostok, 1945
Naturalization, British Government, representations by, 3917
Peace treaty, United States Senate reservations, 1060
Purchasing Board, 1480
Schelking, Baron, ques. 3618
Shipbuilding
Contracts, 908, 919
Returned men employed, 909
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 4145-8
Special War Revenue
Beer, 3605
Firearms, 3595
Overcoats, 3586
Stock transfers, 3626
Steel and shipping merger, 1967
Supreme Court Act Amdt., 2318
Typhus epidemic, 4545
Vessel rates—letter from Montreal Corn Exchange, 1727

Japan, 3670-1

Japanese
Canada, in ques. 805
Fisheries, 844
Occupation of Vladivostok, 1945

Jellicoe, Admiral Viscount
Visit of, 11, 92, ques. 310, ques. 314
Papers called for, 321
Report presented, 308, ques. 309, 344, 386
Australia and New Zealand, 1159
India, inquiry, 1290
Printing of, 386
Job Brothers, wharf rent, 2124
Johnson, "Pussyfoot," 786
Johnston, Mr. J. Fred (Last Mountain)
Agricultural problems, 2397
Budget, 2664. Protection does not retain population—no handicap should impede agriculture—appreciation of Minister of Finance, 2664; ex-Minister of Finance and public borrowing—school lands trust fund, 2665—Mr. Elkin and protection, 2665; farmers and payment of taxes, 2666; farmers and American grain markets, 2667; cross-benchers and the Budget, 2668; make the farmers prosperous, 2669
Canadian Northern securities, ques. 2006
Canadian Pacific Railway taxation, ques, 1360
Franchise Bill
Advance polls, 1940-1
Aliens—certificate, 2099, 2244
Returning Officer, 1583
Gordon's Indian reserve, 3628-71
Immigration and emigration, ques. 1119
Immigration in 1919 and 1920, ques. 3862
Last Mountain river dam, 3788-9
School buildings on Indian reserves, ques. 2894
Soldier Settlement, 2149-50
Special War Revenue Amdt. Bill
Containers, 3633
Wheat meal, 3796
Sugar importations, ques. 2009

Joint Committee on Printing. *See* Printing

Joint Distribution office, 1536

Joint Industrial Councils, 4512

Judges. *See also* Admiralty Act Amdt., Exchequer Court Act Amdt.
Salaries of in province of Quebec, ques. 1035, 3227

Judges' Act Amdt. Bill (Salaries). Res., 4323; 4331; 1r., 4340; 2r., 4341; 4417; com., 4418; 3r., 4426

Juvenile Delinquents Act Amdt. Bill. 1r.,2842

Kamloops, public building, 3156

Kamouraska, vacancy and election, 1, 948-9

Kapuskasing-Spirit Lake, 2398-2401

Kay, Mr. W. Fred (Missisquoi)
Commercial Feeding Stuffs, 3167-70
Honey adulteration, 2315
Missisquoi Bay—not fishing, 3535
Oleomargarine, 1968-71
Privilege—Ottawa Citizen—not member for "Mississippi," 2016
Rent of Daly Building, Ottawa, ques. 1200
Rural mail, 4525

Keefer, Mr. Francis H. (Parliamentary Secretary for External Affairs)
Franchise Bill, advance polls, 3876
National defence, 4302-3
Natural resources development, 1030
Oleomargarine, 1874
Passports, 4544
Shipbuilding, 634, 4142
Stewart, Mr. W. J., 3985
Vessel rates, proposed regulation, 1733
West Indian trade, 635

Kelley, Rev. P. R., 794

Kemp, Hon. Sir Edward (Toronto East)
Canteen profits, 709

Kennedy, Mr. J. Wilfred (Glengarry and Stormont)
Budget, 3067. Strange features of previous speeches—tariff, "moderate protection," 3068; protective tariff directs capital towards manufacturers rather than to-towards farming, 3069; dairying farm surveys, 3070; cheese product and prices—appropriations for the benefit of agriculture, 3071; features of the budget criticised or commended, 3072
Commercial Feeding Stuffs, 3406-8
Indemnity of members and salaries of ministers, 4447
Oleomargarine, ques. 1627, 1859
Rural mail carriers, 1283
St. Anne bridge, 3776
Kennedy, Mr. William C. (North Essex)
Budget, 2644. Expenditure and public loans, 2644; banks and their profits—Victory bonds, stabilizing, 2645; collection of taxation, American system—unnecessary expenses, Board of Commerce, Wheat Board, 2646; wheat prices, Canada's credit as affected by Govt. dealings, 2647; subsidies—shipbuilding, 2648; tariff, 2649
Experimental farms, 2384-7
Income tax, Toronto payments, ques. 592
Interest to Govt. by chartered banks, ques. 673

Kennedy, Mr. William C.—*Con.*
Parliament Building, 1426-7
Shipbuilding, 664
Vessel rates, proposed regulation, 1732

King, Hon. W. L. Mackenzie (Prince, P.E.I.)
See also Leader of the Opposition.
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 23. Mover and seconder—external affairs dwelt upon in Speech from the Throne, 23; Grand Trunk agreement, absence of documents—Opium Convention, food not drugs, 24; Parliamentary government, extension of term of Parliament, 25; Franchise Act, 26; War-time Elections Act, 27; Proposed new Franchise Act—vacancies, 28; Parliament a deliberative assembly—voting of supply, 30; government by Order in Council—Prime Minister's absence, 31; Cabinet changes—commissions and government, 32; cabinet representation and responsibility, 33; need of post-war policy, 34; amdt. in favour of early general election, 35; (neg., 303)
Air Service, 4554-6
Auditor General's report, 458
Bill not distributed—objection to proceeding with, 1057
Board of Commerce
Murdock, Mr., resignation of, 4170-77, 4466, 4460, 4499
O'Connor, Mr., resignation of, 3685
Robson, Judge, resignation of, 4258
British Columbia Indians, 792-3, 950
Budget, inquiry as to, 1465, 2126, 2247
Budget, 2969. Congratulations to Minister of Finance, 2969; no further loans—direct taxes, approved—economy, 2970; Government's promise for period of the war—general election proposed, 2971; war-time spirit and extravagance—advances unaccounted for—contracts without tender, 2972; supervision of Parliament—loans to foreign countries — unnecessary appropriations, 2973; a profiteer's Budget—income tax delinquents—tax on war profits, 2974; war-wealth taxes in Britain, 2975; the community's share in production of wealth—high cost of living, 2977; industry and taxation—taxes on capital, 2979; manufacturers and freedom of production—basic industries, 2980; urban and rural populations, 2981; Liberal platform on agricultural production, 2982; Health Department and tuberculosis, 2983; child life and welfare—National policy,

King, Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
2984; St. John harbour and its trade, 2985; cargoes in as well as cargoes out—all classes to be considered in arranging taxation, 2987; Britain's industries and tariff policy, 2987; England and Germany—Supreme Council of Peace Conference, declaration, 2988; Mr. Fielding's amdt., 2989; Government's promise of tariff revision, 2990; Liberal tariff platform and Mr. Fielding's amdt., 2991; Liberal party's fiscal policy—British preference, 2993; Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the Fielding tariff, 2994; common ground for Liberals, Farmers and Labour—need of unity on the part of those who think alike, 2995; two wings of the Government forces, 2996
Business of the House
Complaint of delay, 2778, 3506, 4102, 4274, 4314, 4547, 4586. *See also under this head,* Interim Supply Bill
Defective legislation—complaint of, 2779, 3147
Hasty legislation, 2779
Legislation pending, 1789, 2723, 2779
Long sittings, 1893, 4432
Morning and Saturday sittings, 2778, 3684
Wednesday evening sittings, 1044-5
Canada's national status, 464
Constitution, power to amend, 468
Parliament, authority of, 468, 474
Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Sir Robert Borden, 472
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Business statement, 950
"Canadian Inventor", steamer, 3226, 3359
Canadian National Railways
Grand Trunk loans, 881
Withholding of information, 1656, 1669-70
Canadian Wheat Board, 4102
Cash gratuities to returned soldiers, 1083
Civil Service
Canadian National Railways employees, and, 3140
Classification, 3142-4, 3769, 3985, 4547
Insurance, 1055-6, 1779-80
Retirement of members of, 3836-9, 4063-8, 4461-2
Taxation of salaries, 579-80
Civil Service Bill—Senate amdts., 4059
Coal Operations Director, 3186-91
Jurisdiction, 3691
Orders in Council, ratification of, 3185, 3360-75
Cold storage and fox farming, 2407-9

King, Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Concurrence in Supply, 4586
Contracts signed by Government before submission to House—Ottawa agreement, 1047
Criminal Code Amdt. (French version) 3081
Customs Tariff Act, 3174
Demobilization, 4550-3, 4585
Appropriation for, 1877, 1887
Dominion Franchise Bill
2r., reply to Mr. Guthrie, 723
Advance Polls, 1933-43, 1998-2002, 3874
Agents and officers, 1918
Aliens—certificates, 2075, 2212-7
Ballots
Counting before opening of poll, 1101
Forgery or destruction of, 1098
Bribery, treating, undue influence, personation, 1156-7
By-elections, 1091
Campaign funds, publicity — amdt., 4272-4
Canada Temperance Act, 2054, 3866
Chief Electoral Officer, 4136
Biggar, Mr. O. M., appointment of, 4268
Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, 1069-72
Contributions, 783-4
Counting and reporting vote, 1109
Corrupt practices, 1160
Debate on, arrangements for, 1072, 1944, 2002
Deposit, 1092, 1095
Return of, 1110
Disqualification of candidates, 1086-8, 4271
Election expenses, 1929-32, 1155
Accounts, audit of, 1929
Return by agent, 1155
Election officers, 1075
Fees, etc., 1112, 3867
Enumerators. *See under this title,* Voters' lists.
False statement made to affect election, 1066
Indians, 1535
Inquiry as to possible additions, 582
Interpretation
"Candidate," 1944
"Rural polling division," 1992
Liquor on polling day, 1108-9
Names not on list, 1926-8,
Oaths, 3877-8
Non-contentious clauses, 775
Oath by elector, 1102
Ontario voters' lists, 3880-98

King, Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Dominion Franchise Bill—*Con.*
Paid publicity—Amdt. (Mr. McMaster) to 3r., 4376
Peace and good order, 1105-7
Polling divisions, returning officer's discretion, 1995-6
Polls
Fourteenth day, 1101
Hours to be open, 1920-2
Preparation of voters' lists, clause not acceptable, 3905-6
Provincial lists, amdt. to 3r., 4361
Recall, the, 2043
Recount by judge, 1110
"Registrar" and "enumerator," 1096-7
Registration—interrogatories, 1167
Telegraph communications by, 1068
Vacancies, 1091
Voters' lists
Addition and elimination of names, 3911-3
Candidates, to, 3908
Preparation of, 3879, 3905-6
Provincial, adoption of, 2355-7, 2365-6, 2421-36
Voting, manner of, 1103
Drill halls, 3147-8
East Elgin vacancy, 11, 1085
Eight-hour day, 373, 451-2
Contractual rights, 373-4
Employment offices, 3087
Minister, powers of, 3091-2
Orders in Council, effect of, 3091
Estimates and their consideration, 30, 567, 859, 918, 2779, 3215-7, 3769, 4586-8
European distress, 4546
Exchequer Court Act, 2201
Export regulations, 3622, 3690
Farm problems—fertilizers, 2405-7
Food and Drugs Bill, 956-61, 971-9, 1257-8
Franchise. *See under this title,* Dominion Franchise
Citizenship, and, 340
Gisborne, Mr. F. H., Parliamentary Counsel, 4587
Grand Trunk Railway acquisition, 11, 1113 1291, 1313, 1488, 1509-10
Appeal from Chairman's ruling—difference in question as put, 1327
Arbitrators, 3860
Correspondence, 1228, 1235, 1251-3
Ratification of agreement, 1329
Strike of 1910 and pensions, 1136-7, 1329-56, 1537-51, 1557-61, 4507-12
Amdt. to 3r., 1547
Hewitt, the late Dr. Gordon, 2382

King, Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
House of Commons Staff, 3099
Housing, 3543-8
Expenditure for, 3543-4
Houses constructed—rural and urban areas, 3546
Icebreaker and car ferry, 1601, 1621
Uniforms of men on— contracts, fair wages, 1604-8
Income tax delinquents, 3119
Indemnity of members and salaries of ministers, 4075, 4431
Indian Act Amdt. 4029-39
M. six months' hoist, 4179
Industrial Disputes Investigation, 1900-15, 1971-4, 1977-85, 2190-7, 2248-9
Interim Supply Bill
Opposition's intention as to advances in future, 3215-7
Irrigation, 3700-2
Jellicoe, Admiral Lord, visit of and report, 11, 344
India, 1290
New Zealand and Australia, 1159
Kamouraska, by-elections, 948
Labour Dept. estimates, 3821, 4512. *See also under this title*, Eight-hour day
Labour, Minister of, 4512
League of Nations, 464
Ames, Sir Herbert, statement by, 3971
Canada's status, 360-7
Labour
Canada's status in relation to, 356
International Labour office, 355-7
Liberal Party's tariff policy, 2537
Little Sands, 4580
Magdalen Islands, 1601
Maple products, 797, 1254
Marshall, the late David, M.P., 10
Militia, 3710
Active militia—allowances, 3657-8
Annual drill, 3674-5
Cadet service, 3702
Contingencies, 3715-6
Dominion arsenals, 3720
Amdt. to reduce vote, 3721-2, neg. 3722-3
Military properties, maintenance, 3726
Ordnance land, 3728
Permanent force
Barracks, 4579
M. to reduce vote, 4548-9
Reply to Ministerial statement by Mr. Guthrie, 3645
Narrows, the, 3159
Naval Service
Additional appropriation, $1,700,000, 4408-9

King, Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Naval Service—*Con.*
Additional appropriation—*Con.*
M. to strike out, 4313-6
After-war conditions, 3511
Correspondence and negotiations, 4408, 4503
Dept
Estimates, consideration of—agreement as to debate, 4409
Debate should be deferred until Supplementaries, 3520
Increase of, 3506-8, 3512-3
Halifax and Esquimalt, 4390
Policy of government, 707
Pre-war lines, 3511
Submarines, acceptance of, 3512-3
Opium and Drug Bill, 1640-8
Control—statement of historical development, 559, 1761
Habit forming drugs, use of, 562
Orders in Council
Coal Operations Director, 3185, 3360
Ottawa city, agreement with, 579, 988-92, 1047
Parliament, two sessions in one year, 4457
Parliament buildings, 4
Peace treaty
Bulgaria, with, 464, 1057-60
Hungary and Turkey, 3983-4
Parliament, authority of, 3984
Pensions and Re-establishment, Com. recommendations, special facilities for legislation founded on, 3957
Petroleum and naphtha inspection, 1916
Prime Minister,
Absence of, 138
Health of, denial of statement by Mr. A. Thompson, 80
Return of, 2126, 2454
Prince Edward Island
Car ferry, 2103-4, 1601, 1621
Railway, 891-2
Purchasing Commissioner, 1469-70, 1477, 1483, 4580-1
Resignations of cabinet ministers, 386
Royal Canadian Mounted Police
Barracks, 4572
M. to reduce vote, 4574
Change of name of Force, 398
Expenses, 3203-8
Provincial authorities, and, 3196
Royal military college, 3152-3
St. Julien, battle of, 1357
Scientific Research, 2174
Services during the war—personal statement, 1405
Session of Parliament,
Progress of, 2779

King, Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Shipbuilding
Contracts, 651, 892-4, 906, 909-10
Expenditure, meeting of, 915-7
Programme, 662-9
Soldiers
Cash gratuities, 1083
Great War Veterans' Association charges, 3223.
Settlement, 1684
Speaker's Chair, 3225
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill
"Excise and Sales" tax, 3318-23
Licenses, 3607
Stock in trade, 3604
Speer, Rev. Dr., statement by, 3492
Statistics, including census, 1880
Steel and Shipping merger, 1959-60
Supplementary estimates, inquiry as to,
Supply and Budget, 918
Civil Government, 859
Com. of, arrangements for, 1597, 1615
Interim vote, 754-5
Technical education, 1762
Timiskaming election, 1995
Trade Commissions, 1885-6
War memorial, 3228
Washington, Canadian representative at, 448, 2178, 2454-63, 4540-3
Amdt. to reduce vote, 4540

King's Bench, Court of, jurisdiction, 3295-6

Kingsmill, Admiral Sir Charles, 707

Kingston
By-election, 459
Harbour improvements, 458
Income tax inspector, ques. 2181

Kingsville public building, 3153

Kinmel Camp, 709

Knox, Mr. Andrew (Prince Albert)
Budget, 3051. Increase revenues by lowering the tariff—farmers and packers, 3051; critics of Progressive party—attacks on Mr. Crerar—Canada should have greater population—immigration policy, 3053
Canadian National Railways, western extensions, 3388
Road and structural material, 3808
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 3201
Stock-raising—sunflower ensilage, 2388

Kouchibouguac, 4578

Labour. *See also* International Labour Conference; League of Nations; Eight-hour day; Grand Trunk; Industrial Disputes; Bulgarian Treaty

Labour—*Con.*
Capital and, 16, 22
Employment offices, 4512-3
International Labour Conference, 3359
Joint industrial councils, 4512
National industrial conference, 4512
Washington Conference, 371

Labrie Brothers. *See* Habeas Corpus

Lachine Canal, work on, 3423, 3561
Bridge, 3778, 4236

Lafortune, Mr. David A. (Jacques Cartier)
Indemnity of members, 3228
Lachine canal bridge, 3778, 4236
St. Anne bridge, 3775

Lake of the Woods, 3985

Lalor, Mr. Francis R. (Haldimand)
Luxury taxes in United States, 2528-9
Oleomargarine, 1782-4
Special War Revenue
Automobiles, 3598
Bank overdrafts, 3798-3800
Jewellery, 3583
Sales tax, 3609-17
Silk goods, 3573

Lanctôt, Mr. Roch (Laprairie and Napierville)
Budget, 2766. Balance sheet, items entered as assets, 2766; Canadian National Railways, deficit — prosperity and prices, 2767; expenditure criticised, 2768; war and conscription, 2769; burden of taxation—low revenue tariff favoured, 2770; war profiteers, 2771
Indemnity of members and salaries of ministers, 4444, 4450-5
Amdt. in Com. negatived, 4457-8
Judges' salaries, 4417-25, 4333
2r. of Bill objected to, 4341
Militia, 3650
Potato bag, 4562

Land Surveyors, ques. 1115, ques. 2006

Land Tax. *See* Taxation

Lands. *See* Dominion Lands; Indians
Canadian Northern, in Quebec, ques. 1626, ques. 2008
West, in, ques. 1118

Langton, Brig.-Gen. J. G., ques. 541, ques. 811

Language Questions, 87, 110, 209. *See also* Dominion Franchise; Education, Criminal Code Amdt. (French Version)

Language Questions—*Con.*
Auditor General's report, ques. 1627
Bilingual stamps, ques. 314
Blue books, ques, 992, ques. 1004
Calendar, House of Commons, ques. 2005
Customs forms, 3859
Debates reporters, 1425
Editorial Committee, 4322. *See also* Printing
Election proclamation, 1828. *See also this title under* Dominion Franchise
Farmers' Account Book, ques. 315
House of Commons, in, 697, 1039, 4587
Income tax forms, 1084, 1573
Lennox Mr. Justice and non-English speaking witness, 1231
Pensions report, 2016
Publications in French, ques. 541
Replies in English to letters in French, 1045
Schools, in, 285

Lapointe, Mr. Ernest (Quebec East)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 264. Proposed general election, 264; by-elections, 265; Union Government and public opinion, 266; mandate of Parliament, 268; cleavage between progress and reaction, 269; illness of Prime Minister, 270; Unionist party differences—Liberal party's attitude, 271; Franchise Act and redistribution, 272; Imperial Conference, 273
Air Service, 4555-6
British Columbia Indians, 793-5
Budget Speech, inquiry for copies of, 2626
Business Profits war tax, 3113
Public utilities, 3229-34
Civil Service classification, 555-6
Coal Operations Director Bill, 3370
Easter adjournment, 752
Electricity, competition and taxation, 3113-7
European distress, 4546
Exchequer Court, 2201-3
Federal Bureau of Education, 1383, 1401
Franchise Bill
Advance and proxy voting, 1163
Aliens—certificate, 2062-3, 2100-1, 2219-21
Assistant Chief Electoral officer, 1513
Canada Temperance Act, 2053-4
Chief Electoral officer, 4266-7
Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, 1072-3
Contributions, 782-3
Debate on, arrangements for, 1837
Disqualification
Charitable aid, those receiving, 1813-4
Indians, 2055

Lapointe, Mr. Ernest—*Con.*
Franchise Bill—*Con.*
Interpretation—"Standard time," 1989
Polling divisions, 1518-21
Recall, the, 2036
Returning officers — public officials,
Voters' lists, 2418-30
Married Women's names, 1827, 2418-22
Gaspesia—railway extensions—memorial of Quebec Board of Trade, 4216-7
House of Commons
Notices of motion, 1628
Saturday and morning sittings, 2782
Staff, 4414, 4563
French translators, 1043
Journals, 1039
Immigration Act, 3426
Imperial Conference, 114
Indemnity of members and salaries of ministers, 4437
Income tax, 3242
Newspaper report, 4172
Indian Act Amdt. Bill, 4137, 4173-7
Industrial legislation, 1790
Lennox, Mr. Justice, 1232
Militia, 3670
Annual drill, 3677
Moving pictures—Canadian National pictorial, 4544
National Transcontinental Railway, rentals, ques. 1461
Naval Service—additional appropriation, $1,700,000, 4317-9
Parliament Building, 1424
Prime Minister's return, 2126
Quebec riots of 1918, 1209
Resignation for Kamouraska, 1
St. James by-election, 787
Soldier settlement, 1685
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill—Quebec Board of trade and, 3457
Vessel rates, proposed regulation of, 1734
Washington, Canadian Minister at, 2449
Winnipeg strikers, ques. 2181

Lapointe, Mr. L. A., M. P., death of, 1

Last Mountain River, Dam, 3788-9

Lavigueur, Mr. Henri E. (Quebec County)
Fiset, Dr., Michel, ques. 317, 4530
Income tax, exemptions on account of children, 3298
Lennox, Mr. Justice, 1231
Militia, 3678
Orleans Island, public works, ques. 810
Parcel post supervisor, 4530
Parliament buildings, 1429
Pilotage, 1839

Lavigueur, Mr. Henri E.—*Con.*
Quebec riots of 1918, 1212
St. Jean wharf, ques. 317
St. Lawrence navigation, 3295
Ste. Famille wharf, ques. 317, ques. 810
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill — Musical instruments, 3628-9
Telephone contracts, ques. 1627

Leader of the Opposition
Speech on Address commended, 45
War the, and, 222, 1405

League of Nations, 8, 12, 161, 246, 4320.
See also Peace Treaty; Washington.
Ames, Sir Herbert, Financial Director of Secretariat, general statement by, 3961
Armenia, 855, 1465, 3979
Belgium, 3978
Brazil, 3978
Canada and the United States, 500
Canada's contribution to defray expenses, ques. 316, ques. 410, ques. 589, ques. 618, 3981, 4544
Canada's status under, 144, 214, 567. *See also* Canada's status
Canadian interests and representation, 567, 3982
Commercial treaties, 3973
Council of Nine, 3974
Disarmament, 3976
Eight-hour day, 449
Enforcement of decisions, 3975
German territory, occupation by France, 1046
Great Powers
If they withdrew, 3973
Those not now members, 3983
Greece, 3978
India, 361
Labour—Washington Conference, decisions, 371
Lenroot reservations, 496
Military contribution, 492, 502
Next assembly, 3977
Peace, 938
Persia, 3968, 3975
Public and private sessions, 3973
Russia, Poland, Ukrainia, 3968, 3978
Saar Basin, 3963, 3974
Secret treaties, 3973
Self-determination, 3978
Spain, 3978
Typhus epidemic, 4545
United States
Failure of to join, ques. 1118
Representation of, 3977

Leduc, Mr. J. Alfred (Westmount-St. Henry)
Butter prices, ques. 807
Grand Trunk entrance to Montreal, ques. 413
Hoarding foodstuffs, ques. 807
Lachine canal work, 3423, 3561
St. Pierre river floods, ques. 1115, ques. 4019
Westmount-St. Henri gatekeepers, ques. 998

Leger, Mr. Auguste T. (Kent, N.B.)
C. G. S. "Simcoe," ques. 413
Dredging, New Brunswick, 3781
Franchise Bill
Election expenses, 1932
Peace and good order, 1106
Polls, hours to be open, 1920-1
Proclamation—two languages, 1081, 1828-32, 2270-3
Returning officers, 1575
Voters' lists, provincial, 2332
Grand Trunk Railway, 1500-2
Inquiry for papers, 3769
Lightkeepers' remuneration, 1281, 2110
Milk tests, 2406
Oleomargarine, 1873
St. John armoury, ques. 994
Telegraphs and Telephones, 4576

Legislation. Royal Commission on, ques. 4502

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe (Maisonneuve) (Gaspé)
Administration of Justice
Labrie Brothers, case of, 3227, 3295, 3558-60, 3840
Bankruptcy Bill, 3256-63
Board of Commerce
Chairman, resignation of, 3863
Murdock, Mr., letter of, 4486-96
British mails, 4531
Budget, 2786. The new taxes, 2787; economy needed—naval expenditure rumours, 2788; British safety valves—Mr. Asquith and Mr. Lloyd George, 2789; The Onlooker and leading members of the Government, 2790; repressive measures criticized, 2791; Liberal party and tariff, 2792; Mr. M. Clark and the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 2794; party government—national unity, 2795
Buffalo herd, 3283
Canadian National Railways and Gaspesia, 4213-6
Caughnawaga, 3266

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe—*Con.*
Civil Service
Reorganization, ques. 3861
Griffenhagen and Associates, 3863, 4521-2, 3491
Holidays, 4261
Coal operations director, 3175
Coal Supply—M. to adjourn to discuss, 3686-8
Colonial Investment and Loan, 3859
Criminal Code Amdt. (French version) 3082
Customs
Appointments, etc., 3858-9
Forms, in French, 3859
DeCelles, Mr. 2968
Divorce Bills, charges, 4321, 4413
Dominion arsenals, 3717-20
Dorval military property, 3731
Dry docks, 4567-74
Editorial Board, 4559. *See also, under this title* Printing
European distress, 4546
Fish inspection, 4586
Franchise Bill
Aliens—certificate, 2223-4
Proclamation, language of publication, 1832, 2299-2302
Returning officers—public officials, 1799-1801
French treaty, 3425, ques. 3684, 4274, ques. 4323
Goods arrived—date of delivery, 4505
Fuel Supply—special powers for Railway Commission, 4325-30. *See also under this title,* Coal
Grand Trunk Railway acquisition—arbitration, ex-President Taft, 3490
Habeas Corpus. *See, under this title,* Administration
Hartney, Mr. E. P., 4566
House of Commons
Attendance of members, 4458
Staff—classification and organization, 4563-4
Income tax, 3237
Advertisements, 3240
Exemptions on account of children, 3298
Indemnity of members, 3310-1
Indemnities of members and salaries of ministers, 4442, 4458
Indian Act Amdt., 4137
Industrial Disputes, 2193-9
Judges' salaries and pensions, 4422
Labrie Brothers. *See under this title,* Administration
Magdalen Islands, 4282-4
Relief ships to, 1742

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe—*Con.*
Mail service, increase in, 4526
Military Service branch, 4517
Naval Service, 3513
Additional appropriation, $1,700,000, 4309
Navigation, Pictou—Baie de Chaleur—St. Lawrence, 2186-9, 3492-3
Newspaper postage rates, 3349
Zone system, 3351
Nile Voyageurs, 3857
Northern Canada, resources, 3283-4
Peace Conference Labour Bureau, 4507
Pecuniary Claims Convention, 3857-8
Penitentiary Act Amdt., 3410
Permanent force, commissions to N.C.O's, ques. 3619
Point of order—relevancy, 3743
Post Office
Department, 3735-43
Estimates, 4521-2
Reorganization, 3739
Rural mail carriers, 4522
Post Office and Customs Departments
Rumoured investigation of, 3491
Printing, Joint Com. on, 4257, 4322, 4505
Purchasing Commission, 4581
Quebec-Gaspé service, 4282
Reindeer herds, 3284
Returned soldiers' needs, 3212
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 3197, 3206
St. John harbour, 3492-3, 4567-74
Shipping federation, 2266
Sick and distressed mariners, 2260-2
Special War Revenue, 3444
Chewing gum, 3594
Returned soldiers, exemption of, Amdt. proposed, 3446-7
Supply, Com. of, Saturday, order for, 3840
Tobacco, 3819
Washington, Canadian Minister at, 2464
Correspondence, 3080-1
West Indies, 2892-3, 3161

Lennox, Mr. Justice, alleged statement by, 1232

Lesage, Mr. J. E. (Hochelaga)
Proprietary Medicines, ques. 1036
War Tax stamps, ques. 807

Letter Carriers. *See* Post Office

Levis Drill Hall, ques. 1360, 3727

Library of Parliament, 211, 1426
Joint Com appointed, 307
Librarian, 114. *See also* DeCelles

Lighthouses and Lightkeepers, 1281-2, 2110, ques. 1897
British Columbia, 1616
Charlevoix-Montmorency, ques. 319
Lighthouse Board, 2117
St. Lawrence river, 3295. *For individual lights see their titles*

Lindsay arsenal, 3717

Linen. *See* Flax

Liquor. *See also* Inland Revenue; Special War Revenue; Prohibition
Duties, 2487
Shipments to United States, 2107, 2118

Little Sands, 4580

Live Stock
Cattle embargo, ques. 340
Feeding of. *See* Commercial Feeding Stuffs
Shipments, inspection, 1614

Lloyd's. *See* Canada Shipping Act; Canadian Government Merchant Marine

Loan Companies Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 855; 2r., 1776; Com., 1777; 3r., 1779

Loans, ques. 810. *See also* Victory Loans
Not another popular, ques., 810

Loans to Foreign Countries, Summary, ques. 318. *See also* Finance

Lobsters. *See* Fisheries

Lockeport
Froude's Point service, 4514, 4284-5
Railway connection, proposed, 3085, 3376, 4218

Loggie, Mr. William S. (Northumberland, N.B.)
Budget, 3033. New Parliament building—customs reductions, 3033; tariff revision—manufactured food products—adequate revenue, 3034; commercial and industrial competition — cottons, 3036; stabilizing the general tariff—export taxes, 3036; Mr. Fielding's amdt., 3037; Liberal tariff plank—the farmers and free agricultural implements, 3038; Budget approved, 3039
Franchise Bill—proclamation, 2267
Income tax returns, 3255-6
Newcastle-Tracadie, proposed railway, 4217
Opium and Drug Bill, 1754
Sick and distressed mariners, 3105

Loggie, Mr. William S.—*Con.*
Special War Revenue
Boots, 3565
Collection, method of, 3336-8, 3484
Dresses, 3586
Gloves, 3568
Jewellers, 3579-80
Lace and braid, 3573-4
Collars, 3574
Licenses, 3583, 3607
Penalties, 3302
Refunds, 3608
"Sales taxes" returned soldier amdt., 3452, 3610, 3336
Silk goods, 3563-4, 3572-3
Snowshoes, 3571
Stockings, silk, 3567
Taxes, effect of, 3485
Telegraphs and telephones, 4578

London, Canadian Mission in, ques., 410

Long, Mr. Charles E. (North Battleford)
Canadian Northern Railway extensions, 3391

Lorette, Hurons of. *See* Indians

Lotbiniere and Megantic Railway, ques. 590, 950, 4578, 4585

Louiseville, postmaster, ques., 1739

Lunenburg, acting registrar of shipping, 2108

Luxury Taxes, 2486. *See also* Special War Revenue

Macallum, Professor, 3806

Mack, Mr., Lunenburg, N.S., 2108-9

Mackenzie Avenue, Ottawa, ques. 999

Mackenzie, Sir William, private car, ques. 1628; ques. 2572

Mackenzie and Mann, 2379, 4184
Inverness coal, 4238

Mackie, Mr. Henry A. (East Edmonton)
Bird, Mr. Eustace G., ques. 1625
Canadian National Railways, rates, 4189
Carvill, Mr. George, case of, 4226
Child labour, 368
Civil Service
Dismissals and appointments, ques. 320
Holidays, 4058
Edmonton post office, 4518
Deputy postmaster, ques. 1739
Money parcel lost, ques. 412, 923
Eight-hour day, 337, 367, 379
Empire Day adjournment, 2575

Mackie, Mr. Henry A.
Federal Bureau of Education, 1374
Franchise Bill, 749
Aliens—certificate, 2091, 2096
Ballot boxes, 1097-8
By-elections, simultaneous, 1091
Chief Electoral Officer—Biggar, Mr. O. M., appointment of, 4269
Conveyance of electors, 787
Deposit, 1094
Notices, 778
Oaths, 780
Recall, the, 2028
Returning officers, 1522, 1532-3, 1577, 1582
Public officials, 1795-6, 1806
Voters' lists, 2426-36
Indemnity of members, 4074, 4448-9
Industrial disputes, 1910-11
Judges' salaries, ques. 1035, 4339, 4422
League of Nations, 3978
Marriage Act Amdt, 1787-8
Naturalization
"Disloyal," 3917-9
Galicians, 3922
Naval Service, additional appropriation, $1,700,000, 4404
New party movement, 125
Oil from tar sands, 332-3
Oliver-St. Paul de Metis Railway, 344, 871
Privilege—comment on absence from House, 2968-9
Returned soldiers, provision for
M. for special Com. 513
Soldiers' widows and children, ques. 920
Saturday and morning sittings, 2781-2
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 4005
Speech read—point of order, 2966
Washington labour conference, 371

Mackie, Mr. Herbert J. (North Renfrew)
Indemnity of members and salaries of ministers, 4446
Rural mail carriers, 4524

Maclean, Hon. A. K. (Halifax)
Canadian Wheat Board, 4111
Civil Service Act Amdt. 3133-9
Judges' salaries, 4421-2
Resignation as Minister, 448
Scientific Research, 2169

Maclean, Mr. W. F. (South York)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 129. Union Government — Prime Minister and Parliamentary government, 129; proposed general election, 130

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Business Profits tax—public utilities, 3229-34
Canadian National Railways
Public ownership—duplications—colonization lines—community centres—situation in Toronto—public ownership in United States coming, 4195-9
Canadian Wheat Board, 4351
Civil Service, technical officers, 4514
Coal—alienation of lands, 3811
Estimates and their discussion, 4589
Federal laws, enforcement of, 4506
Fuel supply, 4506
Special powers to Railway Commission 4331
Grank Trunk Railway acquisition, 1439-42
Judges' salaries, 4335-41
Labour representatives, 4513-4
Newsprint shortage, 2968
Pensions and Re-establishment, 3947
Railway Commission, jurisdiction over telephones, 2413
Rural mail, 4525
Soldier Settlement—housebuilding, 1687
Steel and shipping merger, 1955-60
Toronto Union station, 3225-6

MacNutt, Mr. Thomas (Saltcoats)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 174. Proposed general election —census and representation, figures, 174; income tax and land value tax—the Farmers' party, 175; Liberals and free trade, 176
Budget, 2884. New party and its names—its platform on the tariff—former Liberals supporting the Budget, 2884; Mr. Stacey and duty on apples—Opposition tariff policy, 2885; effect of Budget on public revenues and on prices, 2887; income tax, land value tax, 2888; no tariff at all but land value tax and if necessary other direct taxes, 2889
Canadian Pacific Railway freight rates, ques. 2010
Franchise Bill, advance polls, 3876
Indemnity of members, 4081
Wheat participation certificates, ques. 802; ques. 802

McCoig, Mr. A. B. (Kent, Ont.)
Agricultural machinery, standardizing, 2079
Apple barrel, 2018
Budget, 2626. Manufacturers and tariff—United Farmers, 2627; effects of policy on stock-raising, 2628; profiteering

McCoig, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
and Board of Commerce, 2629; prices, 2630; luxury taxes—taxation of war profits, 2631
Canadian Wheat Board, ques. 799, 3561, 4109
Chaplin, Mr., criticism by, 2816
Erieau port, 2115, 2118
Franchise Bill—voters' lists, 2350
Income tax
Part payment with return, 3254
Residence or investment outside Canada, 3251
Indemnity of members, 4083
Indians, enfranchisement, 4037
Opium and Drug Bill, 1705
Postmen, rumoured strike of, 3623
Purchasing Commission, 1472
Returned soldiers, provision for, 514
Special War Revenue
Bank overdrafts, 3624-5
Chandeliers, 3578
Sporting goods, 3571
Stock transfers, 3626

McCrea, Mr. Francis N. (Sherbrooke)
Grand Trunk Railway acquisition, 1497
Stocks, 1571
Strike of 1910, 1570
Indemnity of members, 4454
Parliament Buildings, 1422-1434
Railways, purchase of by Government, 1454
Railway rates, 1498
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 4013

McCurdy, Mr. F. B. (Colchester)
Budget, 2936. Budget should be circulated in condensed and popular form, 2936; supposed prosperity, prices, inflation, 2937; gold reserve—taxes and revenue, 2938; expenditures, public debt, 2939; sinking fund—effects of war extravagance, 2940; Government example needed — greater efficiency and economy in Civil Service, 2941
Income tax—corporations, 3239

McDonald, Mr. Angus (Timiskaming)
Budget, 3039. Failure to catch Speaker's eye—Timiskaming by-election — Mrs. Rose Henderson—One Big Union, 3039; in honour of Canada's soldier heroes, 3041
Canadian Northern Railway, North Bay through, ques. 3619
Election and introduction, 1684, 1787
Industrial disputes, 1909-11, 1975-7
Personal position on labour questions, 1977

McGibbon, Mr. Peter (Muskoka)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 215. Exchange situation, 216; Great Britain's industrial efficiency, German competition, 218; protection, income tax, taxation of foodstuffs, 218; duties on boots and shoes, agricultural implements, free goods, 219; tax on farm lands, development of resources —Franchise Act, 220; proposed general election, 221
Civil Service, 4059
Franchise Bill
Agents, 1098
Conveying voters, 786, 1062
Disqualification, charitable aid, those receiving, 1818
Income tax—Charities, 3246, 3314
Indians
Gibson, reserve, 3277
Tuberculosis amongst, 3277
Military training and cadet service, 3710
Newspaper postage rates, 3349, 3354
Northern Canada—oil properties, 3281
Oleomargarine, 1870
Opium and Drug Bill, 1746-50, 1753-6
Pensions and Re-establishment, 3937
Race track betting, 3429
Returned soldiers, 514
Scientific Research, 2164
Special War Revenue,
Automobiles, 3599
Boats and canoes, 3589-92
Proprietary medicines, 3602

McGibbon, Mr. Peter Robert (Argenteuil)
Parliament Buildings, 1434

McGregor, Mr. Alexander (Pictou)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech (Seconder) 18. Illness and absence of Prime Minister, 18; returned soldiers, 19; after-war conditions—class divisions, 20; iron and steel industry in war and peace, 21; labour and capital, 22
Pictou Harbour, 2185
Voters' lists, 2361-2

McIsaac, Mr. James (Kings, P.E.I.)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 221. Parliament buildings, 221; contents of Speech from the Throne—Union Government—leader of the Opposition and the war, 222; illness of Prime Minister—proposed general election, 223; reply to Mr. McKenzie, 224
Agriculture, 2395

McIsaac, Mr. James—*Con.*
Budget, 2864. Congratulations to Minister of Finance—trade and production, 2864; national debt, 2865; revenue and expenditure—new taxes, 2866; Mr. Fielding's amdt. and address, 2867; fiscal policy of Liberal party, 2868; tariff investigation and amendment, 2869; national policy, 2870
Canadian National Railways
Prince Edward Island car ferry—standardization of railway — winter navigation—Georgetown harbour and terminals—invitation to Prince Edward Island, 4208-12
Car ferry, 2103
Franchise Bill
"Ecclesiastics," 1078
Polls, hours to be open, 1926
Voters' lists, provincial, 2360
Grading export butter and cheese, 606
Icebreakers, 2103
Lightkeeper's salaries, 2111
Masters and mates, examiner, 1610
North Lake harbour, 3159
School of navigation, 1612
Sick sailors, 3553-4
Soldier settlement, 2152

McKenzie, Mr. D. D. (Cape Breton North and Victoria)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 46, 47. Congratulations, 47; new leader of the Opposition, 48; Montreal Gazette's and Hon. Robert Rogers' opinion of the Government, 50; Minister's absence from the House, 51; health of Prime Minister—extension of parliamentary term, 52; technical education — shipbuilding—production—returned soldiers-civil service reform, 53; Liberal policy—late Liberal leader, 54; exchange rate and foreign trade, 55
Admiralty Act, 3086
Appeals in sumary convictions, 3418-9
Arrest and summoning of persons outside the province, 3417-8
Banff National Park, 3770-6
Bankruptcy Bill, 3258-65
Betting machine, 3416
Board of Commerce
Constitutional question, 3685
Porter, Mr. Arthur S., dismissal of, 568
Budget, 2580. Tariff and tariff commission, 2580; the Budget, its purpose, 2581; revenue and expenditure, 2582; luxury taxes and prices, 2583; foreign credits, 2584; governmental interference in

McKenzie, Mr. D. D.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
trade, 2585; government and by-elections, 2585; parties and the tariff, 2587; Liberals' and Farmers' tariff resolutions, 2588
Canada Grain Act, administration, 1877
Canadian National Railways
Appointments, how made, 3140
Canadian National Railway Company, 345
Extensions, 3376, 3384-9, 3393-4
Victoria County, 4241
North Sydney terminal, 4251
Reply to general summary of Minister of Railways, 872
Taxation of, 3393-4
Withholding of information, 1657-8
Canadian Wheat Board, 4114
Cape Breton
Need of railways, 875
Newfoundland steamship service, 4285
Civil Service
Bonus, 1270-2, 1276, 1280, 1284, 3147
Cheques, preparation of, 1285-7
Classification, 553
Insurance, 1780
Retirement fund, 460, 3836
Salaries, 3541
Temporary employees, 3133-5
Outside Canada, 3129
War record, civil servants with, 3131
Coal and iron resources, 327
Coal mining—prevention of explosions, 3814
Coal Operations Director, 3693
Orders in Council, 3186
Orders of, 3191
Cold storage for bait, 2408
Commercial Feeding stuffs, 3409
Criminal Code
Change of venue, 3421-2
Courts of appeal, 3423
Prisoner, re-election by, 3419-20
Currency Act Amdt., 460
Dominion lands, 1049-50
United States soldiers and, 1233
Dredging, 3786
Exchange rate, 55, 460
Exchequer Court, 2202-4
Experimental and demonstration farms, 2384-5
Firearms licenses, 3410, 3413
Fish inspection, 1053-4
Fisheries treaty with United States, 1290, 3161
Food and Drugs Bill, 957, 961-77, 1258-9, 1262
Prosecutions, 1263-9

McKenzie, Mr. D. D.—*Con.*
Food inspectors, 3540
Franchise Bill
Advance polls, 1942, 1999
Lists, 3914
Aliens—certificate, 2101, 2204
Bribery, treating, undue influence, personation, 1156-8
Burden of proof, 1161, 1825
Clerk of Crown in Chancery, 1071
Contributions, 1169
Corrupt practices, 1160
Deputy returning officers, 1074
Disqualification
Charitable aid, those receiving, 1818
Citizenships and franchise, 1824
Election officers, 1075-8
False statement made to affect election, 1066-7
Interpretation
"Lists of voters," 1989
"Voter," 1993-4
Orders in Council, repeal of 776-7
Payment of voters' expenses, 1064
Poll books, etc., returning officer, 1078-80
Preparation of voters' lists—complaint of unfairness, 3905
Proclamation—language of publication, 1832
Registrars, rural, attendance of, 3908-9
Returning officers, 1161, 1589-90
Voters' lists
Provincial, 1989, 2329, 2341-6, 2348, 2361-4
Voting notwithstanding disqualification, 1161, 1825
Writ of election, 1166
Franking privilege, 3358
Gas and electricity inspection, 1887
Government annuities, 462-3
Government steamers—wages, 1609-11
Grand Trunk Railway, 1291, 1299-1300, 1486, 1489, 1506-7
Branch lines, 1313-6, 1321
Stock, 1321
Strike of 1910 and pensions, 1130, 1551, 1568
Halifax-Cape Breton service, 4281
Halifax explosion, 3698-9
Harbour dues, 2189
Highlander's plaid and clasp, 445
Housing expenditure, 3550
Hungarian treaty, 1060
Icebreakers, 1600, 2106
Imperial conference, 359

McKenzie, Mr. D. D.—*Con.*
Income tax
Assessment methods, 3254
Charities, 3247, 3314
Delinquents, 3120, 3123-4
Exemptions, 3127
"Householders," 3249
Indians,
British Columbia, 951-5
Economic and religious situation, 3268
Education of, 3277
Enfranchisement, 4038-40
Nova Scotia, 3272-3
Tuberculosis amongst, 3275
Industrial disputes, 1901-4, 1912, 1972-3, 2199-2200
Isle Madame fishery officers, ques. 3294
Irrigation, 3698-9
League of Nations
Britain's treaty-making power and, 349
Washington Labour Conference, 355
Liberal leadership, and, 898, 913, 1277
Liquor sales—jurisdiction, 3498
Live stock shipments inspection, 1615
Loan Companies, 1778-9
Lotbiniere and Megantic Railway, 950
Marine hospitals, 3552-3
Masters and mates, 406, 562-4, 573-4, 979-87
Examiners, 1611
Militia
Cadet service, 3703
Headquarters officers, ques. 344
Mines Dept., explosives, 3804
Moving pictures of Canada, 1884
Naturalization, 3918
Naval Service, badges, 446
Necessaries, prices of, 327
Newfoundland, 4276, 4278-9, 4281
Cattle trade—veterinary, 2410
North Sydney
Harbour and breakwater, 2186, 3493-94
Terminal facilities, 875, 4241
Oleomargarine, 1875-7
Opium and Drug Bill, 1643-4, 1761, 1900
Ottawa city, agreement with, 578, 581, 989-91
Parliamentary restaurant, 3095-6
Patent Record, 1886
Peace Treaty, 1058-60
Pensions and Re-establishment, 3947
Fisheries and returned men, 3948
Pensioner resident outside of Canada, 4044-5
Vocational training, 3949
Widowed mother, 4044
Pictou harbour, 2186
Pilotage, 1967
Questions not answered, 949

McKenzie, Mr. D. D.—*Con.*
Railway Act Amdt. (Provincial jurisdiction) 3635
Railways, Govt. vs. private ownership, 872
Registration of shipping, 1614
Returned soldiers' insurance, 4054-5
Returned soldiers, 525
Soldier settlement, 527, 1695
Fishermen, aid to, 1691, 3948
St. John harbour—pilots, 2120
St. Lawrence dredging, 1617-20
Schools of navigation, 1612-3
Scottish Canadian Insurance Corporation, 583
Shipbuilding
Contracts, 911
Prices, 912
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 3999, 4009-16, 4137, 4157, 4166
Sick and distressed mariners, 2266-7
Special War Revenue
Candy, 3593
Collection, method of, 3482
Debate on Bill, arrangements for, 3456
Excise and sales taxes
Returned soldier amdt. (Mr. Lemieux) 3452-3
Sporting goods, 3571-2
Spirits, illicit distillation, 3817
Statutes, suggested revision and consolidation, 3821, 4053
Steamboat inspection, 1051, 1767-76
Steamers "Champlain" and "Lady Grey," ques. 3619
Steel and shipping merger, 1965
Supply, interim, vote, 756
Supreme Court Act, 2315-16
Sydney harbour
South Bar lighthouse, 2116
Sydney Quarantine station, 3148
Sydney-Whycocomagh service, 4287
Terminal elevators, 1878-9
Ticket-of-leave system, 398
Treaty of Peace, ratification, 476
Wednesday evening sittings, 1045
Wharves and wharfage, 2123, 2189
Wheeler, Mr. S—rust proof wheat, 2388
Yukon and British Columbia, 3282

McMaster, Mr. Andrew R. (Brome)
Air service, 4555
Alien immigrants, 833
Asbestos, 4513
Banff National park, 3772
Board of Commerce—Murdock, Mr., letter of, 4474-8, 4494
Bright, John, on hours of labour, 326
Budget, 2518-20. Gross and net debt—taxation methods, 2521; inflation and rates of duty, 2522; deficit, and suggestions of economy, 2523; military preparations, 2523; public works, 2524; subsidies, 2525; taxation, methods, 2526; luxury taxes, 2528; tariff investigation, 2529; protection or free trade, 2530; United States free list—"Reduction Rimes," 2533

McMaster, Mr. Andrew R.—*Con.*
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Civil Service insurance, and, 1780
Canadian Mission in London, ques. 410
Canadian National Railways
Nomenclature and legislation, 3390
Taxation of, 3394
Withholding information, 1672-4, 1680
Coal Operations Director, 3694
Coinage
Deficient, 461
Silver—international standard, 400
Debates, difficulty of hearing, 1418
Eastern Townships, scenic beauty, 3538
Exchequer Court, 2204
Export regulations, 3622
Food and Drugs Bill, 955-9, 966-70
Franchise Bill, 738
Compulsory voting, 1062
Contributions—amdt. 1171, 1192-6
Paid propaganda, amdt. to 3r., 4374
Polling divisions, 1516, 1518-9
Proclamation, language of publication, 2284-5
Returning officers, 1524-5
Telegraph, communications by, 1068
Franking privilege, 3762-8
Grand Trunk Railway, 1313, 1325-8
Appeal from ruling of Chairman, 1327
House of Commons, pages, 3098-9
Indemnity of members, 4452
International Joint Commission—Sir William Hearst — Non-representation of Quebec, 3986
Irrigation, 3695-3701
Judges' salaries, 4419
Labour, Minister of, 4513
League of Nations, 3983
Expenses, Canada's contribution, ques. 410
Loan Companies, 1778
Militarism, 3706-7
Militia, Cadet service, 3704-8, 3706
Mines Department and Geological Survey, 4513
Missisquoi Bay, 3538
Naval Service badges, 444
News Service, 4333
Opium and Drug Bill, 1758

McMaster, Mr. Andrew R.—*Con.*
Palmer, Mr. K. H., ques. 1001
Parliament Building, 1418, 1429-30
Peace, 230-1
Peace Treaty, Ratification, 478, 3984
Pensions
French reservist from Canada, 4048
Widowed mothers, resident outside of Canada, 4045-6
Post Office Dept, postal rates, etc., 3738, 3756-8
Press censorship, ques. 541
Purchasing Commission, 1476
Race track betting, 3427-8, 3432
Regina Library, 396
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 396-7
Shipbuilding, 638, 666-7, 907-9
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 3989-92, 4154-61
Special War Revenue, 3791
Administration — book of instructions suggested, 3791
Caps, 3566
"Excise and sales" and luxury taxes, 3466-7
Changes, date of coming into effect, 3607
Clocks and watches, 3574
Currency, foreign, depreciated, 3615
Fountain pens, 3577
Fuel, 3609
Glassware, cut, 3569
Imports and manufactures, 3566
Jewellery, 3582-4
Musical instruments, 3596
Neckwear, 3790
Proprietary medicines, 3603-4
Refunds, 3607
Socks, 3566
Sporting goods, 3570-1
Umbrellas, 3568
Underwear, 3568
Wedding rings, 3797
Steamboat inspection, 1770-75
Steamboat subsidies, 4515
T. Eaton Life Assurance Company, 669
Washington, Canadian representative at,

McMasterville, Explosive works at, 2247

McNichol, Mr. J. L. ques. 994

McQuarrie, Mr. W. G. (New Westminster)
Judges' salaries, 3853
Returned soldiers, 537

Magdalen Islands, 649, 1601, 4586
Visit of "Canadian Sealer," 649
Relief ships to, 1742
Steamship services, 4276-87

Magill, Dr., 4124-5, 4342-7

Maharg, Mr. John A. (Maple Creek)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 299. Farmers' movement, 299; reply to Sir Thomas White, 300; reply to Mr. McGibbon (Muskoka)—returned soldiers, 301; taxation of war profits, 302; tariff protection—proposed new Liberal and Conservative party, 303
Alien immigrants, 827, 839
Budget, 2632. Luxury taxes, 2632; Liberal party's tariff policy—Great Britain under free trade, 2633; Wheat Board and the farmers, 2635; farmers and purchase of American implements, 2636
Campaign funds, 1224
Canadian Wheat Board, 4131-5, 4346, 4351, 4355
Franchise Bill
Contributions, 783, 1189, 1191, 4373
Election expenses, 1154
Grand Trunk Railway, 1458
Indemnity of members, 4090
Opium and Drug Bill, 1634-7, 1641-2
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 395
Pensions, 615
Shipbuilding, inland waters, vessels for, 913
Soldier Settlement, cattle branding, 1700
Universal military training, 942

Mail Carriers, ques. 343. *See also* Civil Service; Post Office; Rural Mail

Manion, Mr. Robert J. (Fort William and Rainy River)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 211. Ontario and Quebec—Parliamentary librarian — Parliament Building, 211; proposed general election, 212; franchise, pensions, shipping, civil service, development, 212; tariff, 213; League of Nations, Canada's status, 214
Agricultural and industrial populations, ques. 1002
Budget. 2544. Tariff, 2544; free trade or moderate tariff, 2545; markets, 2547; foreign commerce, 2548; how to estimate prosperity and progress, 2550, 2634; railways, agriculture, pulpwood, minerals, 2552; foreign competition, 2554; tariff revision, 2554
Canadian Wheat Board, 4111
Chisholm, Col. H. A., ques. 3359
Coal Operations Director, 3179
Dairying—cheese, 2406

Manion, Mr. Robert J.—*Con.*
Food and Drugs Bill, 1636, 1642
Fort Frances public buildings, 3151-2
Franchise Bill
Advance and proxy voting, 1165
Contributions, 1190-1
Disqualification—charitable aid, those receiving, 1815, 1818-9
"Ecclesiastics," 1078
Non-residents and non-electors, 786
Voters' lists, 2429-30
Income tax—aliens in Canada, 3250
National resources development, M. in favour, 1017
Oleomargarine, 1864
Opium and Drug Bill, 1759
Returned Soldiers, M. for Special Com. 519
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 390
Shipbuilding—foreign trade, 906
Special War Revenue
Ethyl alcohol, 3604
Furniture, 3575
Medicines, 3627, 3631
Sporting Goods, 3571
War medals, ques. 1003, 1046, ques. 1120

Mann, Sir Donald, private car, ques. 2183

Mantezono. *See* Labrie

Manufacturers. *See also debates on* Address; Budget
Aid in appeals, 321
United States competition, 2857
Vessel rates, 1728

Maple Products Adulteration Bill. 1r., 582; 2r., 796; com, 796, 1254; 3r., 1256; Senate amdts., 2366, 4020

Marcil, Hon. Charles (Bonaventure)
Banff National park, 3777
Bonaventure
Experimental farms, ques. 414
Pensions, ques. 993
Postmasters, ques. 507
Public Works engineer, ques. 411
Wharves, ques. 411
Bonaventure and Gaspe, dairy products and fish, ques. 587
Bridges and the provinces, 3771-3
Campbellton-Cross Point
Bridge, ques. 3490
Ferry, ques. 342, ques. 411, ques. 588, ques. 1789, ques. 2415
Canadian National Railways—cars, 864
Chambly fort, 3725
Civil Service retirement, 3833
Dredging, 3783-7

Marcil, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
Franchise Bill
Election expenses, 1932
Polls, hours to be open, 1921-2
Gascons wharf, ques. 411
International Joint Commission, 3986
League of Nations, 3982
Matapedia
Bridge and highway, 3780, ques. 411
Station, freights, ques. 587
Mines Dept., 3803
Explosives, 3804
Montreal barracks, 3724-7
Montreal-Quebec-Gaspe service, ques. 587
Newsprint shortage, 2968
Peat, 3806
Public works, resident engineers, 3787
Quebec and Western Railway, ques. 411, ques. 412
Quebec, Oriental and Atlantic Railway, ques. 411, ques. 412, ques. 507
Registered postal rate, 3732-5
Restigouche bridge, ques. 411
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 3998
Special War Revenue
Lace, 3793
Prices, how arrived at, 3790
Spirits and beer, 3817-8
Tache, Mr. Chas. Eugene, ques. 3490
Tobacco, 3818-9

Marcile, Mr. J. E. (Bagot)
Acton Vale post office, ques. 1899
Bagot
Electoral list, ques. 2011
Postal inspection, ques. 2721
Flynn, Capt. Percy, ques. 2415
Franchise Bill, 1991-2
Military Service defaulters, ques. 507
Picard, Mr. Elzear, ques. 993
Ste. Rosalie-Bagot spur line, ques. 2009
Theodore d'Acton post office, ques. 2011

Margeson, Mr. J. W., ques. 1036

Marine. *See also* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Canada Shipping Act. *For vessels, see that title*
Buoys, 2116
Department
Classification, 2113
Members of Parliament, treatment of, 2121
Services, restored to, 3507
Hospitals, 3552. *See also* Canada Shipping Act (Sick and Distressed Mariners)
Liquor shipments and, 2107
Wrecking plants, 1615, 2103
Wrecks, investigations, 1612

Marine and Fisheries
Com. appointed, 307

Maritime Provinces, Harbour Commissions, 3492-3

Marriage Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 1787

Marriage Licenses, 3415

Marshall, Mr. David, M. P., death of, 1, 10

Martin, Mr. Peter F. (Halifax)
Fisheries
Benefits from government policy, 3535
Estimates, 3521
Halifax explosion, 3699
Voters' lists, 2337

Masonic Records in Parliament Tower, ques. 2894

Masters and Mates. *See that title under* Canada Shipping Act

Matapedia
Highway, ques. 411, 3780
Station, ques. 587

Matches—use of phosphorus, 356

Mayrand, Mr. Hormisdas (Maskinongé)
Louiseville postmaster, ques. 1739

Meat and Canned Goods Inspection, 2411

Medicines—*See* Foods and Drugs; Opium and Drugs; Inland Revenue; Proprietary; Special War Revenue

Meighen, Hon. Arthur (Minister of the Interior and Superintendent General of Indian Affairs.)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 152; Farmers' movement a class movement, 153; franchise and conscription of aliens; reply to Mr. Caldwell—Canada's national status, 156; monetary exchange and trade, 157; proposed general election—Cabinet representation—illness of Prime Minister, 158; Union Government's mandate—government by commission, 159; vacancies, 160
Alien immigrants, 831, 2238-40
Alpine Club, 3288
Banff National park, 3771-2
Board of Commerce, Murdock, Mr., letter of, 4492-4500
British Columbia Indians, 386, 787-95, 950-5, 1047, 3273. *See also under this title,* Indian Act.

Meighen, Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Budget, 2683. "Advances unaccounted for," 2683; luxury taxes, 2684; income tax in Canada, in Great Britain and in New Zealand, 2685-2707; tariff—England as an example, 2686; balance of trade, Great Britain and the United States, 2687; people below the poverty line, 2688; effect of free trade on movement of population, 2689; British industry and free trade, 2690; United States an alleged free trade country, 2690; agricultural population in Great Britain and in Canada, 2690; Great Britain and Germany in the field of manufacture, 2691; British reports on industries—iron, steel, tinplate, 2692; electrical trades, engineering trades, 2695; cotton trade, textile industries, 2696; Liberal party and tariff, 2697; Farmers' party tariff plank, 2699; duty on agricultural implements, 2701; Mr. Fielding and "adequate protection," 2702; tariff and foodstuffs, 2703; answers to questions invited—Liberal and agrarian party platforms, 2704; Mr. Crerar and direct taxation—tax on unearned increment of land, 2706; tariff should remain in force pending revision, 2708
Canadian Forestry Association, 3285
Canadian National Railways and Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Information properly withheld, 1664, 1668-70
Canadian Wheat Board, 4115-24, 4136, 4346
Capital punishment, 1152
Coal Operations Director, 3690
Fuel situation, 3175, 3182-92
Orders in Council, 3186-9
Ratification of, 3361, 3365-75
Orders of Director, 3189-92
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. 704, 1048-50
Homesteading privileges to United States Soldiers, 1113, 1233-4
Dominion Water Powers Branch, 3289-93
Employment offices, 2313-4, 3087, 4512-3
Minister, powers of, 3092
Orders in Council, effect of, 3088-91
Explosive works at Beloeil, 2314
Franchise Bill, 756-9
Aliens—certificate, 2238-40
Grand Trunk Railway
Stocks, value of, 1562-3, 1572
Strike of 1910, 1556-64
Hurons of Lorette, 1152

Meighen, Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Indian Act Amdt. Bill, 386, 795-6, 4029-40, 4137, 4174
Indian lands (British Columbia) 386
Indians, 3265-80
Agents—salary and bonus, 3273
British Columbia, 3273
Caughnawaga, 3266-7
Education, 3277-80
Game laws and, 3280
Gordon's Reserve—school, 3270-1, 3278
Health and medical attendance, 3275
—Tuberculosis, 3276
Hurons of Lorette, 1152
Missionary work amongst, 3268
New Brunswick, 3273
Nova Scotia, 3273
Prairie Provinces and Northwest, 3267
Prince Edward Island, 3273
Reserves, surrender of, 3274
Self-sustaining, 3268
Sioux, 3267
Six Nations—education, 3280
Ungava—distress amongst — reindeer herds to be established, 3276
Yukon, 3274
Industrial Disputes, 1900-15, 1971-5, 1981-5, 2190-2200, 2248
International boundary surveys, 3293
Irrigation Act Amdt., 3358, 3694-3702
Joint Industrial Councils, 4512
Labour Dept. salaries, 4506
Lake Winnipeg and Elk Island, 3287
Macallum, Professor, 3806
Mill, John Stuart, and protection, 2907
Mines Dept. 3801-15, 4513
Coal, 3810
Dominion and provinces, 3803
Explosives, 3804
Explosions, avoidance of, 3814
Investigation of deposits, leases, etc., 3808
Lignite, 3805
Oil, 331, 3808-10
Overlapping, 3802
Peat, 3806
Resignations, salaries, etc., 3801-3805
Resources, alienation of, 3810
Road and structural material, 3808
National defence, 4302-4
National Industrial Conference, 4512
National parks, 3283, 3771
Naturalization—franchise and, 770-1
Natural resources of Western Provinces, 3293
Naval Service, 4302-4, 4315
Additional appropriation, $1,700,000 4393-7

Meighen, Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Northern Canada's area, resources and administration, 3280-4
Northwest Game Act Amdt. 2892
Oil—Canada's position and resources, 331
Peace Conference Labour Bureau, 4507
Permanent Force, 3210-1
Provincial affairs and federal aid, 833
Reindeer—caribou, 3276, 3284
St. John River water-powers, 3290-3
Seed grain advances, 3286-8
Soldier Settlement, 1289, 1685-1702, 2127-50, 3218-24
Administration—criticism, 3223
Defaults, 3223
Fishermen, 3219
Irrigated lands, 3223
Loans, employment for districts, 3220
Ministerial explanation, 3192-4
Provincial free grants and, 3223
Repayments, 3218
Solicitors' fees, 3218
Staff, salaries, 3221-3
Training and allowances, 3224
Surveys, 3293
Tariff, personal position on—Mr. Crerar's criticism, 2900
Tar sands, 333
Technical Education, 1761
Yukon administration, 3281-2
British Columbia and, 3282
Yukon Placer Mining Act, 2892, 3106, 4264

Members of Parliament. *See also* House of Commons
Attendance of in House, 2782-6

Members' Indemnity. *See* **House of Commons**

Members' Stenographers, salaries of, ques. 2311

Menace, the, ques. 1899

Mennonites, emigration to United States, 2127, 2179, 2248

Mercantile Marine. *See* Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine; Canada Shipping Act

Metabetchouan postmaster, ques. 1120, 2876

Meteorological Service, 2125

Methylated Spirits for industrial power, 324, 3820-1

Mewburn, Hon. Sidney C. (East Hamilton)
Battlefields Committee, 2078
Resignation as Minister, 447

Michaud, Mr. Pius (Restigouche and Madawaska)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 214. Popular unrest—proposed general election, 215
American loans, ques. 313
Begin, Cardinal, insult to, 1574
Edmundston post office, ques. 2722
Franchise Bill
Oaths, administration of, 779
Proclamation, language of publication, 1328-32
Returning officers, 1591
Newspaper postage rates, 3349
Railway cars, 1114
Roy, Mr. Gustave, ques. 1898
St. John river—International Commission, ques. 1623
Special War Revenue—boots, 3565
Theriault and St. Quentin, N.B., 3080
Wheat exports and imports, ques. 313, ques. 590

Middlebro, Mr. W. S. (North Grey)
Food and Drugs Bill, 960
Franchise Bill
Contributions—Amdt. (Mr. McMaster) 1193-4
Polling divisions, 1517
Returning officers, 1580-1
Highways, payments to Ontario, 1046
House of Commons staff, 1038
Income tax—charities, 3246

Middlings. *See* Commercial Feeding Stuffs; Grain

Militarism. *See* Cadet

Military College, 3152

Military districts in Quebec, ques. 1035

Military Police, ques. 804; ques. 805

Military Service Act
Agricultural representatives, 3399
Collections by Mr. Cimon, ques. 1461; ques. 1462
Defaulters
Chicoutimi, ques. 409
Fines, ques. 507, ques. 543
Military Service branch, 4516

Military Training, 923. *See also* Militia; Cadet Service

Military Uniforms
Colleges, etc., for, ques. 413

Militia and Defence
Active militia—allowances, 3654
Amdt. (Mr. Mackenzie King) to reduce, 3657; neg. 3673
Air Service, 4553
Annual drill, 3674
Amdt. (Mr. Mackenzie King) to reduce, 3675; neg. 3679
Arsenals Dominion
Lindsay, 3717
Quebec—employees, ques. 1898
Associations, grants to, 3725
Cadet service, 3702
Contingencies, 3714
Customs dues, 3716
Demobilization, 4549
Department
Classification, ques. 3358, 4019
Headquarters officers who did not see service in France, ques. 506
London employees, ques. 671
Permanent appointments, ques. 2079
Printing and stationery, 4549
Engineer services and works, 3723
Headquarters staff, ques. 344, ques. 1511, 4548
Levis drill hall, ques. 1360
Military instructors for educational institutions, ques. 413
Military Service Branch, 4516
Ministerial statement, 3636
Military properties, maintenance, 3726
Ordnance, arms, lands, etc., 3727
Permanent Force, 4548
Barracks, 4579
Commissions to N.C.O.'s, ques. 3619
Flynn, Capt. Percy, ques. 2415
Quebec's ancient fortifications, 421
Rifle ranges—Connaught, ques. 671
Long Branch, 3728
Staff, 4548
Training areas, 4549
Transport and freight, 4549
Uniforms for colleges, ques. 413
Use of exhibition buildings by, ques. 2009
Warlike stores, 4549

Militia Pensions Act Amdt. Bill. Res. 1r., 3959; 2r., 4020; Com. 4020; 3r., 4021

Millers. *See* Commercial Feeding Stuffs; Grain

Miners' Disputes. *See under* Coal Operations

Mines and Minerals. *See also* Natural Resources; Yukon Placer
Asbestos, 4513
Coal. *See that title*
Com. appointed, 307

Mines and Minerals—*Con.*
Copper, 4513
Department, 3801. *See also* Geological Survey
Employees, resignation, ques. 672, 3802, 4512
Labour in, 370
Machinery, imported, ques. 1625
Oil, 331, 3281, 3808-10
Unused mineral deposits, 3810

Ministers of the Crown. *See also* Cabinet
Absence of, from Seat of Govt. 39
Attendance in Parliament, 51
Disqualification as candidate for House of Commons, 1086
Resignations of, 386, 447
Salaries, 3228, 4379

Minneapolis stockyards, 3166-7

Mint. *See also* Coinage; Ottawa Mint Act
The Royal, Ottawa Branch, 565

Missisquoi Bay, Net fishing, 3535-8

Molloy, Mr. J. P. (Provencher)
Elevators, ques. 1358
Franchise Bill
Polling divisions, 1518
Returning officers, 1595
Notices of motion, inquiry, 1628

Monroe Doctrine, 4294, 4310, 4404

"Montcalm," Icebreaker, 1060. *See also* Icebreakers

Montmagny, Colonization lots in, ques. 1229

Montreal
Corn Exchange, vessel rates, 1727
Harbour, wharves, ques. 674
Immigrants, landing at, 3226-8

Montreal and Hull Highway, 1113

Morden, Col., 1948

Morphy, Mr. Hugh B. (North Perth)
Active militia—allowances, 3659
British North America Act Amdt. 811
Canadians in Imperial service—Capt. Barron, 857
Cattle trade, 2373
Dairy industry, 2403-4
Difficulty in hearing debates, 463
Eight-hour day, 452-5
Franchise Bill
Chief Electoral officer—Mr. Biggar, K.C., 4267
Conveying voters, 1061

Morphy, Mr. Hugh B.—*Con.*
Franchise Bill—*Con.*
Counting and reporting vote, 1109
False statement made to affect election, 1066
Interpretation, "Candidate" 1943-4
Liquor on polling day, 1108-9
Peace and good order, 1106
Polls, hours to be open, 1924-5
Proclamation—language of publication, 1829-30, 2274, 2285, 2293-6, 2304-6
Provincial lists, 3898
Returning officers
Oath of, 1166
Public officials, 1797
Voters' lists, 2425-6
Franking privilege, 3764-7
Grand Trunk Railway
Strike of 1910, and pensions, 1128, 1133, 1537-9, 1566, 4509-11
Government annuities, 463
House of Commons staff, 4565
Industrial disputes, 2197
Intercolonial Railway, 1443
League of Nations
Armenia, 3979
Enforcement of decisions, 3976
Provinces of Canada, position of, 452
Secret treaties, 3973-4
Second meeting, 3978
United States, 3981-2
Lignite, 3805
Militia—Dominion arsenals, 3718-9
National defence, 4302-3
Newspaper postage, 3753
Oil—leases, etc., 3809
Peat, 3807
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, provincial authorities and, 3196
Rulings and statements as Chairman
Chair to be addressed, 4481
Decorum, 4481
Judiciary, reference to, 4483
Shipbuilding advances Bill, 4149, 4163
Soldier Settlement, 1688, 2153
Steel ammunition charges, 3718-9
Trust and Loan Company of Canada, 586

Morrison's Limited, ques. 997

Motions, Inquiries concerning, 1628

Motor Cars. *See* Automobiles

Mounted Police. *See* Royal Canadian

Moving Pictures
Canada film service, 1882
Canadian National Pictorial, 4544
Tax on, removal of, 2487, ques. 3489

Mowat, Mr. Herbert M. (Parkdale)
Active militia—allowances, 3658-9
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 56. Proposed general election —by-election in Assiniboia, 56; Hon. Mr. Blondin—French Canadian Cabinet representation, 57; Liberal party and war policy, 58; Union party and Liberal members—conscription and party, 59
Budget, 2576. Congratulations to Finance Minister—tariff, 2576; agricultural implement prices—tariff and manufacturing concerns from United States, 2577; Mr. Fielding and tariff, 2578; militia expenditure and military preparedness, 2579; Imperialism, 2580
Canada Security Assurance Company, 1103
Canadian Expeditionary Force, ques. 1200
Civil Service retirement, 4067, 4464
Divorce Bills, remission of charges, 4413
Franchise Bill
Ballot—black border, 1168
Compulsory voting, 1064
Contributions — Assiniboia expenses, 1174-8
Election officers, 3868
Non-residents and non-electors, 785
Judges' salaries and pensions, 4426
Naval service, 3510
Badges, 441
Oleomargarine, 1873-4
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 4152
Special War Revenue
Food, explanation desired, 3632-3
T. Eaton Life Assurance Company, 669
Toronto military property, 3728, 3730
Universal military training, M. in favour of, 923

Municipal Employees, Industrial Disputes Investigation Act and, 1902

Munitions Resources Commission, 2892

Murdock, Mr. *See* Board of Commerce

Murphy, Hon. Charles (Russell)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 231. Reply to Mr. Rowell—Religious orders from France, 231; secretarial fund, 238; Mr. Rowell's income tax, 240; expenditures on conferences, publicity, etc., 241; Department of Health—Mounted Police, 242; Mr. Rowell and his colleagues, 245; Peace Treaty and League of Nations—eight-hour day, 246; circular of Orange order, 249; proposed general election, 254

Murphy, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
Board of Commerce, Robson, Judge, resignation of, 11, 114
Budget, inquiry as to, 1047
Dominion Lands Act (United States Soldiers) 1234
Franchise Bill
Advance polls, 1999
Interpretation, 1986-8, 1987, 1988
Pass on railway, 1065
Telegraph, communications by, 1069
Grand Trunk Railway, 1242-3, 1250
Greek wheat contract, ques. 509
National debt, ques. 309
Naval defence policy, ques. 309
Newsprint Supply, 2893
Parliament Building, ques. 311; ques. 311
Cost, etc., 311
Parliamentary Com., ques. 311
P. Lyall Company, 3156
Point of order—comment on document quoted, 234-6
Prime Minister, illness and absence of, 9
Shipbuilding—contracts and prices, 901-2
Vatican Mission, ques. 310

Murray Bay-Tadoussac Service, 652

Mutual Insurance Companies, taxation of, ques. 2012, 2080

Myers, Mr. E. T. W. (Kindersley)
Canada Grain Act, 3823
Flax fibre grants, ques. 806
Wheat trade, 3823-4

National Battlefields Commission, 421

National Council of Women, oleomargarine and, 1841

National Debt, ques. 309. *See also* Finance
Loans in the United States, ques. 313

National Defence, 4302

National Industrial Conference, 4512

National Parks, 3769

National Transcontinental Railway. *See* Canadian National

Natural Resources.
M. (Mr. Manion) in favour of development, 1017
Prairie provinces, of, ques. 995, 1047, ques. 1461, 3049, 3293
Royal Commission on, ques. 4502

Naturalization, 817. *See also* Aliens; Dominion Franchise, aliens, qualification of electors
Imperial citizenship, and, ques. 996
Papers, fraudulent, ques 4096

Naturalization Act, 1914, Amdt. Bill. 1r., 3682; 2r., com., 3914; 3r., 3922; Senate amdts. 4416

Naval Defence, ques. 309. *See also* Naval Service
Admiral Jellicoe's report, 308
Statement by Minister of the Naval Service, 3498

Naval Service
Additional appropriation, $1,700,000, 4380
Badges, 437, ques. 506
Canadian officers, 4299
Civil Service Insurance and, 1779
Coast defence of Canada, United States and, 4294, 4298
Construction, programme of nations, 4301
Correspondence with Imperial Government, 4408, 4413, 4503
Demobilization, 4299
Estimates, how considered, 4380, 4411
Halifax and Esquimalt depots, 4296-7, 4307, 4390, 4394
Naval college, graduates, 4562
Naval conference of 1921, 4300
"Niobe" and "Rainbow," 4292-3. *See also that title*
Salaries of Dept., 4409
Ship construction, material, ques. 1114
Statement by Minister, 707

Navigation, aid and protection of, 2115
Schools of, 1612
St. Lawrence River—Ile d'Orleans, 3295

Navigation Rates. *See* Railway Act Amdt.

Navy, ques. 540. *See also debates under* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Naval Service
Jellicoe, Admiral, 11. *See also that title*
Ships from Great Britain, 4413

Navy League of Canada, ques. 802

Nesbitt, Mr. E. W. (North Oxford)
Chairman, Committee of the Whole, Rulings as, 1326
Unanimous consent for statement in Supply, 2379
Civil Service retirement, 3833
Colonial Investment and Loan, 3859
Commercial Feeding Stuffs, 3403
Demonstration farms, 2396

Nesbitt, Mr. E. W.—*Con.*
Eight-hour day, 376
Food and Drugs Bill, 958, 963, 1257-8
Franchise Bill, 1066
Fuel, transportation cost, 330
House of Commons staff, 4565-6
Income tax
Beneficiaries, 3243
Charities, 3247, 3312
Deficits and losses, 3240-1
Five per cent added, 3251-2
Indemnity of members, 3242
Returns, 3253-4
Stock dividends, 3239-40
Judges' salaries, 3851
Natural resources, oil leases, 3810-3
Naval service badges, 445-6
Newspaper postage rates, 3348
Pensions, 433
Widowed mother resident outside Canada, 4045
Returned soldiers, 528
Insurance, 4054-5
Report of Committee, 1082
Rural mail carriers, 4522
Senate staff, 4060
Soldier settlement, 2129-30, 2138-43
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill
Automobiles, 3599
Collection, method of, 3344-5
Prices, effect on, 3330
Steel and shipping merger, 1952-3
Western Assurance Company, 3860

Neuville Station, ques. 2721

Newfoundland
Cape Race light, 2117
Trade with, 4241, 4242, 4276-7

New Parliament Buildings. *See* Parliament Buildings

New York—Canadian publicity branch at, 1882

Newspaper Postage. *See* Post Office Act Amdt.

Newspapers. *See also* Newsprint; Post Office Act Amdt.; Press
Payments to for printing, ques. 1114
Propaganda, and, 4375

Newsprint
Control, ques. 588, ques. 2720
Controller, resignation of, ques. 315, ques. 589
Embargo, ques. 994
Exportation and embargo, 1358, ques. 1114

Newsprint—*Con.*
Legislation, inquiry as to, 3227
Statement of Finance Minister, 2967
Supply, 2893

News Service, ques. 414, 4532

Nichols, Mr. M. E., ques. 1118

Nicholson, Mr. George B. (East Algoma)
Board of Commerce, Murdock, Mr., letter of, 4483
Budget, 2796. Liberals and free trade, 2796; congratulations to Minister of Finance—luxury tax—Mr. Fielding's amendment, 2797; contradictory tariff policies of members of Opposition, 2798; forty years' tariff policy of Government side, 2799; articles that would be duty-free under proposed King-Crerar government, 2801; personal position on fiscal questions, 2802; tariff and cost of living, 2803; Hon. E. C. Drury and others on cost of food production—development of natural resources, 2804; British fiscal policy—Mr. Crerar criticised, 2805; Timiskaming by-election and One Big Union, 2807; class prejudice and Bolshevism, 2808
Franchise Bill
Advance and proxy voting, 1163
Aliens—certificate, 2075, 2094
Deposit, 1094
Grand Trunk strike of 1910, and pensions, 1132
Income tax, 3476
Aliens in Canada, 3250-1
Errors in returns, 3302
Five per cent added, 3252
"Householders," 3249, 3315
Indemnity of members, 4093
Indians—Gordon's Reserve school, 3271
Industrial disputes, 1976-80, 2193-8
Military training, 3711
Militia, Cadet service, 3711
Newspaper postage, 3758
Opium and Drug Bill, 1755
Race track betting, 3429
Returned soldiers, 534
Pensions, 535
Widowed mother, 4042, 4052
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill
Boats, canoes, etc., 3590-1
Changes—when to come into effect, 3608
Collection, method of, 3474
Machinery for collection, 3324

Nile Voyageurs, 3857

"Niobe" and "Rainbow," 4293, 4297, 4401. *See also* Ballantyne, Hon. Mr., Naval Affairs

North Bay, 3160
Canadian Northern right-of-way and, ques. 3619

North Lake, 3159

North Sydney Harbour, 875, 2186, 3493-4

Northwest Game Act Amdt. 1r., 2892; 2r., com., 3r., 3105-6

Northwest Mounted Police. *See* Royal Canadian

Northwest Territories, administration of, 3280

Notices of Motion, inquiry as to, 2012

Notices, publication of in Canada Gazette, ques. 2179

Nova Scotia Steel Company. *See* Pictou Harbour

Noxious Weeds, 3171. *See also* Commercial Feeding Stuffs

Oaths of Office Bill, 1

Oats, 565. *See* Canada Grain Act

O'Connor, Mr. W. F., K.C., ques. 3618. *See also* Board of Commerce

Oil
Canada's resources, 331. *See also* Mines

Old Age. *See* Government annuities

Oleomargarine, ques. 543, 1010, ques. 1117
Butter, and, food values, ques. 2720
Imports, 597, 604, 606, 612
Regulations, ques. 1627

Oleomargarine Act Amendment Bill. Res. 1405, 1781, 1840; 1r., 1877; 2r., 1968; com., 1968; 3r., 1971

Oliver-St. Paul de Métis Railway, 344, 871

O'Meara, Mr., 792-3, 4038

One Big Union, ques. 409, 2807, 2897, 3039

Ontario
Highways—contribution to, 1046
Immigration, and, 1012

Opium, 24, 141
Convention (International). *See* debate on Opium and Drug Bill

Opium and Drug Bill. Res. 557; 1r., 562; 2r., 1621, 1629; com. 1632, 1744; 3r., 1900; Senate amdts., 3081

Orange order, 249, 285

Oranges and Figs grown in the open in British Columbia, 1016

Orders in Council. *See also* War Measures; Coal operations
Employment offices, 3087
Legislation and Government by, 31, 38, 177, 2018, 2020-1

Orientals
Canada, in, 825
Vote, and, *See* Dominion Franchise

Orleans, Island of, public works, ques. 810

Ostend, Allies Conference at, 2476, 2574

Ottawa
Agreement with Corporation, 557. *See also* Ottawa Agreement Bill
Connaught Rifle Range, 3728
Daly building, rental of, ques. 1200
Mackenzie Avenue, ques. 999
Public buildings, 3154
New, ques. 1002
Wellington street—public building, ques. 1002

Ottawa Agreement Bill. Res. 576, 557, 1r., 581; 2r., com., 988; 3r., 1047

Ottawa Improvement Commission. *See debates under* Ottawa Agreement

Ottawa Mint Act Amdt. Bill. Res. 615; 1r., 616; 2., com., 3r., 798

Otter, Sir William Dillon, ques. 673

Overdrafts, bank. *See* Special War Revenue

Oxford County, Ont., products, 1010

Pacaud, Mr. L. T. (Megantic)
Budget, 3020. The public burdens, 3020; tariff for revenue—programme of the Farmers' party, 3021; cost of living and development of natural resources—line of demarcation between the parties, 3022
Rural mail—Mr. Joseph Houle, ques. 2313

Palmer, Mr. K. H., ques. 1001

Paper, Manufacture of. *See debates on* Scientific Research
Newsprint. *See that title*

Papineau, Mr. Louis J. (Beauharnois)
Board of Commerce, M. 3863
Canadian Northern, total liability, ques. 2011

Pardee, Mr. Frederick F. (West Lambton)
Budget, 2740. Mr. Meighen and the new party—tariff revision, 2740; the consumer and taxes—the new taxes, 2741; address in Montreal, 2742; textile industries and protection, 2743; effect of new taxes upon population, 2744
Canadian Mercantile Marine, insurance, ques. 1511
Canadian National Railways
Deficit, 888-9
Fire insurance, ques. 1623
Withholding of information, 1663
Experimental and demonstration farms, 2382-4, 2388
Franchise Bill, 731
Advance polls, 1999-2001
Aliens certificate, 2063-70, 2225-6, 2230-2, 2238-9
Amdt. moved, 2226; neg. 2242
Election expenses, 1153
False statements made to affect election, 1065
Indians, 2056-7
Name not on list—oaths, 3878
Personation, etc., 1159
Plugging, 2350
Polling stations, additional, 1826
Provincial lists, 2350, 3883, 3889-93
Voters' lists, addition and elimination of names, 3911-2
Writ, nomination, election, delay, 1092
Grand Trunk Railway, strike of 1910, and pensions, 1553-6
Naturalization, 3916
Pensions and Re-establishment, 3938
Purchasing Commission, 1474
Roumanian orders, insurance, ques. 1739
Soldier settlement, 1684, 3192-3

Parent, Mr. George (Quebec West)
Barracks, 3725
Board of Commerce, ques. 408
Business profits tax, public utilities, 3230
By-election lists, ques. 310
Canadian National Railways, 3377
Census of 1911, ques., 2009
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill—M. for 3r., 3423
Food and Drugs Bill, 972-6
Franchise Bill
False statement to affect election, 1067
Payment of voters' expenses, 1065
Undue influence — "spiritual injury," 1158

Parent, Mr. George—*Con.*
Fuel situation, 331
Grand Trunk Railway — administration, 4173
Immigrants landing at Montreal and Quebec, 3226-8
Income tax, stocks below par, 3238
International boundary surveys, 3293
League of Nations, French occupation of German territory, 1046
Magdalen Islands, 649
Mail delivery—Monday holidays, 3354, 4522
Naturalization—certificate, 3917-8
Neuville station, ques. 2721
Peace, declaration of, ques. 801
Peace Treaties, 1059
Pilots, pensions, 4579-80
Public debt and revenue, ques. 592, 753
Quebec riots of 1918, 1202
Correspondence from sufferers, 1203-8
Shipbuilding, 649, 668
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 4165-8
Special War Revenue Act Amdt.
Automobiles, 3598
Beer used to make vinegar, 3604
Furniture, 3575
Jewellery, 3580
Skis, 3570-1
Water-powers, surveys, etc., 3289-92

Pari-Mutuel machines, 3415

Parliament, Sessions of
Extra session, 1919, cost of, ques. 543
Time of, 756

Parliament Buildings, 12, 76, 96, 106, 143, 221, 282, ques. 705
Commons chamber floor, ques. 2894
Cost, contractors, architects, ques. 311
Door contract, ques. 320
Fittings and Furniture, 1433, 3155
Gargoyles, 1433, 1493
Heating, plant, ques. 2896
King, the, message from, 1
Material supplied, ques. 311, ques. 705
Post Office, ques. 3294
Scaffolding, ques. 3079
Speeches on the occasion of their occupation, 2
Tower, alleged masonic records in, ques. 2894
Vote for in Supply, 1416

Parliamentary Counsel, 4587. *See also,* Dominion Franchise Bill

Parliamentary Library, 211, 1426
Librarian, 114. *See also* DeCelles, Mr.

Parliamentary Procedure. *See also* Deputy Speaker; Speaker; Douglas, Mr. J. M.; Morphy, Mr.; Nesbitt, Mr.; Steele, Mr.
Bill disposed of—question not to be raised during same session, 3426
Unanimous consent refused, 3423, 3821
3r., Industrial Disputes Bill, 2200

Parliamentary Restaurant, 47, 3094
Joint Committee, 437
Official list for, 2842-3

Parliamentary Secretaries, ques. 1036

Patent Medicines *See* Proprietary

Patent Record, 1886

Patents of Invention Bill 1r, 505

P. Burns Company, 582

Peace. *See also* League of Nations; Peace Conference; Peace Treaty
Declaration of, ques 801
Time and proclamation of, 231

Peace Conference
Economic Condition of the world, declaration on, 1888
Eight-hour day and, 335
Labour bureau, 4506-7

Peace Treaty, 12, 16, 96, 124
A potential cause of war, 927
Bulgaria, with, ques. 316, 463. *See also* Peace Treaty Bill
Res. and ministerial statement, 346
Senate concurrence, 1054
France—protection against Germany, 1059
Hungary and Turkey, 3983, 1060
Translation of, 3084

Peace Treaty Bill (Bulgaria) 1r., 949; 2r., com., 1057; 3r., 1061

Peat, 3806
Alfred plant, ques. 671

Peck, Lieut.-Col. Cyrus W., V.C., (Skeena)
Artillery, Canadian, in war, 3662
Empire Day adjournment, 2574
Fisheries, ques. 505
British Columbia salmon—trap fishing—parcelling out of fisheries—cannery licenses—hatcheries—Chief Inspector—monopoly opposed, 3525-33
Development, 854
Japanese and, 844-5, 3532
Fisheries
Naval Service and, 3532
Salmon hatcheries, 849-50, 3525

Peck, Lieut.-Col. Cyrus W., V.C.—*Con.*
Indians, British Columbia, 792-5, 3273
Agents, salaries, 3273
Enfranchisement, 4038-40
Militia—Active militia, allowances, 3662-8
Pensions, 434
Com. report—on m. to adopt, 3932
Amdt. 3933, 3952; withdrawn, 3956
M. for Special Com., 513
Resignation from Com., 2081
Returned men and fishing industry, 3932, 3938-40, 3956
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 390
Saar Valley Commission, 344
Senate, cost of, ques. 1118
Surveys, 3293
Uniforms, unlawful wearing of, 3417
Water-powers of British Columbia, ques. 1118
Winnipeg Grain Exchange, ques. 2005

Pecuniary Claims Convention, 3857

Pedlow, Mr. Isaac E. (South Renfrew)
Agriculture, problems and progress of, 2391-5
Armenians, 855
Audibility of debates, 461
Board of Commerce, 4494
Correspondence, 3426
O'Connor, Mr., reported resignation of, 1684
Civil servants with war record, 3129-30
Civil Service
Re-organization, 3741
Retirement, 4462-6
Demonstration farms, 2391
Food and Drugs Bill, 964-71, 1258-62
Prosecutions, 1263-4
Franchise Bill
Advance voting, and voting by mail, 1163-5
Contributions, 1196
Election officers, 1077
Telegraph, communications by, 1068-9
Income tax
Accounting period, 3306-8
Indemnity of members, 3243, 3306
Suggestions, 3124, 3128
Ireland, condition of, 856
Maple products, 1256
Mennonites, 2127, 2179
Mines Dept., resignations, 3804
Opium and Drug Bill, 1638-9, 1748, 1751-2
Pictou harbour, 2186
Postage stamps, used for inland revenue, 3737
Quorum, 964
Renfrew post office, 3151

Pedlow, Mr. Isaac E.—*Con.*
Slidemaster, retirement of, 4462
Soldier settlement, 2131
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill, 3326
Candy, etc., 3592
Clocks and watches, 3574
Clothes, 3563-4
Collection, method of, 3470
Commodity tax, 3319, 3330
Importations, 3795
Jewellery, 3581
Lace, manufacture of, 3791-2
Licenses, 3606-7
Manufacturer who is also retailer, 3468
Overcoats, 3586
Prices, 3340
Purses, shopping bags, 3568
Pyjamas, 3567
Retail Merchants' Association, 3342
Returned soldier, amdt. (Mr. Lemieux) 3452
Sales taxes, 3612
Silk, 3563
Silk clothing, 3790
Silk waists, 3631-2
Socks, etc., 3567, 3791
Sporting goods, 3570
Stamp taxes, 3800-1
Stock transfers, 3626
Taxes, how paid, 3587-8
United States taxes, 3472

Pelletier, Mr. F. J. (Matane)
Cole, Mr. W. B., ques. 2893
Illustration farms, 2382-4, 2388
Industrial disputes, 1983
Masters and mates, 986
Oil, 3811-2
Sparrow, Dr. C. J., ques. 1897

Penitentiary Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 2842; 2r., 3409; Com., 3409; 3r., 3410

Penitentiaries. *See also* Justice; Labrie Brothers
Alberta, ques. 2777, 3855
Appointments pending, 568
Manitoba, ques. 2574
Portsmouth, vacancies in chief positions, 568
Purchasing agent, 3840, 3854
Saskatchewan, ques. 2574
Stoneham, case, 568

Pensions, ques. 993, ques. 994. *See also* Pensions and Re-establishment; Pensions Act
Board of Commissioners, 614
Employees, ques. 2895
Soldier organizations and, ques. 1116
Margeson, Mr. J. W., ques. 1036

Pensions—*Con.*
District offices, closing of, 710, 857
St. John, N.B., 1742
Militia. *See* Militia Pensions Act
Royal Canadian Mounted Police. *See that title*
Taxation of, 1895
Widow and children, ques. 920
Widowed mothers, res. (Mr. Power) 427. *See also* Pensions Act

Pensions and Re-establishment—Special Com.
Appointment of Com., resolutions in favour
Andrews, Mr., 511
Rowell, Mr., 614; agreed to, Com. appointed, 615, 799
Reports, 1199, 3801
Adoption of final report
Res., (Mr. Cronyn) in favour, 3922, agreed to, 3957
Amdt. (Mr. Peck) subsidies to fishermen, 3932-3; withdrawn, 3956
Printing, 3822, 4321
Recommendations not embodied in Bill, how to be carried into effect; inquiry answered by Prime Minister, 4504
Resignations
Lang, Mr., (reported) 1085
Peck, Mr., 2081

Pensions Act Amdt. Bill. Res. 3864; 3959; 1r., 3961; 2r., Com., 4041; 3r., 4053
Additional pension, 4048
Drafting, 4041
Pensioner resident outside Canada, 4044-52
Widowed mother, 4041-50

Permanent Force. *See* Militia

Peterborough
Government Employees, ques. 542
Postmaster, ques., 342

Petroleum and Naphtha Inspection Amdt. Bill. Res. 1573, 1762; 1r., 1762; 2r., com., 3r., 1916

Phosphorus, 356

Picard, Mr. Elzear, ques. 993

Pictou, East River lock, ques. 1119

Pictou Harbour Bill. Res. 1945, 2184; 1r., 2190; 2r., 3491; com., 3491; 3r., 3494

Pigs, Feeding of. *See* Commercial Feeding Stuffs

Pilotage, 1839, 2119, 4579. *See also* Canada Shipping Act
St. John, 2119

Placer Mining. *See* Yukon

Police. *See* Royal Canadian

Political Campaign Funds, 1063-4. *See also* Dominion Franchise; Assiniboia
M. (Mr. Burnham) prohibiting, 1216

Pollution of boundary waters, 3552

Ponton, Mr. G., ques. 341

Popular Unrest, 22, 63, 816, 1145

Population
Agricultural and industrial, 191, ques. 1002
And taxation, 3297

Port Arthur
Board of Trade—vessel rates, resolution, 1733
Canadian National Railway terminals, ques. 2012
Fort William, and, elevators, ques. 1358

Port Hood, 3159

Port Maitland, 4579

Portage la Prairie public building, 3156

Portal Immigration hall, ques. 674

Porter, Mr. Arthur S., dismissal of, 568

Ports, tax on ships arriving in, 2253

Postal Inspection—Bagot Co., ques., 2721

Postmaster General—Senate, member of, 3734. *See also* Blondin, Hon. Mr.

Post Office. *See also* Civil Service; Mail Carriers;
For individual post offices see their titles
Bilingual stamps, ques. 314
Department
Estimates, supplementary, 4518
Letter carriers, 1231, 1276
Classification, 345, 1231, 3424
Salaries and threatened strike, 2670, 3424, 3623-4
Toronto, 345
Magazines, postage rate on, ques. 1898
Money parcel ($50,000) lost, ques. 412
Offices in cities, province of Quebec, ques. 413
Parcel post—Dr. Michel Fiset, 2015
Parliament, hours of, ques. 3294
Rural mail carriers, ques. 414, ques. 506, ques. 591, 1233, 1282-3, 4522. *See also* Rural Mail

Post Office Act Amdt. Bill. Res. 2184; 3346; 1r., 3358; 2r., com., 3732; 3r., 3768. Senate amdts. 4263
Free matter, 3761
Newspapers and periodicals, 3745
Registration fee, 3732

Post Office and Customs Depts.
Rumoured investigation by United States firm, 3491, 3623

Potatoes.
Bags, 4562
Exportation of, ques. 1360

Poultry, Feeding of. *See* Commercial Feeding Stuffs

Power, Mr. Charles G. (South Quebec)
Board of Commerce, M. for abolition, 1146, 1150
Canadian Alpine Club, 3288
Canadian Currency on United States lines of Canadian National Railways, ques. 341
Canadian Forestry Association, 3285
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 644-5
"Canadian Recruit," wreck of, 648
"Canadian Sealer," Magdalen Islands trip, 649
Steamers. *See also, under this title,* Icebreakers
Crews, uniforms, ques. 1003
"Lady Grey" ques. 1361
Canadian National Railways, cargo for ships, 915
Champlain market, 2015
Court martial procedure, ques. 1359
Federal Bureau of Education, 1388
Firearms licenses, 3411-2
Franchise Bill, 777
Aliens—certificate, 2239
Bribery, treating, undue influence, personation, 1157-9
Canada Temperance Act, 2053-4
Disqualification, returned soldiers exempted from, 1811, 1820-4
"Elector," how defined, 1916-8
Executory contracts void, 781
Interpretation, 1991
"Candidate," 1944
Judges, revising officers, 722
Language of voter, 1997
Non-residents and non-electors, 786
Notices—handbills, 1169
Polling stations, additional, 1826-7
Polls, hours to be open, 1923-4
Returning officers, 1583-4, 1596

Power, Mr. Charles G.—*Con.*
Franchise Bill—*Con.*
Voters' lists, use of for advertising, 2319-20
French speeches in House, translation of, 702
Grain trade, 661
Grosse Isle, ques. 1003
Gulf of St. Lawrence Trading Company, 4285
Icebreakers, 1602-5. *See also, under this title,* Steamers
"Montcalm," 1606-7
Uniforms of men on, 1603-4
Indemnity of members, 1281, 4087
Indians—Sioux, 3267
Magdalen Islands-Belle Isle, 1605
Militia Department
Classification of employees, ques. 3358
Permanent appointments, ques. 2079
Newsprint, 3227
Peace treaties—Anatolia and Smyrna, 3984
Pensions and Re-establishment, 3946
Drafting of Bill, 4041
Offices, rumoured closing of, 710
Taxation of pensions, 1895
Widowed mother, 427, 436, 4041, 4051
Amdt. ruled out of order, 4052
Profiteering, etc., 1146
Quebec
Ancient fortifications, 421, 427
Arsenal employees, ques. 1898
Bridge, ques. 1116, ques. 1229
Marine storehouse, ques. 316
Port, grain trade, 858
Riots of 1918, 1210
Returned soldiers, res. (Mr. Andrews) for Special Com., 523
Shipbuilding, 661, 915
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, ques. 2311
Soldier Settlement, 2141-7, 2151, 3222-3
Vocational training and, 3223
Spirit Lake, 2398-9
Stewart farm, 3223

Prairie Provinces
Natural Resources, ques. 995, 1047, ques. 1461, 3049, 3292

Press, The, 4532. *See also* Newsprint; Post Office; Censorship
Murray, Mr. G. M. and the, 2753

Press Conference. *See* Imperial

Press Gallery Reporters, 3747, 3750, 4411, 4503

Prevost, Mr. Jules E. (Terrebonne)
Automobiles, smuggled, ques. 807, ques. 1001

Prevost, Mr. Jules E.—*Con.*
Board of Commerce, ques. 996
Budget, 2771. Government and commissions, 2771; profits and cost of living—Board of Commerce, 2772; increases in expenditure—Liberal party and tariff revision, 2773; manufacturing industries Union Government, 2774; govts. made for the people, 2775
Civil Service Classification, ques. 2413
Customs war tax, ques. 1001
Dominion revenues, ques. 1001

Price Brothers. *See* Board of Commerce; Newsprint

Prime Minister, absence, illness, return, 137. *See also* Borden, Sir Robert
Denial by Leader of Opposition of statement attributed to him, 80
Effect of absence on parliamentary government, 129
Head of Department, 4456
Illness, 63, 158
Portfolio, and, 4456
Return, inquiry concerning, 2126
Enters the House, 2316

Prime Ministers of Great Britain and Canada, correspondence, 3685

Pringle, Mr. R. A., resignation as Newsprint Controller, ques. 315, ques. 589. *See also* Newsprint

Printing
Dept. of Public, reorganization, 2968
Southam Press, ques. 4096

Printing Bureau, 84, ques. 320, 3742. *See also* Civil Service
Alleged Sunday work at, 4020
Commission of newspaper men and, ques. 1114
Dismissals, ques. 672
Wolff, Mr.—ques. 2005
Employees
Nationality of, ques. 2005
Retirement of, 545
Linotypes, ques. 670

Printing, Joint Committee, 2625
French-speaking member of Editorial Board necessary, 4503
Reports, 4257, 4321, 4504

Printing Plants, departmental, ques. 1738

Prisoners
Paroled, ques. 2005
Political, general amnesty to, 1790

Private Bills
Committee, 305, 2311
Discussed
Canada Security Assurance Company, 1103
Colonial Investment and Loan Company, 3859
Northwest Route, Limited, 3861
Scottish Canadian Assurance Corporation, 583
T. Eaton Life Insurance Company, 669
Trust and Loan Company of Canada, 585
Western Assurance Company, 3860

Privileges and Elections, Com., 305

Privy Council
Board of Commerce and, 3685
Jurisdiction of, 2389. *See* Supreme Court Act Amdt.

Profiteering, by farmers, alleged, 3401

Prohibition, 44, 71, 102
As a principle, 1218, 1225, 1228
Canada Temperance Act, ques. 807
Taxes on liquors. *See* Inland Revenue; Special War Revenue

Promissory Notes, tax on. *See* Special War Revenue

Proportional Representation, 15, ques. 803

Proprietary Medicines. *See also* Food and Drugs; Opium and Drug; Special War Revenue
Taxes on, ques. 1036, 2487, 3542

Prorogation, 4589

Proulx, Mr. Edmond (Prescott)
Arrest or summoning of person outside province, 3417-8
Civil Service classification, 547
Desjardins, Mr. Alphonse, 3093
Eight-hour day, 337
Food and Drugs Bill, 1266-8
Franchise Bill
Assistant Chief Electoral Officer, 1514
Chief Electoral Officer, 1512
Contributions, 781
Disqualification of candidates, 1088
Election expenses, 1154
Five-year term for Parliament, 1091
Ontario lists, 3882
Polls—fourteenth day, etc, 1101
Proclamations, 1082
Language of publication, 1080, 1829, 2267
Stamp to be made, 1078
House of Commons staff, 1038

Proulx, Mr. Edmond—*Con.*
Income tax, 3122-7
Indemnity of members, 3096, 3853-4, 4448
M. to strike out clauses, 4459
Judges' salaries, 3852-4, 4337, 4421
M. for six months' hoist of Bill, 4417
Maple products, 1254
Parliament Buildings, 1418-21- 1434
Parliamentary restaurant, 3096
Race track betting, 3430-2
Rural mail, 1283, 4524-5
Salaries of Ministers, 4430
Soldier settlement, 2129-35
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill, 3577
Dresses, 3586-7
Excise and sales taxes, 3453
Musical instruments, 3629
Silk waists, 3632

Provincial Salaries and Indemnities, Taxation of, ques. 3490

Public Accounts Committee, 306-7, 1838, 4321

Public Debt, ques. 592, 753. *See also* Finance

Public Information Dept., ques. 1000, ques. 1740, 2639, 2999
Nichols, Mr. M. E., ques., 1118

Public Ownership, 93, 204. *See also debates under* Canadian National Railways; Grand Trunk
Business profits tax. *See that title*
Electricity, 3113-7
Railways, of, 100

Public Works, 1417. *For individual works see their titles*
Agreement with Ottawa city, 557
Architectural and Engineering Branch, ques. 587
Canals. *See that title*
Department, 1416
Minister, 557
Tache, Mr. C. E., superannuation, ques. 3490

Pulp and Paper. *See also* Customs Act; Newsprint
Pulpwood, 148, 2552

Purchasing Commission, 44, 257, ques. 591, 3718, 3854-5, 4580
Res. to establish Purchasing Board, 1231, 1467

Pure Foods Bill, 3396

Putman, Mr., and Civil Service Commission, ques. 2414

Quarantine, 3554
Grosse Isle, ques. 1003
Sydney, 3148

Quebec (City)
Arsenal, employees, ques. 1898, ques. 3862
Board of Trade and Retail Merchants' Association—proposed taxes, 3457-8
Vessel rates, 1734
Champlain market, 2015
Fortifications, ancient, 421
Mail deliveries, ques. 591
Marine storehouse, ques. 316
Riots of 1918, M. (Mr. Parent) for papers, 1202

Quebec (Port) 650, 654-5, 661
Government Ships, cargoes for, 915
Grain shipments, 858
Harbour Commission, steam dredge, ques. 999
Immigrants landing at, 3226-8

Quebec (Province)
Canadian Northern lands in, ques. 2008
"Hour" of, 61, 67, 90, 143, 206
Military districts in, ques. 1035
People stay on the land, 94
Post offices in cities, ques. 413
Resources—timber, water-powers, 693
Tolerance, 90
Union government and, 83

Quebec and Saguenay Railway, ques. 506, ques. 1120; ques. 3619
Construction and operation, ques. 672
Freight rates, ques. 589
St. Irénée, 3423

Quebec and Western Railway, ques. 411; ques. 412

Quebec Bridge, ques. 1116; ques. 1229

Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Railway, ques. 673, 4585

Quebec, Oriental and Atlantic Railway, ques. 411; ques. 412; ques. 507

Questions and Answers. *See also* House of Commons
Inquiry as to, 949, 2126
Oral answers to, 1623
Not answered, 753, 949
Canadian Government Merchant Marine—information withheld, 1649
Portion deleted, 1045

Questions Passed as Orders for Returns, 320, 344, 415, 510, 543, 591, 707, 811, 1004, 1037, 1121, 1201, 1231, 1362, 1464, 1511, 1628, 1741, 1788, 1899, 2012, 2080, 2183, 2313, 2417, 2519,, 4096
Status of, 1743

Race Track Betting. *See* Criminal Code
Legislation—Statement of Rev. Dr. Speer, 3490, 3557

Radial Railways—Ontario and Hydro-electric, 4172

Railway Act Amendment Bills.
1. Fuel Supply. Res. 4324; 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 4331. Senate amdts. 4506
2. Inland and Coastwise Shipping. 1r., 160; 2r., 1707; debate adjourned, 1738
3. Provincial Jurisdiction. 1r., 2412; 2r., 3086; com., 3634; 3r., 3636

Railway Commission.
Business done from date of establishment, statement of, 1707
Fort William elevators, 565
Vessels and, 160, ques., 2414, ques., 2777

Railways. *See also* Canadian Railway War Board. *For individual railways see their titles.*
Cars, shortage, ques. 319, 1312
Canadian cars in United States, 880, ques. 997, 1114
Official, use of by Ministers, ques. 409
Transcontinental, ques. 999
Rates, 200, ques. 1036
Parliament and, 4188
Reports of, inquiry concerning, 1290
United States, freight from for Canada prepaid, 1789, 1893

Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, 880, 2378
Com. appointed, 305

"Rainbow." *See* Ballantyne, Hon. Mr.; Naval Defence; "Niobe"

Rape, attempted, 2841

Recall, the, 1180, 2023. *See also* Dominion Franchise Bill
Amdt. (Mr. Tweedie) 2025; neg. 2052
Dominion Council of Agriculture, platform on, 2052

Re-cleaned Screenings, ques. 507, 1009. *See also* Commercial Feeding Stuffs; Elevators

Reconstruction, 24. *See also* Demobilization; Pensions; Soldiers Civil Re-establishment; Soldier Settlement

Redman, Mr. Daniel Lee (East Calgary)
Badges for returned men, 443
Eight-hour day, 381
Natural Resources development, 1026
Pensions—widowed mothers, 429
Recall, the, 2026

Re-establishment. *See also* Demobilization Pension; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment; Soldier Settlement
Federal emergency fund, ques. 998
Special Com.; Res. (Mr. Rowell) moved, 614; agreed to, 615

Registration Fee. *See* Post Office Act

Registration of Shipping, 1614, 2108

Reid, Hon. John D. (Minister of Railways and Canals and acting Minister of Public Works)
Banff National park, 3770, 3777
Bridges
Burlington Canal, 3777
Government policy concerning, 3773-9
Canadian freight and United States railways, 1789
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 652
Canadian National Railways
Appointments—how made, 3139-40
Branches and extensions, East and West
Politics and, 4194, 4222
East
Gaspé, 4247-9
Inverness, 4249
Lockeport, 4247-9
Newcastle-Tracdie, 4247-9
Nova Scotia, 3378
Westville-St. John, 4248
West, 3376-82, 3385-7, 4212, 4232
Brudenheim, 885, 4250
Distances, 3390
Land ownership, 3387
Willow Bunch — Wood Mountain, 3380-1, 3388
"Canadian Government Railways" defined, 4219
Canadian National Railway Company, 345
Canadian Northern Railway, 3377, 3390
Coal purchases, 2381
Contracts, details, 4251-6
Damage claims, 887
Deficits, 880, 886, 888
Demurrage "bunched cars," 4230
Directorate, 4190

Reid, Hon. John D.—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Equipment, 4191
Estimates discussion of, 4249-50
Grand Trunk loans, 881. *See also, under this title,* Grand Trunk
Hudson Bay Railway, 4233
Insurance, 4257
Intercolonial
Moncton office, 4268
Operation, 4247
Pension fund, 4248
Mackenzie and Mann, interest in subsidiaries, 4191
Maine Central connection, 3376
Management, 4189
Ministerial statement, 859
Prince Edward Island Railway, 891-2
Car ferry, 4246
Standardization of railway, 4247
Public ownership, 4190
Rates, 4187
Reports of operations, 3086
Stations—shelters, 891
Subsidiaries, 3389
Supplies, contracts for, 4193
Taxation of, 3393
Ties—list of contracts, 4251
Townsites, 4191
Withholding of information justified, 1652-7, 1674, 1684
Canadian National Railways Bill, 2842, 3085, 3376-94, 4187-95
Cars. *See under this title,* Railways
Capilano bridge, 3778
Carvill, Mr. George, 4226-8
Civil Service Commission, 3139
Contracts signed by Government before submission to House, 1048
Dredging, 3781-90
Nova Scotia, 3786
Drill halls, 3148
Dry docks, 4567-72, 4573
Experimental farms, 3156-8
Farm labour, 1227
Flags for public buildings, 3158
Fort Frances public building, 3152
Fort William elevators—coarse grain shipments, 565
Graham's Run, 3159
Granby public building, 3150
Grand Etang bridge, 3780
Grand Trunk Railway acquisition, 1113, 1311-8, 1435-60, 1486-1510
Administration, 4173
Branch lines, 1314-8
Correspondence, 1235-53
Hinton, Mr. W. P., 1311-2
Loan, 4579

Reid, Hon. John D.—*Con.*
Grand Trunk Railway acquisition—*Con.*
London-Trafalgar square office, 1251
Montreal-Toronto line, 1491
Shareholders, list of, 3426-7
Strike of 1910, 1542
Grosse Isle, 3151
Hamilton
Postal station, 3152
Post office, 3151
Hanna, Mr. D. B.
Cahill, Mr., and, 2380
Canada Steamships, Limited, and, 1743
Highways Act, contribution to Ontario, 1047
Hull and Montreal highways, 1113
Hydro-Electric and Ontario Radial railway, 4172
Isle Verte, 3160
Kamloops public building, 3156
Kingsville public building, 3153
Lachine lock bridge, 4236
Lotbinière and Megantic Railway, 950, 4585
Militia, Permanent force, barracks, 4579
Narrows, the, 3159
National parks, 3769-70
North Bay, shore protection, 3160
North Lake harbour, 3159
Oliver-St. Paul de Metis Railway, 344, 871
Ottawa buildings, fittings and furniture, 3154
Ottawa city, agreement with, 577-81, 988-92
Ottawa River conservation, 3779
Parliament Buildings, 1418-34, 3153
Port Hood wharf, 3159
Port Maitland, 4579
Portage la Prairie public building, 3156
Postage stamps for inland revenue, 3737
Post Office Dept., 3736-7
Public buildings, none new, 3147-8
Public works, resident engineers, 3787
Purchasing Commission, 4580-2
Question—complaint of unsatisfactory answer, 1047
Questions, inquiry as to, 2126, 2416
Railway Act Amdt. (Provincial Jurisdiction) 2412-13, 3634-6
Railway Mail Service, 4212
Railway rates, 864
Railways. *See also, under this title,* Canadian National; Grand Trunk
Car shortage, 881-5, 1114
Proposed discussion in Railway Com., 885
Reports of, 1290
Taxation of profits, 865
Renfrew post office, 3151
Royal Military College, 3152-3

Reid, Hon. John D.—*Con.*
St. Anne bridge, 3773-4
St. John
Harbour, 4567
Public buildings, 3148-9
Scammel, Mr. J. D., 3785
Shenacadie wharf, 3159
Shipbuilding, 652
Spirit River wheat shipments, 566
Steel cabinets, 3155
Sydney Quarantine station, 3148
Toronto
Postal station, 3155-6
Union station, 3226
Vancouver public buildings, 3156
Williams Head quarantine, 3156

Reid, Mr. John F. (Mackenzie)
Bridges, 3770
Budget, 2744. Mr. Edwards and United Grain Growers, 2744; Mr. Elkin and tariff, 2745; business methods of United Grain Growers—export market a necessity, 2746; duties collected in Canada and in the United States—railways in Canada and in Great Britain, 2747; Mr. Stevens and the farmers, 2748; Mr. Stacey and duty on apples, 2749; difficulties faced by Minister of Finance—income, luxury and excise taxes, 2750; life insurance for returned soldiers—railways—immigration, 2751; Hudson Bay railway—Mr. G. M. Murray and the press, 2753
Campaign funds, 1226
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines, 3384
Western extensions, 4232
Civil Service bonus, 1281
Commercial feeding stuffs, 3174
Duties on textile imports, ques. 1899
Experimental farms, 2398
Firearms licenses, 3414-5
Food and Drugs Bill, 1635
Franchise Bill
Aliens—certificate, 2100
Disqualification
Charitable support, those receiving, 1817
Election expenses, 1932
Recall, the, 2041
"Rural polling division," 1993
Grand Trunk Railway, 1459
Newspaper postage, 3751
Returned soldiers, tubercular, ques. 2005
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 4153
Soldier Settlement, 1687-8, 2130, 2137-8
Cattle branding, 1700

Reid, Mr. John F.—*Con.*
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill
Firearms, 3793
Proprietary medicines, 3794
Wheat meal, 3795
Steamship subsidies, 4282
Vessel rates, proposed regulation of, 1721, 1734-5

Religious Orders from France, 231, 261

Repatriation Committee. *See* Pensions

Reports tabled, 1199, 1229, 1289, 1357, 1405, 1460, 1573, 1738, 2311, 2571, 2625, 2840, 3225, 4258, 4502

Restaurant Parliamentary. *See* Parliamentary

Restigouche, Interprovincial bridge, ques. 411

Retail Merchants' Association of Canada
Special War Revenue, 3342
Vessel rates, 1717

Retirement. *See* Civil Service

Returned Soldiers, 46, 68. *See also* Pensions; Re-establishment; Soldier Settlement; Civil Service; Dominion Lands
Badges, 437-47
Cash Gratuities, ministerial statement, 1082
Federal emergency fund, ques. 2182
Fishery officers at Isle Madame, ques. 3294
Fishing industry and, 531, 855. *See also* Fisheries
Franchise—exemption from disqualification, 1811, 1820
Life insurance, 519, 524. *See also* State Insurance
Militia Department appointments, ques. 2079, ques. 3358
Saar Valley Commission and, 344
Special War Revenue—taxation and, amdt. (Mr. Lemieux) 3446
Tubercular, treatment of, ques. 2005
Unauthorized wearing of buttons, 4020
University students, 519
Vocational training, 534
War veterans, petitions from, 505
Work for at Victoria—shipbuilding, 4584

Returns
Delayed, 459
Inquiry for, 618, 857, 3226, 4258, 3769

Revenue Bills
1. Business Profits War Tax Act, 1917, Amdt. Bill. Res. 3111; 1r., 3117; 2r., com., 3229; 3r., 3237
2. Customs Tariff Act, 1907, Amdt. Bill. Res., 3110; 1r., 3111; 2r., com., 3174; 3r., 3229
3. Income War Tax, 1917, Amdt. Bill. Res. 3117; 1r., 3128; 2r., com., 3237, 3296, 4288; 3r., 4289
4. Inland Revenue Act Amdt. Bill. Res. 3494; 1r., 3498; 2r., com., 3815; 3r., 3821. Senate amdts. 4263
5. Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill. Res. 3316; 3434; 3561; 1r., 3634; 2r., com., 3790; 3r., 4289. Senate amdts. 4505

Revenue and Expenditure. *See* Budget and debates thereon

Rhodes, Hon. Edgar N. (Cumberland) *See* Speaker

Richardson, Mr. Robert L. (Springfield)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 200. Freight rates, 200; Canadian Pacific and Canadian National Railways, effect of rate increases, 201; Grand Trunk Pacific, 202; public ownership of railways, 204; Union Government, Quebec and her "hour," 206; Hon. Mr. Crerar, 207; Liberals and the tariff, 208
Board of Commerce, 1947
Correspondence, 3427
Murdock, Mr., letter of, 4488
Canadian National Railways, 4199-4204; public ownership — Transcontinental freight rates increase—no political influence, 4199-4202
Rates, 1448
Conner, Mr. James, dismissal of, 415, 419
Electricity, public ownership, 3117
Franchise Bill—advance polls, 1934
Franking privilege, 3767
French speeches, translation of, 702
Grand Trunk Railway, 1447, 1499
Income tax, charities, 3313
Morning sittings, 2723
National parks and game preserves, 3287
Newspaper postage, 3746-60
Press, the, and, 3752-3
Newsprint, price, 2828
Railway rates, 1499
Rural mail, 4524
Steel and shipping merger, 1945-8, 1966
Vote—late in entering Chamber, 4180

Rifle Ranges. *See* Militia

Rimouski
British mails and, 4530-2

Rinfret, Mr. Fernand (St. James)
Budget, 2756. Fresh mandate from the people—election of 1917—by-elections, 2756; race prejudice and class party—cost of living—farmers and prices, 2757; profiteering, 2758; the new taxes, 2759; United States luxury tax how imposed—criticism of public expenditure, 2760; St. James by-election—Mr. Meighen's address, 2761; Liberal party and tariff—good understanding with English-speaking citizens desired, 2762; Quebec a tolerant province—the prosperity desired, 2763
Cressé, Mr. L. G. A., ques, 4502
Customs duties—basis of estimates, ques. 1788
Election and introduction, 1357
Franchise Bill
Poll, hours to be open, 1926
Proclamation—language of publication, 2278, 2282, 2291-2
French treaty, ques. 1788
German and Austrian imports, ques. 2416, ques. 3359
Imports into Canada, ques. 2182
Insurance companies, mutual, taxation of, 2012, 2080
Naval Service, additional appropriation of $1,700,000, 4391-2
Newspaper postage, 3750-1
Press gallery, 3750
Roumania and Greece, advances to, ques. 3488
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill
Beer, 3605
Excise and sales tax, 3335
Medals, gold, 3585
Musical instruments, 3595-6, 3628
Proprietary medicines, 3601

Rivière du Loup
Drill hall, 3726-7
Shops, ques. 315, ques. 801
Engine repairs, ques. 3079

Robb, Mr. James A. (Chateauguay-Huntingdon)
Alcohol, 3816-7
Apple barrels, 2018-21
Banff national park, 3769
Bankruptcy Bill, 3257
Budget debate, arrangements for, 2839-40, 2951
Business profits tax, 3234-7

Robb, Mr. James A.—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways
Extensions, 3388
Land ownership in, 3387
Mails, 3377
Canadian Wheat Board, 4120-5, 4134, 4342-57
Oats, effect on, 4357
Car shortage, 880-3
Coal operations director, 3179, 3367
Commercial feeding stuffs, 1290, 3164-5, 3405-7
Federal Bureau of Education, 1396
Fiset, Dr. Michel, 2015
Food adulteration, 3557
Fort William elevators, 565
Franchise Bill, election expenses, 1155
Grading export cheese and butter, 605
Grain and grain products in freight cars, ques., 1035
Grand Trunk Railway, 1311-2
Branch lines, 1316-20
Hinton, Mr. W. P., 1311
Icebreakers, 1599
Immigrants from United States, ques. 1463
Income tax
Charities, 3241-6
Mistakes made in good faith, 3302-3
Penalties, 3254
Residence or investments outside Canada, 3249-51
Indian affairs estimates, 3265-6
Indians—enfranchisement, 4029-37
Live stock shipments inspection, 1614-5
Malt, 3818
Oleomargarine, 1782, 1970
Purchasing Board, 1468-70
Railway mail service, 4212
Retirement of members of public service, 3836
Returned soldiers' insurance, 4055
St. Lawrence route, insurance, 4515
Seed Grain advances, 3286-7
Shipbuilding
Cattle shippers, and, 910
"Where is the money to come from?" 915
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill, 3574
Bank overdrafts, 3799
Duties paid before changes, 3624
Real estate sales, 3796
Taxes, how paid, 3587
Steel and Shipping Merger, 1966
Sugar embargo, 3226
Welland canal, ques. 1200
Western parks roads, 3283

Robson, Judge H. A. *See* Board of Commerce

Ross, Mr. Duncan C. (West Middlesex)
Automobile imports and excise, ques. 591
Chartered banks, ques. 591
Egg imports and exports, ques. 1898
Food and Drugs, 968, 975
Franchise Bill
Advance polls, 3873-4
Aliens—certificate, 2222-3, 2229-31
Ballot and counterfoil, 1105
Deputy returning officers, lists of, 1096-7
Disqualification — charitable support, those receiving, 1819
Forms, 3871-3
Liquor at elections, 1108
Ontario law and lists, 3880-92
Polling divisions, 1519
Returning officers, 1525-8
Voters' lists, provincial, 2419-27, 2438
Amdt., suggested, 2321
Voting on certificate, 1098-1100
Income tax, losses, 3241
Indians
Medical attendance, 3275-6
Munsees reserve, 3277
Rural credits, ques. 589
Soldier Settlement, 3193-4

Ross Rifle Factory, ques. 1898, ques. 2721, 3722
Sale to Enterprise Foundry, ques. 2415

Roumania,
Advances to, ques. 318, 3027
Bonds, interest on, ques. 3488
Purchases by, ques. 2414
Insurance on, ques. 1739
Ports of shipment, ques. 343
Shipments, ques. 312

Round Robin, 2967

Rowell, Hon. N. W. (President of the Privy Council and Minister of Public Health)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 254. Reply to Mr. Murphy, 254; Lake Superior Corporation, 256; War Purchasing Commission — appointments of members to Senate, 257; Secretarial fund, 258; allegation of evading tax, 260; religious orders from France, 261; Mr. Rowell and his colleagues, 262; Women's Conference, 262; Health Department—Union Government, 263
British mails, 4532
Budget, 2997. Answer to Mr. Mackenzie King—Sir Thomas White's administration of finances—congratulations to Minister of Finance, 2997; public debt—expenditure, 2998; Department

Rowell, Hon. N. W.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
of Public Information and the Daily Record, 2999; Canadian Official Record, Bureau of Information, New York, 3000; "advances unaccounted for," 3001; Civil Service appointments, number of, 3005; decreasing staffs in the Civil Service, 3006; expenditure and income estimated, 3007; public debt, inflation, 3008; Government's record in the war—Canada in a higher position than ever before—Mr. Fielding's amdt. 3009; Liberal Unionists' tariff record—tariff reduction, 3010; general election and franchise, 3011; Union Government's progressive measures—a tariff policy fair to all, 3012
Bulgaria. *See, under this title,* Peace Treaty
Business of the House, private members' business, 539
Canada's national status, 498. *See also, under this title,* League of Nations; Peace Treaty
Empire, in, 359
British connection maintained, 365
Canadian National Railways, mail contracts, 4530
Censorship, 396
Civil Service
Bonus, 1270-6, 3147, 3228
Classification, 548, 556, 1112, 3769, 3984
In force 1 April, 1919, 3142-7
Inside Service, 4019, 4172
Vote to pay increased salaries, 4546
Reduction of pay, 3137
Temporary employees, 3128-33
War record, civil servants with, 3129-31
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 1112, 3146
Senate amdts. 4056-60
Third reading, discussion, 3147
Colonial and Imperial Conference, 359
Commercial Feeding Stuffs, 617
Bill withdrawn, 1290-1
Daughters of Canada, case of, 397
Distressed mariners, 2251-9, 2260-7, 3102-5, 4056
Edmonton post office, theft from, 923, 4520
Eight-hour day, 449-54
European distress, 4546
Food adulteration, 3557
Food and Drugs Bill, 582, 956-79, 1256-69, 1465
Food inspectors, Nova Scotia, 3539-40
Franchise Bill
Aliens—certificate, 2073-5, 2220-3, 2229-30
Disqualification of candidates, 1087
Government annuities, 4528

Rowell, Hon. N. W.—*Con.*
Health department, 263, 3539-57
Honey adulteration, 582, 798, 2314-5
House of Commons staff, 4414, 4567
Housing, 3543-52
Construction, 3546
Immigration—medical inspection, 3555
Information service, 4543-4
International Joint Commission, 3986
International Labour Conference, 798
Labour Conference at Washington, 356
League of Nations, 349
Ames, Sir Herbert, statement by, 3971-84
Assembly, the, 351
Budget of, Canada's contribution, 3982, 4544
Canada's interests and representation, 498, 3982
Decisions, enforcement of, 3975-6
Disarmament, 3976
French occupation of German territory, 1046
Labour, 354
Peace, maintenance of, 351
Phosphorus for matches, 356
Self-governing Dominions' status, 350
United States Senate reservations, 357
Letter-carriers' salaries, 345, 1276, 2670, 4529
Threatened strike—Government's attitude, 1231-2, 3424, 3623
Maple products, 582, 796-7, 1254-6, 2366, 4020
Marine hospitals, 3552-4
Naval Service, additional appropriation, $1,700,000, 4388
News Service, 4532
Opium and Drug Bill, 557, 1621-2, 1629-49, 1702-7, 1745-61, 1900, 3081
Parcel post supervisor, 4530
Peace Treaty. *See also, under this title,* League of Nations
Bulgaria, 498, 1057-61
France—protection against Germany, 1059
Hungary and Turkey, 1059-60, 3983-4
Pensions and Re-establishment, 435
Special Com., 614, 752
Pensions district offices, rumoured closing of, 710, 857
Pollution of boundary waters, 3552
Postal employees' salaries, 2670, 4526-30. *See also, under this title,* Letter Carriers
Postmen. *See, under this title,* Letter Carriers
Printing Bureau
Economies in, 3006
Sunday work, 4020
Proprietary medicines, 3542

Rowell, Hon. N. W.—*Con.*
Purchasing Board, 1470-1, 1481-4
Quarantine—Tracadie, 3554
Regina library, 396
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 10, 387, 4021, 4547-8, 4575
Buildings, 3214, 4573
Distribution of force, 3207-8, 3214
Duties of the force, 3195
Expense—Details, 3204-6
Division of with Provincial Governments, 3203
Increased, 3209
H.R.H. Prince of Wales, Honorary Commandant, 398
Name, change of, 398
Pensions, 388, 391, 398, 3202
Permanent Militia Force and, 3209
Provincial Police and, 3195-6
Strikes and, 3200
Ticket-of-leave system and, 399
Rural mail carriers, 1233, 4525-6
St. John pension office, 1742
Services of Dominion troops overseas, resolution of British House of Commons, 1159
Shipbuilding, expenditure, how to be met, 918
Supply and the Budget, 918
Toronto Postal employees, threatened strike, 3424
Venereal diseases, 3556
Washington, Canadian representation at, 4536-41
M. (Mr. Fielding) in amdt. to supply, 2444, 2474

Roy, Mr. Gustave, ques. 1898, ques. 1899

Roy, Hon. Mr., and International Labour Conference, 3359

Royal Assent, 1165, 2259, 3634-5

Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 242, 4547
Barracks, 3214, 4572
Change of name of force, 398
Duncan, Mr. Walter and, ques. 1117, ques. 2720
H.R.H. Prince of Wales, Honorary Commandant, 398
Ministerial explanation in Supply, 3194-6, 3200-15
Pensions, 388, 397
Special Com. not to consider, 615

Royal Canadian Mounted Police Bills
1. Commissioner. Res. 387; 1r., 10; 2r., com., 395; 3r., 459
2. Pensions. Res. 3864, 3958; 1r., 3959; 2r., com., 3r., 4021

Royal Commission on Natural Resources, Trade and Legislation, ques. 4502

Royal Military College, 3152

Rural Credits, ques. 589

Rural Mail Carriers, ques. 414, ques. 591, 1233, 1282-3, 4522. *See also,* Post Office
Pontbriand-Robertsonville, ques. 2313
Routes, ques. 506

Russia
Icebreakers, sold to, 1599, 1602, 2106-7
Military expedition to, ques. 995
Trade with, 4322

Ruthenian-Greek Rite. *See* Juvenile Delinquent Act

St. Camille-Cabano proposed railway, ques. 589

St. Hermas postal service, ques. 412

St. James By-Election, 707

St. Jean D'Orleans Wharf, ques. 317

St. Joachim Postmaster, ques. 1121

St. John, N.B
Armoury, ques. 994
District pension office, 1742
Exhibition buildings, use by militia, ques. 2009
Harbour, 2189, 2985, 3492-93, 4567, 4573
Obstruction, 2118
Pilots, 2119
Public buildings, 3149

St. John River
Report of International Commission, ques. 1623
Water powers, ques. 674, 3290

St. John and Quebec Railway, ques. 508, ques. 1036

St. Julien, Battle of, Commemoration, 1357, 1510

St. Lawrence River
I'le d'Orleans, 3295
North shore municipalities, ques. 922, ques. 1116
Post offices, ques. 1116
Power development on, ques. 1120
Engineers, ques. 1230
Route and channel
Dredging, 1616
Ice conditions and icebreakers, 230, ques. 317, 856-8
Insurance, 4515

St. Lawrence River—*Con.*
Route and Channel—*Con.*
Navigation season, 916
Steamship service, 652

St. Louis, Mr. Horace and translation of Revised Statutes, 3082

St. Malo shops, ques. 3079, ques. 3618

St. Peter River
Floods, 889, ques. 1115
Work on, ques. 4019

St. Quentin and Theriault, N.B., catastrophe, 3080

St. Regis Indians, ques. 799

St. Romuald, ques. 2005

St. Valier Wharf, ques. 1231

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary. *See* Labrie

Ste. Anne Soldiers' hospital, ques. 588

Ste. Anne de Beaupre Wharf, ques. 506

Ste. Anne de Bellevue Military Hospital, ques. 1115

Ste. Famille Wharf, ques. 317, ques. 810

Ste. Rosalie-Bagot spur line, ques. 2009

Saar Valley Commission, 344, 3963, 3974. *See also* League of Nations

Saguenay River
Buoys, ques. 1000
Dredging, ques. 673

Sailors. *See* Canada Shipping Act

Salaries Act and House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill. Res. 4379; 1r., 4380; 2r., 4427; com., 4456; 3r., 4459

Sales Tax. *See* Special War Revenue

San Remo Conference, 1465

Savard, Mr. Edmond (Chicoutimi-Saguenay)
Bersimis-Rimouski Service, ques. 1463
Budget, 2870. Union Government—congratulations to Minister of Finance, 2871; the new taxes and cost of living—profiteering — Canada's liabilities, 2872; tariff revision—unfair treatment of Chicoutimi and Saguenay by Government, 2873; St. Catharine-Tadoussac mail, 2874; Metabetchouan postmastership, 2876; Liberal fiscal policy approved, 2879

Savard, Mr. Edmond—*Con.*
Chicoutimi, military expedition to, ques. 409
Hebertville-St. Joseph d'Alma, mail, ques. 1000
Inspector of weights and measures, ques. 4096
Malbaie-Tadoussac service, ques. 674
Metabetchouan postmaster, ques. 1120
North Point lighthouse, ques. 1361
Post offices in Quebec cities, ques. 413
Saguenay River
Buoys, ques. 1000
Dredging, ques. 673
St. Lawrence North Shore municipalities, 922, ques. 1116
Soldiers serving in Bermuda, ques. 1461
Telegraph operators, government, ques. 2182

Scammell, Mr. J. K., 3784

Scenic attractions, 3538-9

Schelking, Baron, ques. 3618

Scientific Research, 14, 43, 324
Committee, Special, 617, 2154

Scott, Mr. F. S. (South Waterloo)
Canadian National Railways, withholding of information, 1676
Income tax—charities, 3313
Race track betting, 3430

Scrap Iron and Steel, sale of, ques. 1739

Screenings, ques. 704. *See also* Commercial Feeding Stuffs; Elevators; Grain
Accumulation at elevators, 3395
Export to United States, 3167

Secret Diplomacy. *See Debates under* League of Nations; Peace Treaties

Seduction. *See* Criminal Code

Seed Branch, 2411

Seed Grain
Advances, ques. 321, ques. 2519
Alberta, ques. 674
Purchasing Commission, ques. 1117

Séguin, Mr. Paul A. (L'Assomption-Montcalm)
Budget, 3075. Extravagant expenditure, 3075; so-called luxury taxes—neglect of agriculture—Imperial navy, 3076; lighten people's burden—Mr. Fielding's amdt. 3077
Income tax—provincial salaries, ques. 3490

Seguin, Mr. Paul A.—*Con.*
Leaf tobacco, ques. 996
Military instructors for educational institutions, ques. 413
Military uniforms for educational institutions, ques. 413
Naval Service, 4406

Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. *See* Indemnity of Members.

Senate
Appointment of members of Commons to, 257
Cost of, ques. 1118
Immigration Act Amdt. rejected by, 3426
Provincial legislators and, 1087
Senator also Legislative Councillor, 209
Staff, 4056-9

Serbia, reported credit to, 567. *See also* League of Nations; Peace Treaty

Sevigny, Hon. Albert, 114, 210

Sex Hygiene, 942

Sexsmith, Mr. John Albert (East Peterborough)
Apple barrels, 2018-9
Canadian National Railways, standard time, ques. 588
Demonstration farms, 2390, 2396
Eight-hour day, 379
Food and Drugs Bill, 1260-1
Franchise Bill
Advance polls, 1935, 1941
Assiniboia expenses, 1179, 1184
Conveying voters, 1063
Deposit, 1094-6
Polling place—parties present, 1102
Voters' lists, 2424-6, 2433
Oleomargarine, 1874-5, 1970

Shaw, Mr. Hugh M. (Macleod)
Canadian Northern Railway bonds guaranteed by Alberta, ques. 2180

Sheard, Mr. Charles (South Toronto)
Franchise Bill—liquor on polling day, 1108
Income tax—disputed returns, 3119-20
Letter carriers' salaries, 1231, 3424
Mines Dept., salaries, 3802-3
Special War Revenue Bill, point of order, 3318

Shenacadie Wharf, 3159

Shipbuilding, 44, 53. *See also* Shipbuilding Credits; Canada Shipping Act
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 622, 659

Shipbuilding—*Con.*
Contracts, ques. 314, 662, 892, 919
Govt. operation, Montreal shipping men's opinion, 908
Govt. shipyard at Sorel, 1620, ques. 2180
Inland waters, vessels for, 913
Material for, importation of, ques. 1114
Returned men and, 909
Ship plates, 623
Duty on, ques. 706
Statement by Minister, 618
Steel contracts, ques. 2573
Subsidies, 913
Supply—vote of $20,000,000, 892
Victoria Shipowners (Limited), 4583

Shipbuilding Credits Bill. Res., 3863, 3987; 1r., 4017; 2r., 4137; com., 4155; 3r., 4173
Conditions under which assistance may be given, 4155
Limitation of amount (amdt. Mr. McMaster) 4166
Parliament, report to, 4166-7
Preamble, 4155, 4167
Registration and ownership, 4157, 4167 (amdt. Mr. Duff) 4165
Size of ships, 4159
Wooden ships (amdt. Mr. Duff) 4161

Shipping. *See also* Canada Shipping Act; Steel and Shipping Registration of, 1614

Shipping Federation. *See* Canada Shipping Act

Ships. *See also* Vessels; Naval Service; Shipbuilding; Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Foreign, taxation of. *See* Canada Shipping Act
Great Britain, from, acceptance of, inquiry for correspondence, 4413. *See also* Naval Defence; Naval Service

Shipwrecked Mariners. *See* Canada Shipping Act

Shipyard. *See* Shipbuilding

Shorts. *See* Commercial Feeding Stuffs

Sick and Distressed Mariners. *See* Canada Shipping Act; Marine Hospitals

Sifton, Rt. Hon. A. L. (Secretary of State and Minister of Mines)
Canada Temperance Act, 4559
Censorship, 4556
Editorial Board, 4559
War trophies, 4557

Simpson, Mr. Thomas E. (West Algoma)
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill
Confectionery, 3593
Sales tax, 3794
Voters' lists, 2424

Sinclair, Mr. John E. (Queen's, P.E.I.)
Canadian National Railways—Prince Edward Island car ferry—standardization of railway—Georgetown-Pictou route—labour conditions — Prince Edward Island representative on Board of Management, 4243-6
Commercial Feeding Stuffs, 3174
Franchise Bill, voters' lists, provincial, 2359-60
Govt. steamers, wages, 1598-9
Graham's Run, 3159
Hickey's wharf, 706
Icebreaker and car ferry, 1602
Judges' salaries, 3854
Maple products, 797
Newfoundland, 4280
North Lake harbour, 3159
Soldier Settlement, 2132
Wrecks, 1612

Sinclair, Mr. John H. (Antigonish and Guysborough)
Advances not accounted for, 2641, 3652-3
Alcohol tax—effect on science, 3496
Antigonish and North Sydney public works, ques. 543, ques. 1004
Army boots and shoes, ques. 506, ques. 1229
Auditor General's report, 4274
Banks, chartered, Government receipts from, ques. 1001
British Columbia Indians, 788-90, 951-3
British preference, ques. 811
Budget, 2636. Cessation of borrowing, 2636; checking waste and extravagance—Union party, 2637; how expenditure might be reduced, 2639; Dept. of Public Information, 2639; Militia advances unaccounted for, 2641; many appointments to the Civil Service, 2642; Liberal tariff platform — parliamentary govt., 2643
Buoy service, 2116-7
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Coal, ques. 1623
Earnings, ques. 1359
Freight rates, ques. 2009
Information withheld, complaint of, 1649
Shareholders, ques, 2011
Canadian National Railways
Deficit, 889-90
Eastern Nova Scotia and, 3377-8
Ships and, 897, 904

Sinclair, Mr. John H.—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Taxation of, 3394
Western extensions, 3387-8
Canadian News Service at Washington, ques. 414
Canadian Northern Railway, arbitration, ques. 2008, ques. 3488
Canadian Railway War Board, ques. 508
Canadian Wheat Board, 4345-50
Central Vermont Railway, ques. 1035
Chartered Banks, money received from, ques. 1001
Civil Service, 3132-40
Appointments, ques. 311
Classification, 3144
Employees, number of, 2642, 3145-6
Insurance, 1780
Temporary employees, ques. 415, 3132-40
Coal Operations Director Bill, 3367
Cold storage, 2407
Dominion lands, ques. 1118
Dredging, 3783
Exchequer Court, 2201
Extension of trade, 1881, 1884-5
Fisheries
Overseers and guardians, 3522-3
United States, treaty with, ques. 1002
Food inspectors, 3539-40
Franchise Bill
By-elections, simultaneous, 1093
Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, 1070
Constables, 3907
Election officers, 1075
Fees, etc., 1111
False statement made to affect election, 1066-7
Interpretation, 1991-2
Oaths, administration of, 780
Poll books, etc., to returning officer, 1079
Proclamation, 1081
Recount by judge, 1110
Returning officers, 1575
Voters' lists
Addition and elimination of names, 3909-13
Preparation—partisanship complained of, 3906
Provincial, 2328-30, 2338, 2360, 3883-4, 3894
Transfer of voters, 3904
Voting on certificate, 1100-1
Government steamers—purchases for, 1610
Government vouchers, loss of at sea, ques. 3489
Guysborough harbour, 2124
Halifax grain elevator, ques. 1116
Health Dept.—variety of its business, 3541

Sinclair, Mr. John H.—*Con.*
Honey adulteration, 2315
Housing, 3547
Expenditure
Demobilization vote, and, 3544-5
Ontario, adjustments with, 3551
Imperial Munitions Board, ques. 1002
Income tax, part payment with return, 3254
Indemnity of members, 4448
Inquiry for returns, 857, 4259
Intercolonial Provident Fund, ques. 509
Judges' salaries, 4340
Lightkeepers' salaries, 2113-4
Loan Companies Act, 1779
Lobsters
Hatcheries employees, ques. 4096
Illegal fishing, ques. 410
Marine hospitals, 3553
Market price of Government bonds, ques. 1462
Masters and mates, 981
Militia, 3674
Annual drill, 3681
Contingencies, 3716
Customs brokers, 3716
Rifle associations, 3725
Morrisons' Ltd. ques. 997
Newspaper postage rates, 3348
Nichols, Mr. M. E., ques. 1118
Ottawa city, agreement with, 990
Paper Currency, gold standard, ques. 309
Pensions and Re-establishment, 3941
Pensioner resident outside of Canada, 4044
Widowed mother, dependent parents, 4043
Pictou,
East river lock, ques. 1119
Harbour, 2187
Pilotage, 1839, 1968, 2119-20
Postal rates, 3736-7
Public Information Dept., ques. 1000, ques. 1740
Railway rates, 1036
Registration of shipping, 1614, 2109
Retirement of members of public service, 3827, 3833
Returns, delayed, 459
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 3211
Pensions, 398
St. Lawrence dredging, 1617-20
Schools of navigation, 1612-3
Seed grain advances, ques. 2519, 3286-7
Shipbuilding, Govt.
Assets and liabilities, 896
Contracts and prices, 894, ques. 2573
Trade, tariffs and, 897

Sinclair, Mr. John H.—*Con.*
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 3989-92, 4006, 4009-15, 4157-8, 4166
Sick and distressed mariners, 2254-5, 2264-6
Soldier Settlement
Fishermen and, 1690, 3218-9
Staff of dept. 3221
Special War Revenue—candy, 3594
Steamers
"A. J. McKee," ques. 587, 910
"Recruit," ques. 1199
"Voyageur," insurance, ques. 2776
"33," ques. 410
Steamboat inspection, 1051, 1763-4, 2125
Terminal elevators, 1878-9
Turk—expulsion of from Europe, ques. 409
Unforeseen expenses, 1616
Vancouver, B.C., ques. 3620
Victoria, B.C., dry dock, ques. 3619
Winter fishing, 1609
Yukon Placer Mining Act, 3108-9

Skeena River Hatchery, ques. 412

Slidemaster, 1279

Slums, 816

Smith, Mr. J. E., Ques. 2722

Smith, Mr. William (South Ontario)
Demonstration stations, 1016
Franchise Bill, provincial lists, 3892
Rural mail carriers, 4523
United Grain Growers and the farmers, 2745

Smyrna and Anatolia, 3984

Soldier Organizations and Pension Board employees, ques. 1116

Soldiers. *See also* Returned Soldiers
Canadian prisoners, ques. 1462
Services of Dominion overseas, resolution of British House of Commons, 1159
Votes—effect in general election, 140
Widows and children of, ques. 920. *See also* Pensions

Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment. *See also* Demobilization; Reconstruction
Dept. 513, 520, 524, ques. 2311
Officials travelling, ques. 2311
Prospective ending of, 4456
Report in French ready for distribution, 2126
Report of Com. not printed in French as ordered, 2016
Smith, Mr. J. E., ques. 2722

Soldier Settlement, 275, 516, 521, 524, 527, 534, 1684, 2127, 3218
Colonization lots in Montmagny, ques. 1229
Ministerial explanation in Supply, 3192

Soldier Settlement Act, 1919, Amdt. Bill. 1r., 1289; 2r., 1685; com., 1685; 3r., 1839

Sorel
Government employees at, ques. 1199
Shipyard, 1620, ques. 2180
Superintendent, ques. 343
Vandal, Mr. Calixte, ques. 1740

Soulanges Canal Road, ques. 999

Southam Press Limited, ques. 4096

Sovietism. *See* Bolshevism

Sparrow, Dr. C. J., ques. 1896

Speaker (Hon. Edgar N. Rhodes)
Rulings and Statements of
Amendments, consequential, 2315
Bills
Com., ref. back to—unanimous consent, 4264
Divorce, charges, 4321, 4413
Introducible only by resolution—ref. to trade, 2079
Introduction—not in "Notices of Motion," 1216
Not printed in French, 1152
Resolution adopted, but notice of motion for first reading possibly required, 1229
Senate amendments taken seriatim, 4059
2r
Declared carried, debate closed, 395
Member may speak only once, 3833
Principle only to be discussed, 3827
Same day as 1r., 4341
3r
Amdt. by House without ref. again to Com. 1537
Consequential amdts. 2315
Same day as Com. stage, 2204
Budget debate
Amdt. not to limit debate, 2518
Debate on Thursday and Friday, 2576
Com. suggested for convenience in asking questions—League of Nations, 3971
Comment on documents criticising members, 235
Debate closed by mover, 436, 446, 1137, 1966, 2316, 3102
Exception, by unanimous consent, 2784

Speaker (Hon. Edgar N. Rhodes)—*Con.*
Rulings and Statements of—*Con.*
Debate closed by mover—*Con.*
Rule inapplicable, 2315
Mover of amdt. 3956
3r. of Bill, 2251
Debates, Official Report of
Insertion of documents not read, 363, 364, 1416, 1890, 3932
Question standing as order for return, 1743
Decorum,
Conversation, 2316, 4367
Cowardice, imputation of, 66-7
Noise—building operations, 345
Estimates, item in, debate on, 2467
Hartney, Mr. E. P., 4566
House of Commons
French language, status of, 1039-44
Honour of impugned by statement outside—Rev. Dr Speer, 3491, 3557
Officials and Staff
Organization and classification, 859, 1037-45, 3092-9, 4504, 4563-7
Pages, 3099
Side lobbies, admission of strangers to, 1629
Hypothetical against direct statement, 259
Imputation against a member, 234, 2846
Inquiry for report ordered in French, 2126
Interruptions, 457, 480, 734, 737, 1653, 1709-10
Board of Commerce, 4496-7
Language
"A void in their craniums," 737
"Deliberate falsehood," 2749
"Falsehood," 259
"Mean," 529
"Meanly and untruthfully alleging," 233
"Representatives....the stigma they have left upon themselves," 547
Retracted but afterwards referred to, 774
"Shameless" and words of like character, 235
"Spoke with a brief for the great Massey-Harris corporation," 2627
"Uttered a falsehood deliberately," 2845-6
Members
Asking for answer to question, 2179
Giving way by courtesy, 759
How to be referred to, 50, 528
Mover limited in reply, 1966

Speaker (Hon. Edgar N. Rhodes)—*Con.*
Rulings and Statements of—*Con.*
Members—*Con.*
Not having the floor, not to be interrogated, 528
Right to speak exhausted, 1561, 1572, 1676, 2315, 2702, 4060
Speaking, may not interrogate another, 2631-2
Speaking, may submit questions, 2702-4
To speak only once on a motion, 1466, 1656-7
Motions
Negative, amdt., 4061
Non-debatable
Adjourning debate, 1017, 2840, 4062
Those moved by unanimous consent, 2626
Those taken up under arrangement of no debate, 2014
Notice not given—unanimous consent necessary, 2023, 2177, 2575, 2626
Consent refused, M. stands as notice, 2575
Public expenditure, calling for, 3933
Seconder absent, 418
Successive to adjourn debate, 2840
To adjourn for purpose of discussing matter of urgent, etc.
Steel and shipping merger, 1945-6
Coal shortage, 3685-6
Unnecessary
Authorizing Com. to sit, it not having reported finally, 2776
Withdrawn on understanding of reference, 437
Non-debatable subjects
Com., matters pending before, 3652-3
Report, presentation of, 4257-8
Subjects already debated, 3686
Notice of motion covering question in Votes and Proceedings, 2723
Notice of motion, undesirability of general debate—unanimous consent for
Leader of the Opposition, 2178
Orders of the Day
Debate limited, 33, 230, 231, 710, 856, 1045, 1573, 1896, 2179, 2248, 2968, 3228, 3296
Application must be general, 3424
Appropriateness of matter, 1574, 2476, 1742, 3561, 3423, 3769
Argument, 3427
Labrie Brothers, case of, 3560-1
Letter carriers, 1232
Ministerial statements, 708-9
In the nature of making out a case, 3425

Speaker (Hon. Edgar N. Rhodes)—*Con.*
Rulings and Statements of—*Con.*
Orders of the Day—*Con.*
Debate limited—*Con.*
Replying, latitude allowed in, 3425
Question to be summarized, 3295
Question only partly answered, 753
Question to the House disallowed, 1743
Stoneham, Finlay, case of, 568
Unanimous consent refused, debate not permissible, 2082
Parliamentary restaurant, 3094-6
Previous debate, 1217, 1675, 4417, 4431-2
Coal question, 3686
Privilege
Non-personal reflections, excluded from, 1231
Question may not be raised when another member has the floor, 529, 2838
Ref. to proceedings of Com. which has not reported, 2081
Questions
Answer of Government to be accepted, 753, 1743
Not to be altered by another member; notice to be given, 510
Passed as orders for returns, 1743
At option of Government, 511
Permission not needed to place on Order Paper, 1047
Portion deleted, 1045
Reference to answering—appropriate occasion, 1047, 2416
Standing for Member's revision, 2413
To Chairman of a Committee, and without notice, 2843
Quotations containing language forbidden under the rules, 234-6
Reading of Speeches, 2966
Recognizing members—Mr. Jacobs, Mr. McDonald, 3026, 3039
Relevancy, 734-5, 750-1, 1573, 1954, 3177, 4060
Address, debate on—Budget debate should not be anticipated, 129
Civil Service and patronage, 547
Debate on motion to adjourn for the purpose of discussing, etc., should be strictly relevant, 1951
Judges' salaries and indemnity of members, 4417
Limits of debate, 2468
Naturalization and franchise, 771
Pensions report—general election, 3946
Report not printed in French as ordered, 2016
Speer, Rev. Dr., statement of, 3491, 3557

Speaker (Hon. Edgar N. Rhodes)—*Con.*
Rulings and Statements of—*Con.*
Supply—Committee of
Thursday procedure, 3686
Saturday procedure, 3840, 4275
Unanimous consent, 181, 617, 2078, 2625, 3956, 4060, 4321. *See also, under this titie,* Debates, Official Report of, insertion, etc.
Adjournment to fixed time, moved without notice, 304
Customs Act, 3620
M. (Mr. Lemieux) Coal Supply, 3686
Mr. Mackenzie King on Canadian representative at Washington, 2178
Speech of mover not close of debate, 2784
Statement concerning Com. not otherwise permitted, 2081-2
Unauthorized distribution of documents in House, 1744
Vote—member late, 4180
Wednesday evening sittings, 1045

Speaker's Chair
Offer of gift from the Lords and Commons of the United Kingdom, 3224

Speech from the Throne debated. *See* Address

Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill. Res. 3316; 3334; 3561; 1r., 3634; 2r., com., 3790; 3r., 4289; Senate amendments, 4505
Arrangements for debate, 3617, 3631, 3454
Consideration in detail, 3487-8
Changes proposed, 3345
When effective, 3335, 3607, 3629
Clauses and subjects
"Consumer," definition of, 3795
Effect on prices, 3329, 3340
Importations, 3795
Licenses, 3579, 3600, 4290
Jewellers, 3579
Manufacturer, small, 3797
Manufacturer's agent, 3609
Merchandise not delivered on May 19, 3613
Penalties, 4290
Refunds, 3629, 3607
Retail Merchants' Association, 3342
Revenue from estimated sources, 3332-3
Sales, one or two per cent tax; res., 3608
Stamp taxes and stamps, 3626-7, 3800, 4290
Stocks in trade, 3604
Taxes, how paid, 3587

Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Sources of Revenue Discussed
Acetylene gas, 3796
Airplanes, 3592
Automobiles, 3597, 3793
Baby foods, 3473
Bank overdrafts, 3624-5, 3798
Beer, 3605
Used to make vinegar, 3604
Binder twine, 3610, 3623
Biscuits, 3460
Boats, canoes, yachts, etc., 3588
Boots, 3563-5, 3585
Breakfast foods, 3795
Bric-a-brac 3576
Candy and confectionery 3592
Carpets and rugs, 3577, 3585
Cattle feed, 3473
Chandeliers, 3578, 3597
Chewing gum, 3594
Cigarholders, etc., 3576
Clocks and watches, 3574
Clothes, 3563
Made to order, 4290
Coats, fur, 3791-3
Collars and collarettes of lace, 3574, 3792
Containers, 3615, 3632
Curtains, 3578
Dresses, except silk, 3586-7
Electrical supplies, 3460
Embroideries, 3573
Firearms, 3594, 3793
Food, 3616, 3795
Fountain pens, pocket knives, etc., 3577, 4289
Furniture, 3574
Furs, 3400, 3569, 3791-2
Gas and electric light fixtures, 3596
Glassware, 3569
Gloves, 3568
Hats and caps, 3438, 3453, 3574, 3562, 3565-6, 3790, 4290
Hosiery, 3791
Jams and marmalade, 3796
Jewellery, 3338, 3578
Licenses, 3579
Departmental stores, 3583, 3617
Medals, 3585
Wedding rings, 3584, 3797
Kimonas, petticoats and waists, 3790
Lace, 3573, 3791-3
Collars, 3574, 3792
Liquor and preparations containing alcohol, 3600
Liquor cabinets, etc, 3793
Meats, 3473
Moving pictures, 3627
Musical instruments, 3460-1, 3595-7, 3628

Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Sources of revenue discussed—*Con.*
Neckwear, 3790
Nightgowns, 3567
Oriental rugs, 3577
Overcoats, cloth, 3586
Pedlars, 3574
Plated ware, 3572
Playing cards, 3599
Promissory notes, 3624
Proprietary medicines, 3600, 3627, 3794
Purses and pocketbooks, 3568
Real estate sales, 3796
Ribbons (including typewriter ribbons) 3473, 3574
Sales tax, 2487, 3608, 3794
Silk
Clothing, 3790
Dresses, etc., 3562, 3632
Fabrics, 3572
Split peas, etc., 3795
Spirits and medicated wines, 3793
Sporting goods, 3569, 3572
Socks and stockings (silk)
Men's and boys, 3566
Women's, 3567
Stock transfers, 3624, 3800
Suits, women's, 3587
Tobacco pipes, 4289
Toiletware, 3576
Tooth washes, 3794
Umbrellas, 3568
Underwear, 3453-4, 3791, 3568
Wedding rings, 3584, 3797
Wheat meal, 3795-6

Speer, Rev. Dr. and Race Track Legislation, 3490, 3557

Spence, Rev. Ben., 1218, 1227

Spinney, Mr. Edgar K. (Yarmouth and Clare)
Budget, 2711. Congratulations to Finance Minister—Canada's war service, 2711; business profits tax, 2712; Canada's agriculture and fisheries, 2713; Mr. Fielding's amdt., 2714
Port Maitland, 4579

Spirit Lake, 566, 2398

Springs. *See* Irrigation Act Amdt.

Stacey, Mr. F. B. (Fraser Valley)
Alien immigrants, 823
Budget, 2618. British Columbia farmers, 2618; British Columbia resources—the team spirit—change of attitude on trade question, 2619; orchard industry, 2620; American competition with Canadian fruit growers, 2621; head tax, 2623

Stacey, Mr. F. B.—*Con.*
Campaign funds, 1225
Franchise Bill, Orientals, 1823
Hearing in the Chamber, suggested rearrangement of seats, 394
Indians, British Columbia, 4021, 4037
Inspection and Sale—Fruit containers, 2021
Oleomargarine, 1858
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 394-5
Soldier Settlement, 2141

Stamp taxes, 2487

Standing Orders, Com. appointed, 305

State Insurance for Returned Soldiers' Bill. Res., 3864, 3958; 1r., 3958; 2r., com., 4054; 3r., 4056; Senate amdts., 4466

Statistical Department, 1879, 3296

Statutes, proposed revision, 3821

Steamboat Inspection, 2125. *See also* Canada Shipping Act Amdt.

Steamers. *See* Vessels

Steamship Companies, proposed Govt. supervision of, 2013

Steamship Services
Canadian National Railway vessels, services, ques. 342
Campbellton-Gaspe, ques. 342
Charlottetown, 4280
Halifax-Cape Breton, 4281
Lockeport-Froude's Point, 4514
Magdalen Islands, 649-52
Malbaie-Tadoussac, ques. 674
Montreal-Quebec-Gaspe, ques. 587
Mulgrave-Canso, 4515
New Zealand, 4277
Newfoundland, 4277, 4281
South Africa, 4280
Victoria-Vancouver West Island, 4280
Victoria-Skagway, 4514

Steel Industry, 623, 629, 648. *See also* Shipbuilding
British Empire Steel Corporation, ques. 2777, 4010
Steel and shipping merger, 1895
Debate on M. to adjourn House, 1945

Steele, Mr. Michael (South Perth)
Alien immigrants, 812, 838
Board of Commerce resignations, 4258
Civil Servants with war record, 3130-1
Franchise Bill, voters' lists, 2440
Magazine postage rates, ques. 1898
Press, the, and postal rates, 3745-50, 3761
Retirement of members of public service, 3834

Steele, Mr. Michael—*Con.*
Rulings and statements as Chairman
Relevancy, 3219-20, 3680, 3713
Scientific research, 2169
Southam Press, Ltd., ques. 4096

Stefansson Expedition, ques. 704, 3284

Stein, Mr. Adolph (Kamouraska)
Criminal Code—petty thefts, 3420
Election and introduction, 949
House of Commons staff, 1041
Income tax
Appeals, 3243
Exemptions on account of children, 3298
Lightkeepers' salaries and bonus, 1282, 2110
Quebec and Saguenay Railway, ques. 3619
Rivière du Loup drill hall, 3726

Stenographers, Members', salaries of, ques, 2311

Sterling, payments to C.E.F., ques. 2008

Stevens, Mr. H. H. (Vancouver Centre)
Alcohol, tax on, 3495
Bill, introduction of—point of order, 1216
Budget, 2589. Minister of Finance and his critics—revenue and expenditure, 2589; foreign credits—Liberals and Liberal-Unionists, 2590; tariff as discussed by spokesman for the Opposition, 2591; war wealth taxation amdt. (Mr. Fielding) 2593; tariff reform, 2594; Farmers' platform, 2595; farmers and the sale of wheat, 2596; business profits taxes, 2598; elevators—political campaign contributions, 2599; income tax—the Budget and direct taxation, 2601; Wheat Board and wheat trade, elevators, etc., 2602; public debt and natural resources, 2603
Canadian Wheat Board, ques., 3294, 4104, 4112
Civil Service classification, ques. 674
Civil Service retirement, 3838
Debates—difficulty in hearing, 1416
Eight-hour day, 335
Fisheries—British Columbia, 3521
Franchise Bill
Advance polls, 3875
Aliens—certificate, 2089-91, 2094
Polling divisions, 1520
Returning officers, 1534
Grain trade. *See under this title,* Canadian Wheat Board
Indemnity of members, 4089
Military training, 3707-8

Stevens, Mr. H. H.—*Con.*
Militia, Cadet service, 3707-8
Naval Service
Badges, ques., 506
Debate on estimates—delay, 4411-2
Parliament Buildings, 1416
Purchasing govt. supplies, ques. 591
Returned soldiers' res. for special Com.—pensions, students, vocational training, 532
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 388, 395
Veterans and Pensions, 397, 3201
Sick and distressed mariners, 2253-4, 2263-4, 3099, 3105
Soldier Settlement—soldiers who remained in Canada, 1686
Special War Revenue
Bank overdrafts, 3798-9
Changes by Finance Minister, 3438, 3448
Water carriage of goods, 1213-6
Regulation of, 1723-7
Young, Mr. F., ques. 2313

Stewart, Mr. J. A. (Lanark)
Opium and Drug Bill, 1632, 1637, 1640, 1645, 1648, 1703, 1744-9, 1754-9
Special War Revenue
Proprietary medicines 3601-6
Sales taxes, 3611

Stewart, Mr. Thomas J. (West Hamilton)
Jams and marmalade, 3796
Letter carriers, 1232
Vessel rates, 1709, 1727

Stewart, Mr. W. J., 3985

Stoneham, Finlay, 567

Strikes. *See also* Grand Trunk; Industrial Disputes
How authorized in certain cases, 1902
Trial of Winnipeg parties, ques. 2181

Subsidies and Bounties—Farmers' party position, 899

Sugar
Embargo on, 3226
Importations, ques. 2009
Price, 1896

Superannuation. *See* Civil Service

Supply Bills. *See* Appropriation Acts

Supply, Committee of, 880, 1296, 1416, 1598, 1649, 1877, 2103, 2151, 2366, 2382, 2390, 3147, 3192, 3218, 3265, 3507, 3654, 3702, 3769, 3801, 3821, 3840, 3961, 4069, 4181, 4274, 4291, 4380, 4466, 4506

Supply, Committee of—*Con.*
Debate in, arrangements for, 1597, 1602, 1615
Ordered, 304
Subjects and items debated
Agriculture, 2382
Institute of, 2411
Minister, statement and review by, 2366
Bounties Act administration, 1877
British Columbia lighthouses, 1616
Canada Grain Act administration, 1877
Canada Year Book, 1879
Canadian National Railways, 4181
Civil Government, 859
Civil Service bonus, 1209
Cold storage, 2407
Culling timber, 1877
Customs, 3858
Dairying industry, 2403
Distressed seamen, 1613
Dominion lands and parks, 3283, 3769
Entomological Branch, 2401
Experimental Farms, 2382, 2390, 2412
External affairs, 3973
Fisheries, 3521
Flax, 1886
Gas and Electricity inspection, 1887
Health Dept., 3539
Immigration and Medical inspection, 3555
Indians, 3265
Industrial and Scientific Research, 1886
Interior Dept., 3192
Justice, 3840
Labour Dept., 4506
League of Nations, 3961
Lighthouses, 2110
Live stock, 1614
Marine hospitals, 3552
Marine, unforeseen expenses, 1615
Masters and mates, 1610
Meat and canned foods, 2411
Method of voting, 108. *See also* Estimates
Militia, 3654, 3702
Mines and Geological Survey, 3801
Naval affairs, 3507
Naval service, 4291, 4380
Navigation schools, 1612
Northwest territories, 3280
Ocean and river service, 1598, 2103
Patent record, 1886
Pilotage, 2119
Pollution of boundary waters, 3552
Post office, 4501
Public buildings, Nova Scotia, 3147
Public works, 1416, 3769
Quarantine, 3554
Railways and canals, 880, 2378, 4181

Supply, Committee of—*Con.*
Subjects and items debated—*Con.*
Registration of shipping, 1614
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 3194
St. Lawrence ship channel, 1616
Seed Branch, 2411
Shipbuilding, 618
Soldier Settlement, 2127, 2151, 3192
Sorel shipyard, 1620
Statistics—census, 1879
Steamboat inspection, 2125
Steamship subsidies, 4277
Terminal elevators, 1878
Trade, extension of, 1880
Wharves, 2122
Wrecks—investigations, 1612
Wrecking plants, 1615, 2103
Yukon, 3281

Supreme Court, judgment in *re* Board of Commerce, 3685

Supreme Court Act Amdt. 1r., 2003-4; 2r., 2315; com., 2317; 3r., 2389

Sutherland, Mr. Donald (South Oxford)
Agricultural Gazette, 1085
Budget, 2910. Congratulations to Finance Minister—Sir Robert Borden's return —Mr. Trahan—Canada's part in the war, 2911; Mr. Fielding's amdt. and address, 2912; Mr. Crerar's resignation from the Government, 2913; the recall —Mr. Crerar and farmers' organizations in Ontario, 2914; political organizations on class lines, 2915; farmers' delegation on conscription; Sir Wilfrid Laurier's policy in 1917—the Government and tariff revision, 2916; England and Canada compared as to tariff conditions, 2917; United Grain Growers, Limited, its policy and profits, 2919; elevator screenings, 2920; record of Mr. Crerar and Mr. J. F. Reid—dairy industry and Mr. Crerar's administration, 2921; agriculture in Ontario, abandoned farms, 2922; overcrowding of cities everywhere, 2923; Canada's war record—conscription, 2924; Canada will carry on, 2925
Business Profits tax, public utilities, 3236-7
Butter in cold storage, ques, 543
Campaign funds—Grain Growers, United Farmers, 1227
Canadian Wheat Board, 4125, 4343-4, 4355-6
Civil Service, bonus, 1277, 1282-4
Commercial Feeding Stuffs, 3167-73, 3395-3409
Analysis, ques. 922

Sutherland, Mr. Donald—*Con.*
Eight-hour day, 384
Industry and agriculture, 453
Experimental farm system, ques. 1360
Ontario, 4560
M. for extension, 1005, 1014
Food and Drugs Bill, 965
Food shortage, threatened, 1845
Franchise Bill—Indians, 2056
Grain elevators, ques. 3862
Indemnity of members, 4095
Inspection and Sale Act—containers, 2021
Mining resources—prospectors, 3812
National Council of Women, declaration by, 1841
Oleomargarine, 1840-75
Re-claimed screenings, ques. 507
Registration postal rate, and express companies, 3744
Rural mail carriers, 1233, 1282-4
Soldier Settlement, 2131
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill—License, small manufacturer, 3797
Threat to members by outsiders, 1743
United Grain Growers' Limited, ques. 922

Sydney, Quarantine station, 3149

Syrians in Canada, ques. 3862

Tache, Mr. Charles Eugene, ques. 3490

Tache, Mr. J. de L., 4505

Taft, ex-President, and Grand Trunk Railway, 3490

Tariff. *See also* Address; Budget; Customs, Special War Revenue
French Treaty. *See that title*
Prices, 227
Reduction of—amdt. (Mr. Fielding) to Budget, 2510
7½ per cent, ques. 1001
Tobacco, duties on, ques. 1114

Tariff Changes, 2490

Taxation. *See also* Revenue Bills
Business profits, ques. 314
Civil Service income by Ottawa city. *See* Ottawa City Agreement Bill
Customs. *See also* Tariff
7½ per cent, ques. 1001
Direct or indirect, 128, 167
Excess profits, ques. 2012
Govt. railway property, of, 580-1, 3893
Income, 123, 227
Forms in French, 1084, 1573
Incomes over $100,000, ques. 3490
Inspector at Kingston, ques. 2181
Trust and Loan Company of Canada, 586

Taxation—*Con.*
Income and profits, collection, ques. 806
Indemnity of members. *See that title*
Land, 128, 177, 220, 228, 2612, 2883, 2888
Single Tax, 1120, 2651-7, 2706
Luxuries, 2615. *See also* Special War Revenue
Mines, 128, 3810
Mutual Insurance Companies, ques. 2012
Provincial and Federal, 833
Provincial salaries and indemnities, ques. 3490
Railway profits, 865
Real estate transfers, 3796
War profits, 189, 302
War taxes, ques. 1001
War tax stamps, ques. 807
Waterfront privileges, 128
Wealth, 2527

Taxes, municipal payment by Dominion. *See* Ottawa City agreement

Technical Education, 43, 53
Government assistance, ques. 2519

Technical Education Bill. 1r., 1290; 2r., com., 1761; 3r., 1762

Telegraphs and Telephones, 4577
Govt. contracts, ques. 1627
Govt. operators, bonus, ques. 2182
Rates appeal, ques. 2009

Témiscouata Railway, ques. 674

Textiles, duties on imports, ques. 1899. *See also* Customs

Theodore D'Acton Post Office, ques. 2011

Theriault and St. Quentin catastrophe, 3080

Thompson, Mr. Alfred (Yukon)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 76. Parliament Buildings, 76; Orders in Council and Yukon—stability of Union Government, 77; industrial prosperity and popular unrest—high cost of living and the remedy, 78; Canada and Canada's achievements—local representation in the Cabinet, position of Hon. Mr. Blondin, 79; proposed general election—Leader of the Opposition on the health of the Prime Minister, 80; hopes for Prime Miniser's restoration to health, 81
Franchise Bill
Disqualification of candidates, 1088
"Rural polling division," 1993

Thompson, Mr. Alfred—*Con.*
Franking privilege, 3357
Opium and Drug Bill, 1631-2
Scientific research, 2160
Stefansson expedition, ques. 704
Yukon Placer Mining Act, 3107-9

Thomson, Mr. Levi (Qu'Appelle)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 177. Class representation and class legislation, 177; exchange rate and trade—Canadian Reconstruction Association, 178; proposed general election, 179
Budget, 2614. War revenue, 2614; luxury taxes—critics of Farmers' party, 2615; manufacturers and farmers, 2616; free list asked for by Farmers' party, 2617: manufacturers would benefit by tariff reduction, 2618
Federal Bureau of Education, 1386
Franchise Bill, 746
Advance polls, 1941, 2000-1
Aliens—certificate, 2091-3, 2099
Canada Temperance Act, 2053
Contributions, 1170, 1196
Conveying voters—compulsory voting, 1064
Disqualification — charitable support, those receiving, 1817-8
Election expenses, 1154, 1930-1
Nomination—"Elector," how defined, 1917-8
Recall, the, 2038-40, 2046
Returning officers, 1523
"Rural polling division," 1993
Voters' lists, 2434, 2441
Newspaper postage, 3756-7
Race track betting, 3432
Soldier Settlement, 1698
Cattle branding, 1700-1

Threat to Members, 1743

Three Rivers harbour, 3491

Thrift, 13. *See also* Government Annuities
Need of, Speech from the Throne, reference to, 8

Ticket of Leave, 398, 2015

Timber Culling, 1877

Timiskaming, By-election, 1188, 2898

Timiskaming Lake
Wharves, 2187, 3493

Tobacco. *See also* Inland Revenue and Customs

Tobacco—*Con.*
Duties on, ques. 1114
Leaf, ques. 996

Tobin, Mr. Edmund William (Richmond and Wolfe)
Asbestos postmaster, ques. 320
Auditor General's report, publication in French, ques, 1627
Blondin, Hon. Mr., trips to Europe, 541
Canada Gazette, ques. 2179
Canadian Northern railway lands, ques. 1626, ques. 2008
Chinese in Canada, ques. 805
Connaught Rifle range, ques. 671
Dominion notes and gold standard, ques. 588
Duncan, Mr. Walter, ques. 2720
Finance Dept. employees, ques. 592
Imperial Press Conference, ques. 410
Japanese in Canada, ques. 805
Langton, Brig. Gen. J. G., ques., 541, ques. 811
Medical officers and nurses, ques. 341
Military Police, ques. 804, ques. 805
Militia Dept., London employees, ques. 671
Obligations, Dominion, ques. 998
Parliament Buildings, 1422
Door contract, ques. 320
Post Office, ques. 3294
Ste. Anne soldiers' hospital, ques. 588
Special War Revenue Act
Boots, 3565
Sporting goods, 3572

Tolmie, Hon. S. F.. (Minister of Agriculture)
Agriculture, review of, 2366. Increased production, possibilities, 2366; keeping people on the farm, 2371; city man and farmer—home and foreign markets, 2372; Dept. of Agriculture and its branches, 2373; summary of policy, 2376; dairy cows, 2378; labour situation, 2379
Agricultural Gazette, 1085
Animal Contagious Diseases Bill, 1622, 1840
Cold storage, 2407-9
Commercial feeding stuffs, 3163-74, 3403-9
Dairy industry, 2403-6
Cow testing and milk testing, 2406
Election and introduction, 1, 47
Entomology, branch, 2402
Experimental farms, 1013, 2375, 2382-9, 2396-9, 2401, 2404, 2412
Ontario and, 1015
Flax industry, 696
Fox farming, 2409

Tolmie, Hon. S. F.—*Con.*
Fruit Branch, 2410
Grading export butter and cheese, 602-4
Hewitt, the late Dr. Gordon, 2375-6
Inspection and Sale Act (Fruit packages) 1915-6, 2016-23
Apple barrels, 2022
Authority of Governor in Council, 2019
Nova Scotia fruit growers, 2017-8
Penalties, 2020
Size of packages, 2016-7, 3109
International Institute of Agriculture, 2411
Meat and canned food, 2411
Oleomargarine Bill, 1781, 1875-7, 1968-71
Potato Bag, 4562
Seed Branch, 2411
Tobacco growing, 2376, 2383
Victoria
By-election, 4584
Shipbuilding—work for returned soldiers, 4584
Wheat—work of Mr. S. Wheeler, 2388

Toronto
Exhibition Buildings, use of by militia, ques. 2009
Grain elevators, ques. 1897
Harbour improvements, ques. 2181
Income tax payments, ques. 592
Postal employees, threatened strike of, 3424
Postal station "A," 3155
Rifle range, 3728
Telephone rates appeal, ques. 2009
Union station, 3225-6

Toronto Eastern and Toronto Suburban Railways, ques. 1004, ques. 1510, ques. 2080

Tracadie Lazaretto, 3554

Trade
Austria and Germany, from, ques. 2416, ques. 3359
British Preference, 2079
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 621
Extension of, 1880
Foreign, 2477, 2481
France with
Customs tariff convention, ques. 3684
Treaty, 3425, ques. 4323
Royal Commission on, ques. 4502
Russia, with, 4322
West Indies Conference, 3161
Greece and Roumania with, ques. 2414

Trahan, Mr. Arthur (Nicolet)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 87. Liberal party in the war, 87; Quebec, then and now, 88; farmers' and conscription, 89; Quebec and its "hour"—Quebec and its tolerance, 90; League of Nations—Canadian autonomy, 91; Navy, Lord Jellicoe's visit—tax exempt bonds—Grand Trunk Railway, 92; public ownership of railways—Civil Service classification, 93; agriculture, Quebec people stay on the land—the disease of luxury, 94; radicalism and imperialism, 96

Trahan, Mr. Arthur—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
Bankruptcy Bill, 3256
Budget, 2857. Progressive weakness of national credit and its causes—gold reserve, 2857; inflation of credits—prices, 2859; exchange situation and remedies therefor, 2860; Canada and Japan, position as result of the war— deflation, 2861; increased production necessary, 2862; Mr. Fielding's amdt.—Supreme Council for Peace Conference and commercial freedom — Europe's debts to Canada, 2863
Civil Service holidays, 4057-62
Franchise Bill, 776
Corrupt practices—penalties, 1160-1
Election expenses, 1153-4
Polling divisions, 1518
Mackie, Mr. H. A., absence of, 2969
Water-powers surveys, 3292

Transcontinental Railway. *See* Canadian National

Translation Staff. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. (French version); House of Commons

Trent Canal wharves, ques., 586, ques. 1359

Trust Companies Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 855; 2r., com., 3r., 1779

Turgeon, Mr. Onésiphore (Gloucester)
Abey, Mr. H. R., ques. 1000
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 110. French language—New Brunswick cabinet representation, 110; representation and census, 111; proposed general election—land values taxation—exchange and currency, 112; franchise, 114
Biological Board, ques. 2572
Budget, 2649. Congratulations to Minister of Finance—Canada's soldiers, 2649; gross and net debt—new taxes, 2650; Mr. J. H. Sinclair's charges—free trade advocated—Henry George and land values taxation, 2651; Liberal party and free trade, 2652; Farmers' party

Turgeon, Mr. Onésiphore—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
and Liberal party—need of increased production, 2653; Mr. Elkin and tariff; manufacturers would benefit by free trade, 2654; foreign trade, harbours and shipping, 2655; free trade and new sources of revenue, 2656; land values tax and its effects, 2657; repeal of land value taxes in Britain, 2659; "Scientific tariff," 2659
Canadian National Railways
Deficits — rates — management—representation of labour — subdivisions, 4202-8
Rates, 1443
Experimental Farms, 2382
Franchise Bill
Advance polls—fixed day of the week for elections, 1164, 1942
Election officers, fees, etc., 3868
Proclamation—language of publication, 1080, 1828, 1833-7, 2267-70, 2310
Amdt. 1834, neg. 2311
Returning officers, 1530, 1581-2
French speeches in House, 701
Grand Trunk Railway, 1443
Indemnity of members, 4086
Pensions, 432, 3934
Quarantine—Tracadie and D'Arcy Island, 3554
Railway rates and Parliament, 4188
Returned soldiers, 531
Fishing industry, and, 3934
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 3993

Turk, Expulsion of from Europe, ques. 409

Tweedie, Mr. Thomas M. M. (West Calgary)
Banff National park, 3770
Farmers' Co-operative Company, 3995-6
Franchise Bill
Aliens—certificate, 2236-7
Contributions, 1184
Recall, the, 2023, 2029, 2033, 2045-50
Returning officers, 1528, 1533
Voters' lists, 2431-8
Indemnity of members 4090
Militia—active militia, allowance, 3669-71
Opium and Drug Bill, 1645, 1647-9
Personal position, 2049
Retirement of members of public service, 3826-9
Scientific research, 2172
Shipbuilding, Credits Bill, 3996

Typhus Epidemic, 4545

Uniform, unlawful use of, 3417. *See also* Criminal Code

Union Government. *See debates under* Address; Budget

United Grain Growers, Limited, ques. 922

United Shoe Company case, 4479

United States, *See also* League of Nations
Canadian ambassador to, announcement, 2177
Canadian representation in, 4533. *See also* Washington
Coast defence and, 4294, 4298
Export of screenings to. *See* Commercial Feeding Stuffs
Fisheries treaty with, ques. 1002, 1290, 3161
Immigrants from, ques. 1463
League of Nations, and, ques. 1118, 3977
Liquor shipments to, 2107, 2118
Shipping Board and Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, ques. 2009
Soldiers and lands in Canada. *See* Dominion Lands Act Amdt.

Universal Military Training, 923

Unopposed Motions for Returns, 321, 415, 437, 544, 675, 923, 1004, 1123, 1362, 1464, 1628, 1900, 2015, 2313, 2417, 2722, 2896, 3079, 3294, 3490

Vancouver, B. C.
Dry dock, ques. 316, ques. 3620
Public building, 3156

Vandal, Mr. Calixte, ques. 1740

Vatican Mission, ques. 310

Venereal Diseases, 924, 927, 3556

Verville, Mr. Alphonse (St. Denis)
Board of Commerce, M. for abolition, 1143
Bonus and salaries, ques. 2079; ques. 2311
Eight-hour day, 381
Grand Trunk Railway and strike of 1910, 1564
House of Commons staff, ques. 590
Indemnity of members, 4072-3
Industrial disputes, 1981-2
Musical instruments, tax on, 3595-6
Parliament Buildings, 1424-7
Popular unrest, 1145
Price regulation, 1143
Profiteers—punishment, 1145

Vessel Rates, 1733, ques. 2414, ques. 2572, ques. 2777. *See also* Railway Act Amendment

Vessels. *See also* Shipbuilding
Canadian National Railways, ques. 342
Charge on for sick mariners, 2253
Icebreakers, 230, 1598, 1620
Uniforms of men on, 1603
"Montcalm," 1606
Importation of material used in construction, ques. 1114

Names
"A. J. McKie," ques. 587, 903, 910
"Canada," ques. 1230
"Canadian Inventor," 3226, 3359
"Canadian Pioneer," 902
"Canadian Recruit," ques. 312, ques. 1199, 648
"Champlain," ques. 314, ques. 672, ques. 921, ques. 1121; ques. 3619
"J. D. Hazen," 2105
"Lady Evelyn," ques. 3619
"Lady Grey"—Uniforms for crew, ques. 1003, ques. 1361
"Montcalm," 1606. *See also* Icebreakers
"Niobe" and "Rainbow." *See* Naval Defence
"Simcoe," ques. 413
"Stanley," ques. 312
"Three Rivers," ques. 1897
"Voyageur," ques. 2776
"33," ques. 410
Under Railway Commission, ques. 2777. *See also* Railway Act Amdt.

Victoria
By-election, 4584
Dry dock, ques. 3619
Shipowners (Limited) 4583

Victoria and Carleton, by-election, 121

Victoriaville-Arthabaska Branch Line, ques. 4502

Victory Loans, ques. 803, 2520
Amount of, ques. 2008
Commissions, ques. 320
Committee, ques. 320, ques. 2008
Gold, payments in, 2647-8
Tax exemption, 92. *See also* Loans

Vien, Mr. Thomas (Lotbiniére)
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, withholding of information, 1654-5, 1681-3
Canadian National Railways, 1457
Civil Service
Bonus, 1273, 1285
Holidays, 4062
Retirement of members, 4461

Vien, Mr. Thomas—*Con.*
Electricity, competition in sale of—taxation, 3116
Food and Drugs Bill, 1256, 1266-7
Franchise Bill
Disqualification, charitable aid, those receiving, 1815-8
Proclamation, language of publication, 2286-96
Grand Trunk Railway, 1454-9
Income tax, 3120
Charities, 3246
Stock dividends, 3239-40
Maple products, 1255-6
Opium and Drug Bill, 1703-6
Pilotage, 1839
Post Office salaries, 4527-9
Private Bills—insurance and loan, 3860
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 3210-1, 3213-4
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 4139
Soldier settlement
Defaults, 3223
Staff, 3220-1
Steel and shipping merger, 1953-6

Vimy Battlefield, ques. 1358, 1460

Vladivostok, Japanese occupation of, 1945

Vouchers, Govt. loss of at sea, ques. 3489

Wainwright, Herd of Buffalo, 3283

War
Army boots and shoes, ques. 506
Battlefields Memorial, 1460, 1738, 2078, 2177
Bonus to soldiers, 1082
Canada's record, 46
Canadian Expenditionary Force
Burke, Rev. A. E., Chaplain, ques. 2079
Members, ques. 315
Officers and men stationed in Canada, ques. 1200
Provinces, enlistments by, ques. 408
Sterling, payments in, ques. 2008
Vouchers, Government, loss of at sea, ques. 3489
Canteen profits, 709, ques. 800
Defaulters, Chicoutimi, ques. 409
Equipment, guns, 3661-2
Fishermen, and, 845
Indemnity
Allies conference at Ostend, 2476, 2574
Canada's share, 1084
Germany, payments, ques. 310, ques. 1463
Kinmel camp riots, 709
Medals, ques. 1003, 1046, ques. 1120
Medical officers and nurses, ques. 341

War—*Con.*
Memorial, 1460, 3228
Militia headquarters officers not in France, ques. 506
Pensions. *See that title*
Re-establishment. *See that title*
Trophies, 4557

War Bonds. *See also* Budget
Govt., amount of, 2009

War Bonds Over-Suscription Validation Bill. Res. 4137, 4180; 1r., 4181; 2r., com., 4287; 3r., 4288

War Measures Act, Coal Operations and. *See* Coal

War Purchasing Commission. *See* Purchasing Commission

War Tax Stamps, ques. 807

War Trophies, 4557

Washington, Canadian Representative at, 448, 1742, 3080-1, 4533
Amdt. (Mr. Fielding) to Supply, 2442-4, neg. 2475
Amdt. (Mr. Mackenzie King) to reduce vote, 4540
Announcement, 2177

Washington Labour Conference, 371

Washington, Trade Mission at, 1882

Waste, deplorable, 679

Water Carriage of Goods. *See also* Railway Act Amdt.
M. (Mr. Stevens) 1213
Order for Bill called—dropped, 2311

Water Powers of British Columbia, ques. 1118

Water Rights. *See* Irrigation Act Amdt.

Waugh, Mr.—Saar Valley Commission, 344

Ways and Means, Committee ordered, 304, 1289, 3078, 3110, 3111, 3215

Weeds. *See* Noxious

Weights and Measures, Inspector of, ques. 4096

Westfield Beach Railway, running rights, ques. 508, 4230

West Indies
Canada's trade with, 635, 2542
Conference, 1884, 2892, 3161, 3860
Outrages on blacks, 2845-6

Wharves, 2122. *For individual wharves, see their titles*

Wheat. *See also* Canada Grain Act
Exports to United States, ques. 313
Greece, for, ques. 509, ques. 415
Improved breeds of seed—Mr. S. Wheeler's work, 2387
Marquis, 1013
Participation certificates, 127, ques. 802, ques. 802
Production, 147
Shipments by farmers to United States, ques., 802

Wheat Board. *See* Canada Wheat Board

Wheeler, Mr. S., 2387-8

Whidden, Mr. Howard Primrose (Brandon)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 115; Proposed general election—Reconstruction, 115; Franchise Act—Canada and external affairs—European distress, 116; Little Canadians, 118
Alien immigrants, 829
Canada Temperance Act, ques. 807
Scientific research, 2166

White, Mr. A. V., ques. 1002

White, Mr. James, ques. 2573

White, Hon. Sir Thomas (Leeds)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 182. Personal position—congratulations to leader of the Opposition—proposed general election, 182; mandate of the Govt.—Franchise Act, 183; Union Govt. and its record, 184; the country needs stability of administration, 185; National Liberal-Conservative party—Farmers' movement, 185; Canada's war finance—Hon. Mr. Crerar, 187; tariff for revenue and for protection—his financial administration, 188; taking war profits for public benefit, 189; loans in New York—exchange rate and trade, 190—farmers leaving the land—domestic loans, 191; thrift campaign—tax-free bonds, 192; Canada's financial credit, 193; "Carry On!" 194

White, Mr. W. H. (Victoria, Alberta)
Agriculture and stock raising, 2376-8
Alberta penitentiary, ques. 2777, 3855-7

White, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways
Brudenheim branch, 871-2, 885, 4250
Equipment, 4250
Canadian Wheat Board, 4130
Car shortage, 882-3
Franchise Bill, 765
Advance polls, 1934, 3875-6
Name not on list—oaths, 3877
Polls, hours to be open, 1920-1
Recall, the, 2050-1
Horse racing 3428
Naturalization, enemy alien origin, 3921-2
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 3199-3200
Pensions, 3202
Saskatchewan and Manitoba penitentiaries, ques. 2574
Soldier Settlement, 2132-3
Spirit River wheat shipments, 566

Wigmore, Mr. Rupert W. (St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert)
Freight to Canada from United States prepaid, 1893
Opium and Drug Bill, 1753, 1756-8
St. John dry dock, 4573
St. John harbour—pilots, 2118
St. John river—wharves, 2123
St. John-Digby service, 4285-6

Williams Head quarantine, 3156

Wilson, Mr. J. R. (Saskatoon)
Agriculture, 2387
Canadian Wheat Board, 4354
Civil Service bonus—letter carriers, 1276
Coal Operations director, 3180
Commercial Feeding Stuffs, 3165-6
Franchise Bill—conveying voters, 1062
Income tax, charities, 3313
Newsprint, 2967

Wilson, Mr. J. R.—*Con.*
Soldier Settlement—cattle branding, 1699
Special War Revenue, 3574
Jewellers, licenses'—department stores, 3583
Wheeler, Mr. S., 2387

Wine—imports from France, ques. 1627

Winnipeg
Grain exchange, ques. 2005
Meterological station, 2125
Postal station "A," 3156
Strikers, trial of, ques. 2181

Wolff, Mr., and Printing Bureau, ques. 1624

Women in Industry, 369

Women's Conference, 262

Wood Alcohol, 3580

Workmen's Compensation Act and seamen, 2263. *See also* Canada Shipping Act, 2263

Wrecks, Investigations, 1612

Wrecking Plants, subsidies, 1615

Wright, Mr. H. O. (Battleford)
Budget, 2753. Luxury taxes, 2754; duties on farm machinery—farmers and tariff—Mr. Fielding's amdt., 2755
Franchise Bill, advance polls, 3876

Young and Co., Arthur. *See* Arthur Young

Young Men's Christian Association, 1219, 1226

Yukon, administration—salaries, etc., 3281

Yukon Placer Mining Bill. 1r., 2892; 2r., com., 3106; 3r., 3109; Senate amdts. 4264